Genomic analysis of European *Drosophila melanogaster* populations on a dense spatial scale reveals longitudinal population structure and continent-wide selection

Martin Kapun[1,2,3,*], Maite G. Barrón[1,4,*], Fabian Staubach[1,5,§], Jorge Vieira[1,6,7], Darren J. Obbard[1,8], Clément Goubert[1,9,10], Omar Rota-Stabelli[1,11], Maaria Kankare[1,12,§], Annabelle Haudry[1,9], R. Axel W. Wiberg[1,13,14], Lena Waidele[1,5], Iryna Kozeretska[1,15], Elena G. Pasyukova[1,16], Volker Loeschcke[1,17], Marta Pascual[1,18], Cristina P. Vieira[1,6,7], Svitlana Serga[1,15], Catherine Montchamp-Moreau[1,19], Jessica Abbott[1,20], Patricia Gibert[1,9], Damiano Porcelli[1,21], Nico Posnien[1,22], Sonja Grath[1,23], Élio Sucena[1,24,25], Alan O. Bergland[1,26,§], Maria Pilar Garcia Guerreiro[1,27], Banu Sebnem Onder[1,28], Eliza Argyridou[1,23], Lain Guio[1,4], Mads Fristrup Schou[1,17], Bart Deplancke[1,29], Cristina Vieira[1,9], Michael G. Ritchie[1,13], Bas J. Zwaan[1,30], Eran Tauber[1,31], Dorcas J. Orengo[1,18], Eva Puerma[1,18], Montserrat Aguadé[1,18], Paul S. Schmidt[1,32,§], John Parsch[1,23], Andrea J. Betancourt[1,33], Thomas Flatt[1,2,3,†,§], Josefa González[1,4,†,§]

[1] The European *Drosophila* Population Genomics Consortium (*DrosEU*)

[2] Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

[3] Department of Biology, University of Fribourg, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland

[4] Institute of Evolutionary Biology, CSIC-Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

[5] Department of Evolutionary Biology and Ecology, University of Freiburg, 79104 Freiburg, German

[6] Instituto de Biologia Molecular e Celular (IBMC) University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

[7] Instituto de Investigação e Inovação em Saúde (I3S), University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

[8] Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

[9] Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive, UMR CNRS 5558, University Lyon 1,

Lyon, France

[10] Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, 107 Biotechnology Building, Cornell

University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

[11] Research and Innovation Centre, Fondazione Edmund Mach, San Michele all' Adige,

Italy

[12] Department of Biological and Environmental Science, University of Jyväskylä,

Jyväskylä, Finland

[13] Centre for Biological Diversity, School of Biology, University of St. Andrews, St Andrews,

United Kingdom

[14] Evolutionary Biology, Zoological Institute, University of Basel, Basel, CH-4051,

Switzerland

[15] General and Medical Genetics Department, Taras Shevchenko National University of

Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

[16] Laboratory of Genome Variation, Institute of Molecular Genetics of RAS, Moscow,

Russia

[17] Department of Bioscience - Genetics, Ecology and Evolution, Aarhus University, Aarhus

C, Denmark

[18] Departament de Genètica, Microbiologia i Estadística, Facultat de Biologia and Institut

de Recerca de la Biodiversitat (IRBio), Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[19] Laboratoire Evolution, Génomes, Comportement et Ecologie (EGCE) UMR 9191 CNRS

- UMR247 IRD - Université Paris Sud - Université Paris Saclay. 91198 Gif sur Yvette

Cedex, France.

[20] Department of Biology, Section for Evolutionary Ecology, Lund, Sweden

[21] Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, Sheffield, United Kingdom

[22] Universität Göttingen, Johann-Friedrich-Blumenbach-Institut für Zoologie und

Anthropologie, Göttingen, Germany

[23] Division of Evolutionary Biology, Faculty of Biology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität

München, Planegg, Germany

[24] Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, Oeiras, Portugal

[25] Departamento de Biologia Animal, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa,

Lisboa, Portugal

[26] Department of Biology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

[27] Departament de Genètica i Microbiologia, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,

Barcelona, Spain

[28] Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

[29] Laboratory of Systems Biology and Genetics, EPFL-SV-IBI-UPDEPLA, CH-1015

Lausanne, Switzerland

[30] Laboratory of Genetics, Department of Plant Sciences, Wageningen University,

Wageningen, Netherlands

[31] Department of Evolutionary and Environmental Biology and Institute of Evolution,

University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

[32] Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

[33] Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom

[†] **For correspondence**: thomas.flatt@unifr.ch, josefa.gonzalez@ibe.upf-csic.es

[*] These authors contributed equally to this work

§ Members of the *Drosophila* Real Time Evolution (Dros-RTEC) Consortium

Competing interests: The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

Genetic variation is the fuel of evolution. However, analyzing dynamics of evolutionary

change in natural populations is challenging, genome sequencing of entire populations

remains costly and comprehensive sample collection logistically challenging. To tackle this

issue and to define relevant spatial and temporal scales of variation for a population

genetic model system, the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, we have founded the

European *Drosophila* Population Genomics Consortium (*DrosEU*). Our principal objective

is to employ the strengths of this collaborative consortium to extensively sample and

sequence natural populations on a continent-wide scale and across distinct timescales.

Here we present the first analysis of the first *DrosEU* pool-sequencing dataset, consisting

of 48 population samples collected across the European continent in 2014. The analysis of

this comprehensive dataset uncovers novel patterns of variation at multiple levels:

genome-wide neutral SNPs, mtDNA haplotypes, inversions and TEs that exhibit previously

cryptic longitudinal population structure across the European continent; signatures of

selective sweeps shared among the majority of European populations; presumably

adaptive clines in inversions; and geographic variation in TEs. Additionally, we document

highly variable microbiota among European fruit fly populations and identify several new

Drosophila viruses. Our study reveals novel aspects of the population biology of *D.*

melanogaster and illustrates the power of extensive sampling and pooled sequencing of

natural populations on a continent-wide scale.

Keywords: *Drosophila*, population genomics, demography, selection, clines, SNPs,

structural variants, symbionts.

Introduction

Genetic variation is the raw material for evolutionary change. Understanding the processes

that create and maintain variation in natural populations remains a fundamental goal in

evolutionary biology. The identification of patterns of genetic variation within and among

taxa (Dobzhansky 1970; Lewontin 1974; Kreitman 1983; Kimura 1984; Hudson *et al.* 1987;

McDonald & Kreitman 1991; e.g., Adrian & Comeron 2013) provides fundamental insights

into the action of various evolutionary forces. Historically, due to technological constraints,

studies of genetic variation were limited to single loci or small genomic regions and to

static sampling of small numbers of individuals from natural populations. The development

of population genomics has extended such analyses to patterns of variation on a genome-

wide scale (e.g., Black *et al.* 2001; Jorde *et al.* 2001; Luikart *et al.* 2003; Begun *et al.* 2007;

Sella *et al.* 2009; Charlesworth 2010; Casillas & Barbadilla 2017). This has resulted in

fundamental advances in our understanding of historical and contemporaneous

evolutionary dynamics in natural populations (e.g., Sella *et al.* 2009; Hohenlohe *et al.*

2010; Cheng *et al.* 2012; Fabian *et al.* 2012; Pool *et al.* 2012; Messer & Petrov 2013;

Ellegren 2014; Harpur *et al.* 2014; Kapun *et al.* 2014; Bergland *et al.* 2014; Charlesworth

2015; Zanini *et al.* 2015; Kapun *et al.* 2016a; Casillas & Barbadilla 2017).

However, large-scale sampling and genome sequencing of entire populations remains

largely prohibitive in terms of sequencing costs and labor-intensive sample collection,

limiting the number of populations that can be analyzed. Evolution is a highly dynamic

process across a variety of spatial scales in many taxa; thus, to generate a comprehensive

context for population genomic analyses, it is essential to define the appropriate spatial

scales of analysis, from meters to thousands of kilometers (Levins 1968; Endler 1977;

Richardson *et al.* 2014). Furthermore, one-time sampling of natural populations provides

only a static view of patterns of genetic variation. Allele frequency changes can be highly

dynamic even across very short timescales (e.g., Umina *et al.* 2005; Bergland *et al.* 2014;

Behrman *et al.* 2018), and theoretical work suggests that such temporal dynamics may be

an important yet largely understudied mechanism by which genetic variation is maintained

(Wittmann *et al.* 2017). It is thus essential to define the relevant spatio-temporal scales for

sampling and population genomic analyses accordingly.

To generate a population genomic framework that can deliver appropriate high-resolution

sampling and to provide a unique resource to the research community, we formed the

European *Drosophila* Population Genomics Consortium (*DrosEU*; https://droseu.net). Our

primary objective is to utilize the strengths of this consortium to extensively sample and

sequence European populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* on a continent-wide scale

and across distinct timescales

D. melanogaster offers several advantages for such an concerted sampling and analysis

effort: a relatively small genome, a broad geographic range, a multivoltine life history that

allows sampling across generations over short timescales, ease of sampling natural

populations using standardized techniques, an extensive research community and a well-

developed context for population genomic analysis (Powell 1997; Keller 2007; Hales *et al.*

2015). The species is native to sub-Saharan Africa and has subsequently expanded its

range into novel habitats in Europe over the last 10,000-15,000 years and in North

America and Australia in the last several hundred years (e.g., Lachaise *et al.* 1988; David

& Capy 1988; Keller 2007). On both the North American and Australian continents, the

prevalence of latitudinal clines in frequencies of alleles (e.g., Schmidt & Paaby 2008;

Turner *et al.* 2008; Kolaczkowski *et al.* 2011b; Fabian *et al.* 2012; Bergland *et al.* 2014;

Machado *et al.* 2016; Kapun *et al.* 2016a), structural variants such as chromosomal

inversions (Mettler *et al.* 1977; Voelker *et al.* 1978; Knibb *et al.* 1981; Knibb 1982; 1986;

Anderson *et al.* 1991; Rako *et al.* 2006; Kapun *et al.* 2014; Rane *et al.* 2015; Kapun *et al.*

2016a) and transposable elements (TEs) (Boussy *et al.* 1998; González *et al.* 2008; 2010),

and complex phenotypes (de Jong & Bochdanovits 2003; Schmidt & Paaby 2008; Schmidt

et al. 2008; Flatt *et al.* 2013; Adrion *et al.* 2015 and references therein; Kapun *et al.* 2016b;

Behrman *et al.* 2018) have been interpreted to result from local adaptation to

environmental factors that co-vary with latitude or as the legacy of an out-of-Africa

dispersal history. However, sampling across these latitudinal gradients has not been

replicated outside of a single transect on the east coasts of both continents. The observed

latitudinal clines on the east coasts of North America and Australia may have been

generated, at least in part, by demography and differential colonization histories of

populations at high and low latitudes (Bergland *et al.* 2016). In North America, for example,

temperate populations appear to be largely of European origin, whereas low latitude

populations show evidence of greater admixture from ancestral African populations and

the Caribbean (Caracristi & Schlötterer 2003; Yukilevich & True 2008a; b; Duchen *et al.*

2013; Kao *et al.* 2015; Bergland *et al.* 2016). More intensive sampling and analysis of both

African as well as European populations is essential to disentangling the relative

importance of local adaptation versus colonization history and demography in generating

the clinal patterns that have been widely observed. While there has been a great deal of

progress in the analysis of ancestral African populations (e.g., Begun & Aquadro 1993;

Corbett-Detig & Hartl 2012; Pool *et al.* 2012; Fabian *et al.* 2015; Lack *et al.* 2015; 2016),

Europe remains largely uncharacterized at the population genomic level (Božičević *et al.*

2016; Pool *et al.* 2016; Mateo *et al.* 2018).

Here, we present the first analysis of the *DrosEU* pool-sequencing data from a set of 48

European population samples collected in 2014. We examine the 2014 *DrosEU* data at

three levels: (1) patterns of variation at ~5.5 x 10^6 single-nucleotide polymorphisms

(SNPs) in the nuclear and mitochondrial (mtDNA) genomes; (2) variation in copy number

of transposable elements (TEs); (3) cosmopolitan chromosomal inversions previously

associated with climate adaptation; and (4) large amounts of variation among populations

in microbiota, including endosymbionts, bacteria, and viruses. We find that European

populations of *D. melanogaster* exhibit novel patterns of variation at all levels investigated:

neutral SNPs in the nuclear genome and mtDNA haplotypes that reveal previously

unknown longitudinal population structure; genomic regions consistent with selective

sweeps that indicate selection on a continent-wide scale; new evidence for inversion clines

in Europe; and spatio-temporal variation in TEs frequencies. We also identify four new

DNA viruses and for the first time assemble the complete genome of a fifth. These novel

features are revealed by the comprehensive magnitude of our coordinated sampling, thus

demonstrating the utility of this approach.

Together with other genomic datasets for *D. melanogaster* (e.g., DGRP, DPGP, DGN;

reviewed in Casillas & Barbadilla 2017) our data provide a rich and powerful community

resource for studies in molecular population genetics. Importantly, the *DrosEU* data

represent the first comprehensive characterization of genetic variation in *D. melanogaster*

on the European continent.

Results

As part of the *DrosEU* effort, we collected and sequenced 48 population samples of *D. melanogaster* from 32 geographical locations across Europe in 2014 (Table 1; Figure 2 and Figure 3A). While our analyses focus on spatial patterns, thirteen of the 32 locations were sampled repeatedly (at least twice) during the year, allowing a first, crude analysis of seasonal changes in allele frequencies between summer and fall on a genome-wide level (Figure 2). All 48 samples were sequenced to high coverage, with a mean coverage per population of >50x (Table S1 and Figure S1). Using this high-quality dataset, we performed the first comprehensive, continent-wide population genomic analysis of European *D. melanogaster* (Figure 2). In addition to nuclear SNPs, we also analyzed mtDNA, TE insertions, chromosomal inversion polymorphisms, and the *Drosophila*-associated microbiome (Figure 3).

Most SNPs are widespread throughout Europe

We identified a total of 5,558,241 "high confidence" SNPs with frequencies > 0.1% across all 48 samples (Figure 3B, Table S1 and S2). Of these, 17% (941,080) were shared among all samples, whereas 62% were polymorphic in fewer than 50% of the samples (Figure 4A). Due to our filtering scheme, SNPs that are private or nearly private to a sample will be recovered only if they are at a substantial frequency in that sample (~5%). In fact, only a small proportion of SNPs (1% = 3,645) was found in fewer than 10% of the samples, and only 0.004% (210) were specific to a single sample (Figure 4A). To avoid an excess contribution of SNPs from populations with multiple (seasonal) sampling, we repeated the analysis by considering only the earliest (Figure S2A) or latest (Figure S2B) sample from populations with seasonal data. We observed very similar patterns across the three analyses: (i) a very small number of sample-specific, private SNPs (210, 527 and

455, respectively), (ii) a majority of SNPs shared among 20% to 40% of the samples (53%, 52% and 52%, respectively), and (iii) a substantial proportion shared among all samples (17%, 20% and 19%, respectively; Figure 4A and Figure S2). These results suggest that most SNPs are geographically widespread in Europe and that genetic differentiation among populations is moderate, consistent with high levels of gene flow across the European continent.

Derived European and North American populations share more SNPs with each other than they do with an ancestral African population

D. melanogaster originated in sub-Saharan Africa, migrated to Europe ~10,000-15,000 years ago, and subsequently colonized the rest of the world, including North America and Australia ~150 years ago (Lachaise *et al.* 1988; David & Capy 1988; Keller 2007). To search for genetic signatures of this shared history, we investigated the amount of allele sharing between African, European, and North American populations. We compared our SNP set to two published datasets, one from Zambia in sub-Saharan Africa (DPGP3; Lack *et al.* 2015) and one from North Carolina in North America (DGRP; Huang *et al.* 2014). Populations from Zambia inhabit the ancestral geographical range of *D. melanogaster* (Pool *et al.* 2012; Lack *et al.* 2015); North American populations are thought to be derived from European populations, with some degree of admixture from African populations, particularly in the southern United States and the Caribbean (Caracristi & Schlötterer 2003; Yukilevich & True 2008a; b; Yukilevich *et al.* 2010; Duchen *et al.* 2013; Kao *et al.* 2015; Pool 2015; Bergland *et al.* 2016). The population from North Carolina exhibits primarily European ancestry, with approximately 15% admixture from Africa (Bergland *et al.* 2016).

Approximately 10% of the SNPs (~1 million) were shared among all three datasets (Figure

4B). Since the out-of-Africa range expansion and the subsequent colonization of the North

America continent by European and - to a lesser degree - African ancestors was likely

accompanied by founder effects, leading to a loss of African alleles, as well as adaptation

to novel, temperate climates (de Jong & Bochdanovits 2003; Adrion *et al.* 2015) we

predicted that a relatively high proportion of SNPs would be shared between Europe and

North America. As expected, we found that the proportion of shared SNPs was higher

between Europe and North America (22%) than between either Europe or North America

and Zambia (11% and 13%, respectively; Figure 4B). When we analyzed SNPs in variant

frequency bins, the proportion of SNPs shared across at least two continents increased

from 26% to 41% for SNPs with variant frequencies larger than 50% (Figure S3A). In

contrast, only 6% of the SNPs at low variant frequency (<10%; Figure S3C) were shared.

These results are consistent with the loss of low-frequency variants during the colonization

of new continents; they suggest that intermediate frequency alleles are more likely to be

ancestral and thus shared across broad geographic scales. Interestingly, as compared to

Africa and North America, we identified nearly 3 million private SNPs that are specific to

Europe (Figure 4B). Given that North American and Australian populations are – at least

partly – of European ancestry (e.g., Bergland *et al.* 2016), future analysis of our data may

be able to shed light on the demography and adaptation of these derived populations.

European and other derived populations exhibit similar amounts of genetic variation

Next, we estimated genome-wide levels of nucleotide diversity within the European

population samples using population genetic summary statistics. Pairwise nucleotide

diversity (π and Watterson's θ), corrected for pooling (Futschik 2010; Kofler *et al.* 2011),

ranged from 0.0047 to 0.0057 and from 0.0045 to 0.0064, respectively (Figure S4 and

Figure S5), with the estimates being qualitatively similar to those from non-African *D.*

melanogaster populations sequenced as individuals (see Table S3 and Figure S6; Mackay

et al. 2012; Langley *et al.* 2012; Huang *et al.* 2014; Grenier *et al.* 2015) or as pools

(Kolaczkowski *et al.* 2011b; Fabian *et al.* 2012; Reinhardt *et al.* 2014). Estimates of π were

slightly lower than, but in close agreement with, estimates of θ, leading to a slightly

negative average of Tajima's *D* (Tajima 1989). Due to our SNP calling approach (see

Materials and Methods), we found a deficiency of alleles with frequencies ≤ 0.01, both in

the sample-wise site frequency spectra (SFS) and in the combined SFS by SNP type, with

the sample-wise SFS being skewed towards low frequency variants (Figure S7A). In

addition, we observed an excess of low-frequency SNPs at non-synonymous sites as

compared to other types of site, which is consistent with purifying selection eliminating

deleterious non-synonymous mutations (Figure 8B; Grenier *et al.* 2015).

Overall, we observed only minor differences in the amount of genetic variation among

populations. Specifically, genome-wide π ranged from 0.005 (Yalta, Ukraine) to 0.006

(Chalet à Gobet, Switzerland) for autosomes, and from 0.003 (Odesa, Ukraine) to 0.0035

(Chalet à Gobet, Switzerland) for the *X* chromosome (Table S1 and Figure S4). When

testing for associations between geographic variables and genome-wide average levels of

genetic variation, we found that both π and θ were strongly negatively correlated with

altitude, but neither was correlated with latitude or longitude (Table 2). No correlations

were found between the season in which the samples were collected and levels of

average genome-wide genetic variation as measured by π and θ (Table 2).

The *X* chromosome showed markedly lower genetic variation than the autosomes, with the

ratio of *X*-linked to autosomal variation (π_X/π_A) ranging from 0.53 to 0.66. These values

are well below the ratio of 0.75 (one-sample Wilcoxon rank test, p < 0.001) that is

expected under standard neutrality and equal sex ratios, but are consistent with previous

findings for European populations of D. *melanogaster* and variously attributed to selection

(e.g., Hutter *et al.* 2007), or changes in population size (Pool & Nielsen 2007). This pattern

is consistent with previous estimates of relatively low *X*-linked diversity for European

(Andolfatto 2001; Kauer *et al.* 2002; Hutter *et al.* 2007) and other non-African populations

(also see Betancourt *et al.* 2004 and references therein; Mackay *et al.* 2012; Langley *et al.*

2012). Interestingly, the π_X/π_A was significantly, albeit weakly, positively correlated with

latitude (Spearman's r = 0.315, p = 0.0289), with northern populations having slightly

higher *X*/*A* ratios than southern populations, contrary to our naive prediction of periodically

bottlenecked populations leading to a lower *X*/*A* ratio in the north, perhaps reflecting more

complex demographic scenarios (Hutter *et al.* 2007; Pool & Nielsen 2007).

In contrast to π and θ, we observed major differences in the genome-wide averages of

Tajima's *D* among samples (Figure S8). The chromosome-wide Tajima's *D* was negative

in approximately half of all samples and close to zero or slightly positive in the remaining

samples, possibly due to heterogeneity in the proportion of sequencing errors among the

multiplexed sequencing runs. However, models that included sequence run as a covariate

did not explain more of the observed variance than models without the covariate,

suggesting that associations of π and θ with geographic variables were not confounded by

sequencing heterogeneity (see Supporting Information; Table S4). Moreover, our results

for π, θ and *D* are unlikely to be confounded by spatio-temporal autocorrelations: after

accounting for similarity among spatial neighbors (Moran's $I \approx 0$, $p > 0.05$ for all tests),

there were no significant residual autocorrelations among samples for these estimators.

Genetic variation was not distributed homogeneously across the genome. Both π and θ

were markedly reduced close to centromeric and telomeric regions (Figure 5), which is in

good agreement with previous studies reporting systematic reductions in genetic variation

in regions with reduced recombination (Begun & Aquadro 1992; Mackay *et al.* 2012;

Langley *et al.* 2012; Huang *et al.* 2014). Consistent with this, we detected strong

correlations with estimates of recombination rates based on the data of Comeron *et al.*

(2012; linear regression, $p < 0.001$; not accounting for autocorrelation), suggesting that the

distribution of genome-wide genetic variation is strongly influenced by the recombination

landscape (Table S5). For autosomes, fine-scale recombination rates explained 41-47% of

the variation in π, whereas broad-scale recombination rates (based on the recombination

rate calculator of Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2010) explained 50-56% of the variation in diversity.

We obtained similar results for *X*-chromosomes, with recombination rates explaining 31-

38% (based on Comeron *et al.* 2012) or 24-33% (based on Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2010) of the

variation (Figure 5, Table S5, Figure S9).

We also observed variation in Tajima's *D* with respect to genomic position (Figure 5).

Notably, Tajima's *D* was markedly lower than the corresponding chromosome-wide

average in the proximity of telomeric and centromeric regions on all chromosomal arms.

These patterns possibly reflect purifying selection or selective sweeps close to

heterochromatic regions (but see Betancourt *et al.* 2009), or might alternatively be a result

of sequencing errors having a stronger effect on the SFS in low SNP density regions.

Localized reductions in Tajima's *D* are consistent with selective sweeps

We identified 144 genomic locations on the autosomes with non-zero recombination,

reduced genetic variation, and a local reduction in Tajima's *D* (see Methods, Table S6),

which jointly may be indicative of selective sweeps. Although we cannot rule out that these

patterns are the result of non-selective demographic effects (e.g., bottlenecks), two

observations suggest that at least some of these regions are affected by positive selection.

First, bottlenecks are typically expected to cause genome-wide, non-localized reductions

in Tajima's D. Second, several of these genomic regions coincide with previously

identified, well-supported selective sweeps in the proximity of *Hen1*, *Cyp6g1* (Figure 6A

and Figure S10A; Daborn *et al.* 2002), *wapl* (Beisswanger *et al.* 2006), *HDAC6* (Svetec *et*

al. 2009), or around the chimeric gene *CR18217* (Figure 6B, Figure S10B; Rogers & Hartl

2012). Note, however, that some regions, such as those around *wapl* or *HDAC6,* are

characterized by low recombination rates (< 0.5 cM/Mb; Table S5), which can itself lead to

reduced variation and Tajima's D (see also Nolte *et al.* 2013). Our screen also uncovered

several regions that have not previously been described as harboring sweeps (Table S6).

These represent promising candidate regions containing putative targets of positive

selection. For several of these candidate sweep regions, patterns of variation were highly

similar across the majority of European samples, suggesting continent-wide selective

sweeps that either predate the colonization of Europe (e.g., Beisswanger *et al.* 2006) or

that have swept across all European populations more recently. In contrast, some

candidate sweep regions were restricted to only a few populations and characterized by

highly negative values of Tajima's D, i.e. deviating from the among-population average by

more than two standard deviations, thus possibly hinting at cases of local, population-

specific adaptation (Figure S11 and Table S6 for examples).

European populations are strongly structured along an east-west gradient

We next investigated patterns of genetic differentiation due to demographic substructure.

Overall, pairwise differentiation as measured by F_{ST} was relatively low, though markedly

higher for *X*-chromosomes (0.043–0.076) than for autosomes (0.013–0.059; Student's *t*-

test; $p < 0.001$; Figure S12), possibly reflecting differences in effective population size

between the *X* chromosome and the autosomes (Hutter *et al.* 2007). One population, from

Sheffield, UK, showed an unusually high amount of differentiation on the *X*-chromosome

as compared to other populations (Figure S12).

Despite these overall low levels of among-population differentiation, European populations

showed some evidence of geographic substructure. To analyze this structure in more

detail, we focused on a set of SNPs located in short introns (< 60 bp), as these sites are

relatively unaffected by selection (Haddrill *et al.* 2005; Singh *et al.* 2009; Parsch *et al.*

2010; Clemente & Vogl 2012; Lawrie *et al.* 2013). We analyzed the extent of isolation by

distance (IBD) within Europe by correlating genetic and geographic distance and using

pairwise F_{ST} between populations as a measure of genetic isolation. F_{ST} was overall low

but significantly correlated with distance across the continent, indicating weak but

significant IBD (Mantel test; $p < 0.001$; max. $F_{ST} \sim 0.05$; Figure 7A). We also investigated

the populations that were most and least separated by genetic differentiation, estimated by

pairwise F_{ST} (Figure 7B). In general, we found that longitude had a stronger effect on

isolation than latitude, with populations showing the strongest differentiation separated

along an east-west, rather than a north-south, axis (Figure 7B). This pattern remained

when the number of populations sampled from Ukraine was reduced to avoid over-

representation (Figure S13).

To further explore these patterns, we performed a principal component analysis (PCA) on

the allele frequencies of SNPs in short introns. The first three principal components (PC)

explained more than 25% of the total variance (PC1: 16.3%, PC2: 5.4%, PC3: 4.8%,

eigenvalues = 599.2, 199.1, and 178.5 respectively; Figure 7C and Figure S14). As

expected, PC1 was strongly correlated with longitude. Despite significant signals of

autocorrelation, as indicated by Moran's test on residuals from linear regressions with

PC1, the association with longitude was not due to spatial autocorrelation, since a spatial

error model also resulted in a significant association. PC2 was similarly, but to a lesser

extent, correlated with longitude and also with altitude. PC3, by contrast, was not

associated with any variable examined (Table 2). None of the major PC axes were

correlated with season, indicating that there were no shared seasonal differences across

samples in our dataset. Hierarchical model fitting based on the first three PC axes resulted

in five distinct clusters (Figure 7C) that were oriented along the axis of PC1, supporting the

notion of strong longitudinal differentiation among European populations. To the best of

our knowledge, such a pronounced longitudinal signature of differentiation has not

previously been reported in European *D. melanogaster*. Remarkably, this pattern is

qualitatively similar to those observed for human populations (Cavalli-Sforza 1966; Xiao *et*

al. 2004; Francalacci & Sanna 2008), perhaps consistent with co-migration of this

commensal species.

Mitochondrial haplotypes also exhibit longitudinal population structure

Our finding that European populations are longitudinally structured is also supported by an

analysis of mitochondrial haplotypes. We identified two main mitochondrial haplotypes in

Europe, separated by at least 41 mutations (between G1.2 and G2.1; Figure 8A). Our

findings are consistent with similar analyses of mitochondrial haplotypes from a North

American *D. melanogaster* population (Cooper *et al.* 2015) as well as from worldwide

samples (Wolff *et al.* 2016), revealing varying degrees of differentiation among haplotypes,

ranging from only a few to hundreds of substitutions. The two G1 subtypes (G1.1 and

G1.2) are separated by only four mutations, and the three G2 subtypes are separated by a

maximum of four mutations (between G2.1 and G2.3). The estimated frequency of these

haplotypes varied greatly among populations (Figure 8B). Qualitatively three types of

European populations can be distinguished based on these haplotypes, namely those with

(1) a high frequency (> 60%) of the G1 haplotypes, characteristic of central European

samples, (2) a low frequency (< 40%) of G1 haplotypes, a pattern common for Eastern

European populations in summer, and (3) a combined frequency of G1 haplotypes,

between 40-60%, which is typical of samples from the Iberian Peninsula and from Eastern

Europe in fall (Figure S15A).

We observed a significant shift in the relative frequencies of the two haplotype classes

between summer and fall samples in only two of the nine possible comparisons among

haplotypes. While there was no correlation between latitude and the combined frequency

of G1 haplotypes, we found a weak but significant negative correlation between G1

haplotypes and longitude (r^2 = 0.10; p < 0.05), which is consistent with the longitudinal

east-west population structure observed for intronic SNPs. In a subsequent analysis, we

divided the dataset at 20º longitude into an eastern and a western subset since in northern

Europe 20º longitude corresponds to the division of two major climatic zones, namely C

(temperate) and D (cold), according to the Köppen-Geiger climate classification (Peel *et al.*

2007). When splitting the populations in a western (longitude < 20º E) and an eastern

group (longitude > 20° E), we found a clear correlation between longitude and the

combined frequency of G1 haplotypes, explaining as much as 50% of the variation in the

western group (Figure S15B). Similarly, in the eastern populations we found a correlation

between longitude and the combined frequency of G1 haplotypes, which explains

approximately 20% of the variance (Figure S15B). Thus, the data on mitochondrial

haplotypes clearly confirm the existence of pronounced east-west population structure and

differentiation in European *D. melanogaster*. While this might be due to climatic selection,

as recently found for clinal mitochondrial haplotypes in Australia (Camus *et al.* 2017), we

can presently not rule out an effect of demography.

The majority of TEs vary with longitude and altitude

To examine the population genetics of structural variants in our dataset, we first focused

on TEs. The repetitive content of the 48 samples analyzed ranged from 16% to 21% with

respect to nuclear genome size (Figure 9). The vast majority of detected repeats were

transposable elements, mostly represented by long terminal repeats (LTR) and long

interspersed nuclear elements (LINE; Class I), as well as a few DNA elements (Class II).

LTR content best explained total TE content (LINE+LTR+DNA) (Pearson's r = 0.87, p <

0.01, *vs.* DNA r = 0.58, p = 0.0117, and LINE r = 0.36, p < 0.01 and Figure S16A).

We estimated population-wise frequencies of 1,630 TE insertions annotated in the *D.*

melanogaster reference genome *v.6.04* using *T-lex2* (Table S7, Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2010).

On average, 56% of the TEs annotated in the reference genome were fixed in all samples.

The remaining polymorphic TEs usually segregated at low frequency in all samples (Figure

S16A), potentially due to the effect of purifying selection (González *et al.* 2008; Petrov *et*

al. 2011; Kofler *et al.* 2012; Cridland *et al.* 2013; Blumenstiel *et al.* 2014). However, we

also observed 142 TE insertions present at intermediate (>10% and <95%) frequencies

(Figure S16B), which might be consistent with transposition-selection balance

(Charlesworth *et al.* 1994).

In each of the 48 samples TE frequency and recombination rate were negatively correlated

on a genome-wide level (Spearman rank sum test; $p < 0.01$), as previously reported

(Bartolomé *et al.* 2002; Petrov *et al.* 2011; Kofler *et al.* 2012). Qualitatively, this pattern still

holds when only polymorphic TEs (population frequency <95%) are analyzed, although it

becomes statistically non-significant for some chromosomes and populations (Table S8).

In either case, the correlation is more negative when using broad-scale, rather than fine-

scale, recombination rate estimates (Materials and methods, Tables S8B, S8D). This

suggests that broad-scale recombination patterns may best capture long-term population

recombination patterns.

We further tested whether the distribution of TE frequencies among samples could be

explained by geographical or temporal variables. We focused on the 141 TE insertions that

showed frequency variability among samples (interquartile range, (IQR) > 10; see

Materials and Methods). Of these, 73 TEs showed significant associations with

geographical or temporal variables after multiple testing correction (Table S9). Note that

we used a conservative *p*-value threshold (< 0.001), and we did not find significant

residual spatio-temporal autocorrelation among samples for any TE tested (Moran's *I* >

0.05 for all tests; Table S9). Sixteen out of seventy-three TEs were located in regions of

very low recombination (0 cM/Mb for either of the two recombination measures used).

Among the 57 significant TEs located in high recombination regions, we observed

significant correlations of 13 TE's with longitude, of 13 with altitude, of five with latitude,

and of three with season (Table S9). In addition, the frequencies of the other 23 insertions

were significantly correlated with more than one of the above-mentioned variables (Table

S9). These significant TEs were scattered along the main five chromosome arms (Table

S9). Among the 57 significant TEs located in high recombination regions two TE families

were enriched (χ^2 p-values after Yate's correction < 0.05): the LTR *297* family with 11

copies, and the DNA *pogo* family with 5 copies (Table S10). We also checked the genomic

localization of the 57 TEs. Most of them (42) were located inside genes: two in 5'UTR, four

in 3'UTR, 18 in the first intron, and 18 TEs in subsequent introns. Additionally, 7 TEs are

<1 kb from the nearest gene, suggesting that these could also affect the regulation of the

nearby genes (Table S9). Interestingly, 14 of these 57 TEs coincide with previously

identified candidate adaptive TEs (Table S9), suggesting that our dataset might be

enriched for adaptive insertions. However, further analyses are needed to discard the

effect of non-selective forces on the patterns observed.

Inversion polymorphisms in Europe exhibit latitudinal and longitudinal clines

Chromosomal inversions are another class of important and common structural genomic

variants, often exhibiting frequency clines on multiple continents, some of which have been

shown to be adaptive (e.g. Kapun *et al.* 2014; 2016a). However, little is known yet about

the spatial distribution and clinality of inversions in Europe. We used a panel of inversion-

specific marker SNPs (Kapun *et al.* 2014) to test for the presence and quantify the

frequency of six cosmopolitan inversion polymorphisms (*In(2L)t, In(2R)NS, In(3L)P,*

In(3R)C, In(3R)Mo, In(3R)Payne) in the 48 samples. All sampled populations were

polymorphic for one or more inversions (Figure 10). However, only *In(2L)t* segregated at

substantial frequencies in most populations (average frequency = 20.2%). All other

inversions were either absent or occurred at low frequencies (average frequencies:

In(2R)NS = 6.2%, *In(3L)P* = 4%, *In(3R)C* = 3.1%, *In(3R)Mo* =2.2%, *In(3R)Payne* = 5.7%).

Despite their overall low frequencies, several inversions exhibited clinal patterns across

space (Table 3). We observed significant latitudinal clines for *In(3L)P, In(3R)C* and

In(3R)Payne. Although they differed in overall frequencies, *In(3L)P* and *In(3R)Payne*

showed latitudinal clines in Europe that are qualitatively similar to the clines previously

observed along the North American and Australian east coasts (Figure S17 and Table

S11, Kapun *et al.* 2016a). For the first time, we also detected a longitudinal cline for *In(2L)t*

and *In(2R)NS*, with both inversions decreasing in frequency from East to West, a result

that is consistent with our finding of strong longitudinal among-population differentiation in

Europe. *In(2L)t* also increased in frequency with altitude (Table 3). Except for *In(3R)C,* we

did not find significant residual spatio-temporal autocorrelation among samples for any

inversion tested (Moran's $I \approx 0$, $p > 0.05$ for all tests; Table 3), suggesting that our analysis

was not confounded by spatial autocorrelation for most of the inversions. It will be

interesting to examine in future work the extent to which clines in inversions (and other

genomic variants) across Europe are shaped by selection and/or demography.

European *Drosophila* microbiomes contain trypanosomatids and novel viruses

Finally, we determined the abundance of microbiota associated with *D. melanogaster* from

the Pool-Seq data – these endosymbionts often have crucial functions in affecting the life

history, immunity, hormonal physiology, and metabolic homeostasis of their fly hosts (e.g.,

Trinder *et al.* 2017; Martino *et al.* 2017). The taxonomic origin of a total of 262 million non-

Drosophila reads was inferred using MGRAST, which identifies and counts short protein

motifs ('features') within reads (Meyer *et al.* 2008). The largest fraction of protein features

was assigned to *Wolbachia* (on average 53.7%; Figure 11)*,* a well-known endosymbiont of

Drosophila (Werren *et al.* 2008). The relative abundance of *Wolbachia* protein features

varied strongly between samples ranging from 8.8% in a sample from the UK to almost

100% in samples from Spain, Portugal, Turkey and Russia (Table 1). Similarly, *Wolbachia*

loads varied 100x between samples if we use the ratio of *Wolbachia* protein features

divided by the number of *Drosophila* sequences retrieved for that sample as a proxy for

relative micro-organismal load (for a full table of micro-organismal loads standardized by

Drosophila genome coverage see Table S12).

Acetic acid bacteria of the genera *Gluconobacter*, *Gluconacetobacter*, and *Acetobacter*

were the second largest group, with an average relative abundance of 34.4%.

Furthermore, we found evidence for the presence of several genera of Enterobacteria

(*Serratia, Yersinia, Klebsiella, Pantoea, Escherichia, Enterobacter, Salmonella*, and

Pectobacterium). *Serratia* occurs only at low frequencies or is absent from most of our

samples, but reaches a very high relative abundance in the Nicosia summer collection

(54.5%). This high relative abundance was accompanied by an 80x increase in *Serratia*

bacterial load. We detected several eukaryotic microorganisms, although they were less

abundant than the bacteria. The fraction of fungal protein features is larger than 3% in only

three of our samples from Finland, Austria and Turkey (Table 1). Interestingly, we detected

the presence of trypanosomatids in 16 of our samples, consistent with other recent

evidence that *Drosophila* can host these organisms (Wilfert *et al.* 2011; Chandler & James

2013; Hamilton *et al.* 2015).

Our data also allowed us to detect the presence of five different DNA viruses (Table S13).

These included approximately two million reads from *Kallithea* nudivirus (Webster *et al.*

2015), allowing us to assemble the complete *Kallithea* genome for the first time (>300-fold

coverage in the Ukrainian sample UA_Kha_14_46; Genbank accession KX130344). We

also identified around 1000 reads from a novel nudivirus that is closely related to *Kallithea*

virus and to *Drosophila innubila* nudivirus (Unckless 2011) in sample DK_Kar_14_41 from

Karensminde, Denmark (Table 1). These sequences permitted us to identify a publicly

available dataset (SRR3939042: 27 male D. *melanogaster* from Esparto, California;

Machado *et al.* 2016) that contained sufficient reads to complete the genome (provisionally

named "*Esparto* Virus"; KY608910). We further identified two novel Densoviruses

(Parvoviridae), which we have provisionally named "*Viltain* virus", a relative of *Culex*

pipiens densovirus found at 94-fold coverage in sample FR_Vil_14_07 (Viltain; KX648535)

and "*Linvill Road* virus", a relative of *Dendrolimus punctatus* densovirus that was

represented by only 300 reads here, but which has previously been found to have a high

coverage in dataset SRR2396966 from a North American sample of *D. simulans*

(KX648536; Machado *et al.* 2016). In addition, we detected a novel member of the

Bidnaviridae family,"*Vesanto* virus", a bidensovirus related to *Bombyx mori* densovirus 3

with approximately 900-fold coverage in sample FI_Ves_14_38 (Vesanto; KX648533 and

KX648534), Using a detection threshold of >0.1% of the *Drosophila* genome copy number,

the most commonly detected viruses were *Kallithea* virus (30/48 of the pools) and *Vesanto*

virus (25/48), followed by *Linvill Road* virus (7/48) and *Viltain* virus (5/48), with *Esparto*

virus being the rarest (2/48). In some samples, the viruses reached strikingly high titers: on

13 occasions the virus genome copy number in the pool exceeded the host genome copy

number, reaching a maximum of nearly 20-fold in Vesanto.

In summary, our continent-wide analysis of the microbiota associated with flies suggests

that natural populations of European *D. melanogaster* differ greatly in the composition and

relative abundance of microbes and viruses.

Discussion

In recent years, large-scale population resequencing projects have shed light on the

biology of both model (Mackay *et al.* 2012; Langley *et al.* 2012; Consortium 2015; Lack *et*

al. 2015; Alonso-Blanco *et al.* 2016; Lack *et al.* 2016) and non-model organisms (e.g.,

Hohenlohe *et al.* 2010; Wolf *et al.* 2010). Such massive datasets contribute significantly to

our growing understanding of the processes that create and maintain genetic variation in

natural populations and of adaptation. However, the relevant spatio-temporal scales for

population genomic analyses remain largely unknown. Here we have applied, for the first

time, a comprehensive sampling and sequencing strategy to European populations of

Drosophila melanogaster, allowing us to uncover previously unknown aspects of this

species' population biology.

A main result from our analyses of SNPs, located in short introns and presumably evolving

neutrally (Parsch *et al.* 2010), is that European *D. melanogaster* populations exhibit very

pronounced longitudinal differentiation, a pattern that – to the best of our knowledge – has

not been observed before for the European continent (for patterns of longitudinal

differentiation in Africa see e.g. Michalakis & Veuille 1996; Aulard *et al.* 2002; Fabian *et al.*

2015). Genetic differentiation was greatest between populations from eastern and western

Europe (Figure 7). The eastern populations included those from the Ukraine, Russia, and

Turkey, as well as one from eastern Austria, which suggests that there may be a region of

restricted gene flow in south-central Europe. However, populations from Finland and

Cyprus are more similar to western populations than to eastern populations, possibly as a

result of migration along shipping routes in the Baltic and Mediterranean seas. More data

from populations in the unsampled, intermediate regions are needed to better delineate

the geographic limits of the eastern and western population groups. Consistent with the

strong differentiation between eastern and western populations, our PCA analysis

revealed that longitude was the major factor associated with among-population

divergence, with no significant effect of latitude (Figure 7C; Table 2). Thus, the patterns of

neutral genetic differentiation in Europe contrast with those previously reported for North

America, where latitude impacts neutral differentiation (Machado *et al.* 2016; Kapun *et al.*

2016a). However, note that our analysis does not exclude the existence of clinally varying

polymorphisms in European populations outside short introns: for example, we detected

latitudinal frequency clines both for TEs and inversion polymorphisms (see below). A

detailed analysis of clinal variation in the *DrosEU data* is beyond the scope of this paper

and currently under way.

The mitochondrial genome and several chromosomal inversions and TEs (also see below)

showed similar patterns of differentiation as the rest of the genome, with the main axis of

differentiation being longitudinal. Uncovering the extent to which this pattern might be

driven by demography and/or selection, and the underlying environmental correlates

(including any potential role of co-migration with human populations), will be an important

task for future analyses. Due to the high density of samples and the large number of SNP

markers, our results show that European populations of *D. melanogaster* exhibit much

more differentiation and structure than previously thought (e.g., Baudry *et al.* 2004;

Dieringer *et al.* 2005; Schlötterer *et al.* 2006; Nunes *et al.* 2008; Mateo *et al.* 2018).

Within the eastern and western population groups there was a low – but detectable – level

of genetic differentiation among populations, including those that are geographically close

(Figure 7C). These population differences persisted over a timespan of at least 2–3

months, as there was less genetic differentiation between the summer and fall samples of

the 13 locations sampled at multiple time points than between neighboring populations

(Figure 7C). Thus, while the weak but significant signal of isolation by distance suggests

homogenizing gene flow across geography, there is seasonally stable differentiation

among populations. The season in which samples were collected did not show a

significant association with genetic differentiation, except when considered in conjunction

with longitude or altitude (Table 2). Note, however, that the data here are from a single

year only; demonstrating recurrent shifts in SNP frequencies due to temporally varying

selection will require analysis of additional annual samples.

Our Pool-Seq data also allowed us to characterize geographic patterns in both inversions

and TEs. In marked contrast to putatively neutral SNPs, the frequencies of several

chromosomal inversions, including *In(3L)P, In(3R)C,* and *In(3R)Payne*, showed a

significant correlation with latitude (Table 3). For *In(3L)P* and *In(3R)Payne*, the latitudinal

clines were in qualitative agreement with parallel clines reported in North America and

Australia, with the inversions decreasing in frequency as distance from the equator

increases (Mettler *et al.* 1977; Knibb *et al.* 1981; Fabian *et al.* 2012; Kapun *et al.* 2014;

Rane *et al.* 2015; Kapun *et al.* 2016a). This suggests that the inversions may contain

genetic variants that are better adapted to warmer environments than to temperate

climates. Note, however, that the overall frequencies of these inversions are low within

Europe (<5%), indicating that they might play only a minor role in local adaptation to

European habitats. Some euchromatic TE insertions also showed geographic or seasonal

patterns of variation (Table S7), suggesting that they have the potential to play a role in

local adaptation, particularly as many of them are located in regions where they might

affect gene regulation. Importantly, several inversions and TEs also showed longitudinal

frequency gradients, thus supporting the notion that European populations exhibit marked

longitudinal differentiation.

We also examined signatures of selective sweeps in our dataset. We found 144 genomic

regions that showed signatures of hard sweeps (i.e., in regions of normal recombination

(cM/Mb ≥ 0.5), but with reduced variation and negative Tajima's D ($D ≤ -0.8$)) in all

European populations (Figure 6, Table S6). Four of these regions were identified in

previous studies as potential targets for positive selection.

The first region, at the center of chromosome arm *2R* (Figure 6A), was previously found to

be strongly differentiated between African and North American populations (Langley *et al.*

2012) and contains two genes, *Cyp6g1* and *Hen-1*, that are associated with recent, strong

selection. The cytochrome P450 gene *Cyp6g1* that has been linked to insecticide

resistance (Daborn *et al.* 2002; Schmidt *et al.* 2010), shows evidence for recent selection

independently in both *D*. *melanogaster* and *D*. *simulans* (Schlenke & Begun 2003; Catania

et al. 2004), and is associated with a large differentiated region in the Australian latitudinal

cline (Kolaczkowski *et al.* 2011a). *Hen-1*, a methyltransferase involved in maturation of

small RNAs involved in virus and TE suppression, showed marginally non-significant

evidence for selective sweeps in North American and African populations of *D.*

melanogaster (Kolaczkowski *et al.* 2011b).

The second region previously implicated in a selective sweep is on chromosome arm *3L*

(Table S6) and is centered around the chimeric gene *CR18217*, which formed from the

fusion of a gene encoding a DNA-repair enzyme (*CG4098*) and a centriole gene (spd-2;

Rogers & Hartl 2012). *CR18217* appears to be unique to *D. melanogaster*, but, in spite of

its recent origin, segregates at frequencies of around 90% (Rogers & Hartl 2012),

consistent with a recent strong sweep in this region of the genome. This putative sweep

region also spans *Prosbeta6*, which (like HDAC) encodes a gene involved in proteolysis

(Flybase v. FB2017_05; Gramates *et al.* 2017). *Prosbeta6* also shows homology to genes

involved in immune function (Lyne *et al.* 2007; Handu *et al.* 2015), which might explain

why it has been a target of positive selection.

The third previously characterized sweep region, surrounding the *wapl* gene on the *X*

chromosome, was identified as showing evidence of a strong selective sweep (or sweeps)

in both African and European *D. melanogaster* populations (Beisswanger *et al.* 2006;

Boitard *et al.* 2012). The gene(s) targeted by selection is unclear, but is most likely *ph-p* in

Europe and *ph-p* or *ph-d* in Africa (Beisswanger *et al.* 2006). These genes are tandem

duplicates involved in the Polycomb response pathway, which functions as an epigenetic

repressor of transcription (reviewed in Kassis *et al.* 2017).

The fourth previously known putative sweep region, originally identified in African

populations of *D. melanogaster*, is also on the *X* chromosome, but 30 cM closer to the

telomere and thus not implicating the *wapl* sweep region (Beisswanger *et al.* 2006; Boitard

et al. 2012). Selection in this region has been attributed to the *HDAC6* gene (Svetec *et al.*

2009). *HDAC6,* although nominally a histone deacetylase, actually functions as a central

player in managing cytotoxic assaults, including in transport and degradation of misfolded

protein aggregates (reviewed in Matthias *et al.* 2008; Svetec *et al.* 2009).

Our data thus support the widespread occurrence of these previously identified sweeps in

many populations in Europe. Notably, practically all European populations showed

reduced variation and negative Tajima's *D* in the identified sweep regions. This is

consistent with the sweeps either pre-dating the colonization of Europe (e.g., Beisswanger

et al. 2006) or having swept across Europe more recently (also see Stephan 2010 for

discussion). In addition, we further uncovered several novel genomic regions showing

evidence for hard sweeps (Table S6), which represent a valuable source for future in-

depth analyses of signals for adaptive evolution in European *Drosophila.*

Finally, we used our Pool-Seq data to identify microbes and viruses and to quantify their

presence in natural populations of *D*. *melanogaster* across the European continent.

Wolbachia was the most abundant bacterial genus associated with the flies, but its relative

abundance and load varied greatly among samples. The second most abundant bacterial

taxon was acetic acid bacteria (Acetobacteraceae), a group previously found among the

most abundant bacteria in natural *D. melanogaster* isolates (Chandler *et al.* 2011;

Staubach *et al.* 2013). Other microbes were highly variable abundance in relative

abundance. For example, *Serratia* abundance was low in most populations, but very high

in the Nicosia sample, which might reflect that there are individuals in the Nicosia sample

that carry a systemic *Serratia* infection generating high bacterial loads. Future sampling

may shed light on the temporal stability and/or population specificity of these patterns.

Contrary to our expectation, we found relatively few yeast sequences. This is something of

a surprise, because yeasts are commonly found on rotting fruit, the main food substrate of

D. melanogaster, and have been found in association with *Drosophila* before (Barata *et al.*

2012; Chandler *et al.* 2012). This suggests that although yeasts can attract flies and play a

role in food choice (Becher *et al.* 2012; Buser *et al.* 2014), they are not highly prevalent in

or on *D*. *melanogaster* bodies. Although trypanosomatids have been reported in

association with *Drosophila* before (Wilfert *et al.* 2011; Chandler & James 2013; Hamilton

et al. 2015), our study provides the first systematic detection across a wide geographic

range in *D*. *melanogaster*.

Despite being host to a wide diversity of RNA viruses (Huszar & Imler 2008; Webster *et al.*

2015), only three DNA viruses have previously been reported in association with the

Drosophilidae, and only one from *D. melanogaster* (Unckless 2011; Webster *et al.* 2015;

2016). Here, we discovered four new DNA viruses. While it is not possible to directly

estimate viral prevalence from pooled sequencing data, we found that the DNA viruses of

D. melanogaster can be widespread, with *Kallithea* virus detectable at a low level in most

populations.

A striking qualitative pattern in our microbiome data is the high level of variability among

populations in the composition and relative amounts of different microbiota and viruses.

Thus, an interesting open question is to what extent geographic differences in microbiota

might contribute to phenotypic differences and local adaptation among fly populations,

especially given that there might be tight and presumably local co-evolutionary interactions

between fly hosts and their endosymbionts (e.g., Haselkorn *et al.* 2009; Richardson *et al.*

2012; Staubach *et al.* 2013; Kriesner *et al.* 2016).

In conclusion, our study demonstrates that extensive sampling on a continent-wide scale

and pooled sequencing of natural populations can reveal new aspects of population

biology, even for a well-studied species such as *D. melanogaster*. Such extensive

population sampling is feasible due to the close cooperation and synergism within our

international consortium. Our efforts in Europe are paralleled in North America by the

Drosophila Real Time Evolution Consortium (*Dros-RTEC*), with whom we are currently

collaborating to compare population genomic data across continents. In future years, our

consortia will continue to sample and sequence European and North American *Drosophila*

populations to study these populations with increasing spatial and temporal resolution,

providing an unprecedented resource for the *Drosophila* and population genetics

communities.

Materials and Methods

Materials and Methods

The *DrosEU* dataset analyzed here consists of 48 samples of *D. melanogaster* collected

from 32 geographical locations at different time-points across the European continent,

through a joint effort of 18 European research groups in 2014 (see Figure 3). Field

collections were performed with baited traps using a standardized protocol (see

Supplementary file for details). Up to 40 males from each collection were pooled, and DNA

extracted from each, using a standard phenol-chloroform based protocol. Each sample

was processed in a single pool (Pool-Seq; Schlötterer *et al.* 2014), with each pool

consisting of at least 33 wild-caught individuals. To exclude morphologically similar and

co-occurring species, such as *D. simulans*, as potential contaminants from the samples,

we only used wild-caught males and distinguished among species by examining genital

morphology. Despite this precaution, we identified a low level of *D. simulans* contamination

in our samples, and further steps were thus taken to exclude *D. simulans* sequences from

our analysis (see below). The *DrosEU* dataset represents the most comprehensive spatio-

temporal sampling of European *D. melanogaster* populations available to date (Table 1,

Figure 3).

DNA extraction, library preparation and sequencing

DNA was extracted from pools of 33–40 males per sample after joint homogenization with

bead beating and standard phenol/chloroform extraction. A detailed extraction protocol can

be found in the Supporting Information file. In brief, 500 ng of DNA in a final volume of 55.5

μl were sheared with a Covaris instrument (Duty cycle 10, intensity 5, cycles/burst 200,

time 30) for each sample separately. Library preparation was performed using NEBNext

Ultra DNA Lib Prep-24 and NebNext Multiplex Oligos for Illumina-24 following the

manufacturer's instructions. Each pool was sequenced as paired-end fragments on a

Illumina NextSeq 500 sequencer at the Genomics Core Facility of Pompeu Fabra

University (UPF; Barcelona, Spain). Samples were multiplexed in five batches of 10

samples each, except for one batch that contained only 8 samples (see Supplementary

Table S1 for further information). Each multiplexed batch was sequenced on four lanes to

obtain an approximate 50x raw coverage for each sample. Reads were sequenced to a

length of 151 bp with a median insert size of 348 bp (ranging from 209 to 454 bp).

Mapping pipeline and variant calling

Prior to mapping, we trimmed and filtered raw FASTQ reads to remove low-quality bases

(minimum base PHRED quality = 18; minimum sequence length = 75 bp) and sequencing

adaptors using cutadapt (v. 1.8.3; Martin 2011). We only retained read pairs for which both

reads fulfilled our quality criteria after trimming. FastQC analyses of trimmed and quality

filtered reads showed overall high base-qualities (median ranging from 29 to 35 in all 48

samples) and indicated a loss of ~1.36% of all bases after trimming relative to the raw

data. We used bwa mem (v. 0.7.15; Li 2013) with default parameters to map trimmed

reads against a compound reference genome consisting of the genomes from *D.*

melanogaster (v.6.12) and genomes from common commensals and pathogens, including

Saccharomyces cerevisiae (GCF_000146045.2), *Wolbachia pipientis* (NC_002978.6),

Pseudomonas entomophila (NC_008027.1), *Commensalibacter intestine*

(NZ_AGFR00000000.1), *Acetobacter pomorum* (NZ_AEUP00000000.1), *Gluconobacter*

morbifer (NZ_AGQV00000000.1), *Providencia burhodogranariea* (NZ_AKKL00000000.1),

Providencia alcalifaciens (NZ_AKKM01000049.1), *Providencia rettgeri*

(NZ_AJSB00000000.1), *Enterococcus faecalis* (NC_004668.1), *Lactobacillus brevis*

(NC_008497.1), and *Lactobacillus plantarum* (NC_004567.2), to avoid paralogous

mapping. We used Picard (v.1.109; http://picard.sourceforge.net) to remove duplicate

reads and reads with a mapping quality below 20. In addition, we re-aligned sequences

flanking insertions-deletions (indels) with GATK (v3.4-46; McKenna *et al.* 2010).

After mapping, Pool-Seq samples were tested for DNA contamination from *D. simulans*.

To do this, we used a set of SNPs known to be divergent between *D. simulans* and *D.*

melanogaster and assessed the frequencies of *D. simulans*-specific alleles following the

approach of Bastide *et al*. (2013). We combined the genomes of *D. melanogaster* (v.6.12)

and *D. simulans* (Hu *et al.* 2013) and separated species-specific reads for samples with a

contamination level > 1% via competitive mapping against the combined references using

the pipeline described above. Custom software was used to remove reads uniquely

mapping to *D. simulans*. In 9 samples, we identified contamination with *D. simulans*,

ranging between 1.2 % and 8.7% (Table S1). After applying our decontamination pipeline,

contamination levels dropped below 0.4 % in all 9 samples.

We used *Qualimap* (v. 2.2., Okonechnikov *et al.* 2016) to evaluate average mapping

qualities per population and chromosome, which ranged from 58.3 to 58.8 (Table S1). We

found heterogeneous sequencing depths among the 48 samples, ranging from 34x to

115x for autosomes and from 17x to 59x for *X*-chromosomes (Figure S1, Table S1). We

then combined individual BAM files from all samples into a single *mpileup* file using

samtools (v. 1.3; Li & Durbin 2009). Due to the large number of Pool-Seq datasets

analyzed in parallel, we had to implement quality control criteria for all libraries jointly in

order to call SNPs. To accomplish this, we implemented a novel custom SNP calling

software to call SNPs with stringent heuristic parameters (PoolSNP; see Supplementary

Information), available at Dryad (doi: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rj1gn54). A site was

considered polymorphic if (1) the minimum coverage from all samples was greater than

10x, (2) the maximum coverage from all samples was less than the 95th coverage

percentile for a given chromosome and sample (to avoid paralogous regions duplicated in

the sample but not in the reference), (3) the minimum read count for a given allele was

greater than 20x across all samples pooled, and (4) the minimum read frequency of a

given allele was greater than 0.001 across all samples pooled. The above threshold

parameters were optimized based on simulated Pool-Seq data in order to maximize true

positives and minimize false positives (see Figure S18 and Supporting Information).

Additionally, we excluded SNPs (1) for which more than 20% of all samples did not fulfill

the above-mentioned coverage thresholds, (2) which were located within 5 bp of an indel

with a minimum count larger than 10x in all samples pooled and (3) which were located

within known transposable elements (TE) based on the *D. melanogaster* TE library v.6.10.

We further annotated our final set of SNPs with SNPeff (v.4.2; Cingolani *et al.* 2012) using

the Ensembl genome annotation version BDGP6.82 (Figure 3).

Combined and population-specific site frequency spectra (SFS)

We quantified the amount of allelic variation with respect to different SNP classes. For this,

we first combined the full dataset across all 48 samples and used the SNPeff annotation

(see above) to classify the SNPs into four classes (intergenic, intronic, non-synonymous,

and synonymous). For each class, we calculated the site frequency spectrum (SFS) based

on minor allele frequencies for the *X*-chromosome and the autosomes, as well as for each

sample and chromosomal arm separately, by counting alleles in 50 frequency bins of size

0.01.

Genetic variation in Europe

876 We characterized patterns of genetic variation among the 48 samples by estimating three

877 standard population genetic parameters: π, Watterson's θ and Tajima's D (Watterson

878 1975; Nei 1987; Tajima 1989). We focused on SNPs located on the five major

879 chromosomal arms (*X*, *2L*, *2R*, *3L*, *3R*) and calculated sample-wise π, θ and Tajima's D

880 with corrections for Pool-Seq data (Kofler *et al.* 2011). Since PoPoolation, the most

881 commonly used software for population genetics inference from Pool-Seq data, does not

882 allow using predefined SNPs (which was desirable for our analyses), we implemented

883 corrected population genetic estimators described in Kofler *et al*. (2011) in Python

884 (PoolGen; available at Dryad; doi: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rj1gn54). Before

885 calculating the estimators, we subsampled the data to an even coverage of 40x for the

886 autosomes and 20x for the *X*-chromosome to control for the sensitivity to coverage

887 variation of Watterson's θ and Tajima's D (Korneliussen *et al.* 2013). At sites with greater

888 than 40x coverage, we randomly subsampled reads to 40x without replacement; at sites

889 with below 40x coverage, we sampled reads 40 times with replacement. Using R (R

890 Development Core Team 2009), we calculated sample-wise chromosome-wide averages

891 for autosomes and X chromosomes separately and tested for correlations of π, θ and

892 Tajima's D with latitude, longitude, altitude, and season using a linear regression model of

893 the following form: y_i = *Lat* + *Lon* + *Alt* +*Season* + ε_i, where y_i is either π, θ and D. Here,

894 latitude, longitude, and altitude are continuous predictors (Table 1), while 'season' is a

895 categorical factor with two levels S ("summer") and F ("fall"), corresponding to collection

896 dates before and after September 1st, respectively. We chose this arbitrary threshold for

897 consistency with previous studies (Bergland *et al.* 2014; Kapun *et al.* 2016a). To further

898 test for residual spatio-temporal autocorrelation among the samples (Kühn & Dormann

899 2012), we calculated Moran's I (Moran 1950) with the R package *spdep* (v.06-15., Bivand

900 & Piras 2015). To do this, we used the residuals of the above-mentioned models, as well

as matrices defining pairs of samples as neighbors weighted by geographical distances

between the locations (samples within 10° latitude/longitude were considered neighbors).

Whenever these tests revealed significant autocorrelation (indicating non-independence of

the samples), we repeated the above-mentioned regressions using spatial error models as

implemented in the *R* package *spdep*, which incorporate spatial effects through weighted

error terms, as described above.

To test for confounding effects of variation in sequencing errors between runs, we

extended the above-mentioned linear models including the run ID as a random factor

using the *R* package *lme4* (v.1.1-14; see Supporting Information). Preliminary analyses

showed that this model was not significantly better than simpler models, so we did not

include sequencing run in the final analysis (see Supporting information and Table S4).

To investigate genome-wide patterns of variation, we averaged π, θ, and *D* in 200 kb non-

overlapping windows for each sample and chromosomal arm separately and plotted the

distributions in *R*. In addition, we calculated Tajima's *D* in 50 kb sliding windows with a

step size of 10 kb to investigate fine-scale deviations from neutral expectations. We

applied heuristic parameters to identify genomic regions harboring potential candidates for

selective sweeps. To identify candidate regions with sweep patterns across most of the 48

samples, we searched for windows with log-transformed recombination rates ≥ 0.5,

pairwise nucleotide diversity ($\pi \leq 0.004$), and average Tajima's *D* across all populations $\leq$ -

0.8 (5% percentile). To identify potential selective sweeps restricted to a few population

samples only, we searched for regions characterized as above but allowing one or more

samples with Tajima's *D* being more than two standard deviations smaller than the

window-wise average. To account for the effects of strong purifying selection in gene-rich

genomic regions which can result in local negative Tajima's *D* (Tajima 1989) and thus

confound the detection of selective sweeps, we repeated the analysis based on silent sites

(4-fold degenerate sites, SNPs in short introns of ≤ 60 bp lengths and SNPs in intergenic

regions in ≥ 2000 bp distance to the closest gene) only. Despite of the reduction in

polymorphic sites available for this analysis, we found highly consistent sweep regions and

therefore proceeded with the full SNP datasets, which provided better resolution (results

not shown)

For statistical analysis, the diversity statistics were log-transformed to normalize the data.

We then tested for correlations between π and recombination rate using *R* in 100 kb non-

overlapping windows and plotted these data using the *ggplot2* package (v.2.2.1., Wickham

2016). We used two different recombination rate measurements: (i) a fine-scale, high

resolution genomic recombination rate map based on millions of SNPs in a small number

of strains (Comeron *et al.* 2012), and (ii) the broad-scale Recombination Rate Calculator

based on Marey maps generated by laboratory cross data fitting genetic and physical

positions of 644 markers to a third-order polynomial curve for each chromosome arm

(Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2010). Both measurements were converted to version 6 of the *D.*

melanogaster reference genome to match the genomic position of π estimates (see

above).

SNP counts and overlap with other datasets

We used the panel of SNPs identified in the *DrosEU* dataset (available at Dryad; doi:

https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rj1gn54) to describe the overlap in SNP calls with other

published *D. melanogaster* population data: the *Drosophila* Population Genomics Project 3

(DPGP3) from Siavonga, Zambia (69 non-admixed lines; Lack *et al.* 2015; 2016) and the

Drosophila Genetic Reference Panel (DGRP) from Raleigh, North Carolina, USA (205

inbred lines; Mackay *et al.* 2012; Huang *et al.* 2014). For these comparisons, we focused

on biallelic SNPs on the 5 major chromosome arms. We used *bwa mem* for mapping and

a custom pipeline for heuristic SNP calling (PoolSNP; Figure 3). To make the data from

the 69 non-admixed lines from Zambia (Lack *et al.* 2015; 2016) comparable to our data,

we reanalyzed these data using our pipeline for mapping and variant calling (Figure 3).

The VCF file of the DGRP data was downloaded from http://dgrp2.gnets.ncsu.edu/ and

converted to coordinates according to the *D. melanogaster* reference genome v.6. We

depicted the overlap of SNPs called in the three different populations using elliptic Venn

diagrams with *eulerAPE* software (v3 3.0.0., Micallef & Rodgers 2014). While the *DrosEU*

data were generated from sequencing pools of wild-caught individuals, both the DGRP

and DPGP3 data are based on individual sequencing of inbreed lines and haploid

individuals, respectively.

Genetic differentiation and population structure in European populations

To estimate genome-wide pairwise genetic differences, we used custom software to

calculate SNP-wise F_{ST} using the approach of Weir and Cockerham (1984). We estimated

SNP-wise F_{ST} for all possible pairwise combinations among samples. For each sample, we

then averaged F_{ST} across all SNPs for all pairwise combinations that include this particular

sample and finally ranked the 48 population samples by overall differentiation.

We inferred demographic patterns in European populations by focusing on 21,008

putatively neutrally evolving SNPs located in small introns (less than 60 bp length; Haddrill

et al. 2005; Singh *et al.* 2009; Parsch *et al.* 2010; Clemente & Vogl 2012; Lawrie *et al.*

2013) that were at least 200 kb distant from the major chromosomal inversions (see

below). To assess isolation by distance (IBD), we averaged F_{ST} values for each sample

pair across all neutral markers and calculated geographic distances between samples

using the haversine formula (Green & Smart 1985) which takes the spherical curvature of

the planet into account. We tested for correlations between genetic differentiation and

geographic distance using Mantel tests using the *R* package *ade4* (v.1.7-8., Dray & Dufour

2007) with 1,000,000 iterations. In addition, we plotted the 5% smallest and 5% largest F_{ST}

values from all 1,128 pairwise comparisons among the 48 population samples onto a map

to visualize geographic patterns of genetic differentiation. From these putatively neutral

SNPs, we used observed F_{ST} on the autosomes (F_{aut}) to calculate the expected F_{ST} on X

chromosomes (F_X) as in Machado *et al.* (2016) using the equation

$$F_X = 1 - [\frac{9(z+1)*(1-F_{aut})}{8(2z+1)-(1-F_{aut})*(7z-1)}]$$

where *z* is the ratio of effective population sizes of males (N_m) and females (N_f), N_m/N_f

(Ramachandran *et al.* 2004). For the purposes of this study we assume *z* = 1.

We further investigated genetic variation in our dataset by principal component analysis

(PCA) based on allele frequencies of the neutral marker SNPs described above. We used

the *R* package *LEA* (v. 1.2.0., Frichot *et al.* 2013) and performed PCA on unscaled allele

frequencies as suggested by Menozzi *et al.* (1978) and Novembre and Stephens (2008).

We focused on the first three principal components (PCs) and employed a model-based

approach as implemented in the *R* package *mclust* (v. 5.2., Fraley & Raftery 2012) to

identify the most likely number of clusters based on maximum likelihood and assigned

population samples to clusters by *k*-means clustering in *R* (R Development Core Team

2009). Finally, we examined the first three PCs for correlations with latitude, longitude,

altitude, and season using general linear models and tested for spatial autocorrelation as

described above. A Bonferroni-corrected α threshold ($\alpha' = 0.05/3 = 0.017$) was used to

account for multiple testing.

1004

Mitochondria

To obtain consensus mitochondrial sequences for each of the 48 European populations,

reads from individual FASTQ files were aligned and minor variants replaced by the major

variant using *Coral* (Salmela & Schröder 2011). This way, ambiguities that might prevent

the growth of contigs from reads during the assembly process can be eliminated. For each

population, a genome assembly was obtained using *SPAdes* using standard parameters

and *k*-mers of size 21, 33, 55, and 77 (Bankevich *et al.* 2012) and the corrected FASTQ

files. Mitochondrial contigs were retrieved by blastn, using the *D. melanogaster* NC

024511 sequence as a query and each genome assembly as the database. To avoid

nuclear mitochondrial DNA segments (numts), we ensured that only contigs with a much

higher coverage than the average coverage of the genome were retrieved. When multiple

contigs were available for the same region, the one with the highest coverage was

selected. Possible contamination with *D. simulans* was assessed by looking for two or

more consecutive sites that show the same variant as *D. simulans* and looking for

alternative contigs for that region with similar coverage. As an additional quality control

measure, we also examined the presence of pairs of sites showing four gametic types

using *DNAsp* 6 (Rozas *et al.* 2017) – given that there is no recombination in mitochondrial

DNA no such sites are expected. The very few sites presenting such features were

rechecked by looking for alternative contigs for that region and were corrected if needed.

The uncorrected raw reads for each population were mapped on top of the different

consensus haplotypes using *Express* as implemented in *Trinity* (Grabherr *et al.* 2011). If

most reads for a given population mapped to the consensus sequence derived for that

population the consensus sequence was retained, otherwise it was discarded as a

possible chimera between different mitochondrial haplotypes. The repetitive mitochondrial

hypervariable region is difficult to assemble and was therefore not used; the mitochondrial

region was thus analyzed as in Cooper *et al*. (2015). Mitochondrial genealogy was

estimated using statistical parsimony (TCS network; Clement *et al.* 2000), as implemented

in *PopArt* (http://popart.otago.ac.nz), and the surviving mitochondrial haplotypes.

Frequencies of the different mitochondrial haplotypes were estimated from FPKM values

using the surviving mitochondrial haplotypes and expressed as implemented in *Trinity*

(Grabherr *et al.* 2011).

1036

Transposable elements

To quantify the transposable element (TE) abundance in each sample, we assembled and

quantified the repeats from unassembled sequenced reads using *dnaPipeTE* (v.1.2. ,

Goubert *et al.* 2015). The vast majority of high-quality trimmed reads were longer than 135

bp. We thus discarded reads less than 135 bp before sampling. Reads matching mtDNA

were filtered out by mapping to the *D. melanogaster* reference mitochondrial genome

(NC_024511.2. 1) with *bowtie2* (v. 2.1.0., Langmead & Salzberg 2012). Prokaryotic

sequences, including reads from symbiotic bacteria such as *Wolbachia*, were filtered out

from the reads using the implementation of *blastx* (translated nucleic vs. protein database)

vs. the non-redundant protein database (nr) using *DIAMOND* (v. 0.8.7., Buchfink *et al.*

2015). To quantify TE content, we subsampled a proportion of the raw reads (after

filtering) corresponding to a genome coverage of 0.1X (assuming a genome size of 175

MB), and then assembled these reads with *Trinity* assembler (Grabherr *et al.* 2011). Due

to the low coverage of the genome obtained with the subsampled reads, only repetitive

DNA present in multiple copies should be fully assembled (Goubert *et al.* 2015). We

repeated this process with three iterations per sample, as recommended by the program

guidelines, to assess the repeatability of the estimates.

1054

We further estimated frequencies of previously characterized TEs present in the reference

genome with *T-lex2* (v. 2.2.2., Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2015), using all annotated TEs (5,416

TEs) in version 6.04 of the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome from flybase.org (Gramates

et al. 2017). For 108 of these TEs, we used the corrected coordinates as described in

Fiston-Lavier *et al*. (2015), based on the identification of target site duplications at the site

of the insertion. We excluded TEs nested or flanked by other TEs (<100 bp on each side

of the TE), and TEs which are part of segmental duplications, since *T-lex2* does not

provide accurate frequency estimates in complex regions (Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2015). We

additionally excluded the INE-1 TE family, as this TE family is ancient, with thousands of

insertions in the reference genome, which appear to be mostly fixed (2,234 TEs; Kapitonov

& Jurka 2003).

1066

After applying these filters, we were able to estimate frequencies of 1,630 TE insertions

from 113 families from the three main orders, LTR, non-LTR, and DNA across all *DrosEU*

samples. *T-lex2* contains three main modules: (i) the presence detection module, (ii) the

absence detection module, and (iii) the combine module, which joins the results from the

former two detection modules. In the presence module, *T-lex2* uses *Maq* (v. 0.7.1., Li *et al.*

2008) for the mapping of reads. As *Maq* only accepts reads 127 bp or shorter, we cut the

trimmed reads following the general pipeline (Figure 3) and then used *Trimmomatic* (v.

0.35; Bolger *et al.* 2014) to cut trimmed reads longer than 100 bp into two equally sized

fragments using CROP and HEADCROP parameters. Only the presence module was run

with the cut reads.

1077

To avoid inaccurate TE frequency estimates due to very low numbers of reads, we only

considered frequency estimates based on at least 3 reads. Despite the stringency of *T-*

lex2 to select only high-quality reads, we additionally discarded frequency estimates

supported by more than 90 reads, i.e. 3 times the average coverage of the sample with the

lowest coverage (CH_Cha_14_43, Table 1), in order to avoid non-unique mapping reads.

This filtering allows to estimate TE frequencies for ~96% (92.9% to 97.8%) of the TEs in

each population. For 85% of the TEs, we were able to estimate their frequencies in more

than 44 out of 48 *DrosEU* samples.

1086

We tested for correlations between TE insertion frequencies and recombination rates

using Spearman's rank correlations as implemented in *R*. For SNPs, we used

recombination rates from Comeron *et al*. (2012) and from the Recombination Rate

Calculator (Fiston-Lavier *et al.* 2010) in non-overlapping 100 kb windows, and assigned to

each TE insertion the recombination rate of the corresponding 100 kb genomic window.

To test for spatio-temporal variation of TE insertions, we excluded TEs with an interquartile

range (IQR) < 10. There were 141 TE insertions with variable population frequencies

among the *DrosEU* samples. We tested the population frequencies of these insertions for

correlations with latitude, longitude, altitude, and season using generalized linear models

(ANCOVA) following the method used for SNPs but with a binomial error structure in *R*.

We also tested for residual spatio-temporal autocorrelations, with Moran's *I* test (Moran

1950; Kühn & Dormann 2012). We used Bonferroni corrections to account for multiple

testing (α'= 0.05/141 = 0.00035) and only considered p-values < 0.001 to be significant.

TEs with a recombination rate that differed from 0 cM/Mb according to both used

measures (see above) were considered as high recombination regions. To test TE family

enrichment among the significant TEs we performed a χ^2 test and applied Yate's correction

to account for the low number of some of the cells.

1104

Inversion polymorphisms

Since Pool-Seq data precludes a direct assessment of the presence and frequencies of

chromosomal inversions, we indirectly estimated inversion frequencies using a panel of

approximately 400 inversion-specific marker SNPs (Kapun *et al.* 2014) for six

cosmopolitan inversions (*In(2L)t, In(2R)NS, In(3L)P, In(3R)C, In(3R)Mo, In(3R)Payne*). We

averaged allele frequencies of these markers in each sample separately. To test for clinal

variation in the frequencies of inversions, we tested for correlations with latitude, longitude,

altitude and season using generalized linear models with a binomial error structure in *R* to

account for the biallelic nature of karyotype frequencies. In addition, we tested for residual

spatio-temporal autocorrelations as described above and Bonferroni-corrected the α

threshold ($\alpha' = 0.05/7 = 0.007$) to account for multiple testing.

1116

Microbiome

Raw sequences were trimmed and quality filtered as described for the genomic data

analysis. The remaining high quality sequences were mapped against the *D. melanogaster*

genome (v.6.04) including mitochondria using bbmap (v. 35; Bushnell 2016) with standard

settings. The unmapped sequences were submitted to the online classification tool,

MGRAST (Meyer *et al.* 2008) for annotation. Taxonomy information was downloaded and

analyzed in *R* (v. 3.2.3; R Development Core Team 2009) using the matR (v. 0.9;

Braithwaite & Keegan) and RJSONIO (v. 1.3; Lang) packages. Metazoan sequence

features were removed. For microbial load comparisons, the number of protein features

identified by MGRAST for each taxon and sample was divided by the number of

sequences that mapped to *D. melanogaster* chromosomes *X, Y, 2L, 2R, 3L, 3R* and *4*.

1128

We also surveyed the datasets for the presence of novel DNA viruses by performing *de*

novo assembly of the non-fly reads using SPAdes 3.9.0 (Bankevich *et al.* 2012), and using

conceptual translations to query virus proteins from Genbank using DIAMOND 'blastp'

(Buchfink *et al.* 2015). In three cases (*Kallithea* virus, *Vesanto* virus, *Viltain* virus), reads

from a single sample pool were sufficient to assemble a (near) complete genome. In two

other cases, fragmentary assemblies allowed us to identify additional publicly available

datasets that contained sufficient reads to complete the genomes (*Linvill Road* virus,

Esparto virus; completed using SRA datasets SRR2396966 and SRR3939042,

respectively). Novel viruses were provisionally named based on the localities where they

were first detected, and the corresponding novel genome sequences were submitted to

Genbank (KX130344, KY608910, KY457233, KX648533-KX648536). To assess the

relative amount of viral DNA, unmapped (non-fly) reads from each sample pool were

mapped to repeat-masked *Drosophila* DNA virus genomes using bowtie2, and coverage

normalized relative to virus genome length and the number of mapped *Drosophila* reads.

1143

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to all members of the *DrosEU* and Dros-RTEC consortia and to Dmitri

Petrov (Stanford) for support and discussion. *DrosEU* is funded by a Special Topic

Networks (STN) grant from the European Society for Evolutionary Biology (ESEB).

Computational analyses were partially executed at the Vital-IT bioinformatics facility of the

University of Lausanne (Switzerland) and at the computing facilities of the CC

LBBE/PRABI in Lyon (France).

1151

Additional information

1152

Funding

1153

Funder	Grant reference number	Author
University of Freiburg Research Innovation Fund 2014		Fabian Staubach
Academy of Finland	#268241	Maaria Kankare
Academy of Finland	#272927	Maaria Kankare
Russian Foundation of Basic Research	#15-54-46009 CT_a	Elena G. Pasyukova
Danish Natural Science Research Council	4002-00113	Volker Loeschcke
Ministerio de Economia y Competitividad	CTM2017-88080 (AEI/FEDER, UE)	Marta Pascual
CNRS	UMR 9191	Catherine Montchamp-Moreau
Vetenskapsrådet	2011-05679	Jessica Abbott
Vetenskapsrådet	2015-04680	Jessica Abbott
Emmy Noether Programme of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG	PO 1648/3-1	Nico Posnien
National Institute of Health (NIH)	R35GM119686	Alan O. Bergland
Ministerio de Economia y Competitividad	CGL2013-42432-P	Maria Pilar Garcia Guerreiro

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

Author contributions

Martin Kapun, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Supervision, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Project administration, Validation, Resources, Software; Maite G. Barrón, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Project administration, Validation, Resources, Software; Fabian Staubach, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Validation, Resources, Software; Jorge Vieira, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Resources; Darren J. Obbard, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Resources; Clément Goubert, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Investigation, Resources; Omar Rota-Stabelli, Visualization, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Resources; Maaria Kankare, Writing-original draft preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Resources; Annabelle Haudry, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Investigation, Validation, Resources; R. Axel W. Wiberg, Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Resources, Software; Lena Waidele, Svitlana Serga, Patricia Gibert, Damiano Porcelli, Sonja Grath, Eliza Argyridou, Lain Guio, Mads Fristrup Schou, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Investigation, Resources; Iryna Kozeretska, Conceptualization, Writing-

review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Resources; Elena G. Pasyukova, Marta

Pascual, Alan O. Bergland, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Funding

acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Resources; Volker Loeschcke, Catherine

Montchamp-Moreau, Jessica Abbott, Nico Posnien, Maria Pilar Garcia Guerreiro, Banu

Sebnem Onder, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Funding acquisition,

Investigation, Resources; Cristina P. Vieira, Visualization, Formal analysis,

Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Investigation, Resources; Élio Sucena,

Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Methodology, Investigation, Project

administration, Resources; Cristina Vieira, Michael G. Ritchie, Thomas Flatt, Josefa

González, Writing-original draft preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing,

Supervision, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Project administration,

Validation, Resources; Bart Deplancke, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing,

Funding acquisition, Investigation; Bas J. Zwaan, Visualization, Writing-original draft

preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition,

Methodology, Investigation, Project administration; Eran Tauber, Writing-original draft

preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Funding acquisition,

Methodology, Investigation, Resources; Dorcas J. Orengo, Eva Puerma,

Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Investigation, Validation, Resources;

Montserrat Aguadé, Writing-original draft preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review &

editing, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Resources; Paul S. Schmidt, John Parsch,

Writing-original draft preparation, Conceptualization, Writing-review & editing, Funding

acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Resources; Andrea J. Betancourt,

Writing-original draft preparation, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Writing-review &

editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Investigation, Project

administration, Validation, Resources

1212 Author ORCIDs

Names	ORCID
Martin Kapun	0000-0002-3810-0504
Maite G. Barrón	0000-0001-6146-6259
Fabian Staubach	0000-0002-8097-2349
Jorge Vieira	0000-0001-7032-5220
Darren J. Obbard	0000-0001-5392-8142
Clément Goubert	0000-0001-8034-5559
Omar Rota-Stabelli	0000-0002-0030-7788
Maaria Kankare	0000-0003-1541-9050
Annabelle Haudry	0000-0001-6088-0909
R. Axel W. Wiberg	0000-0002-8074-8670
Lena Waidele	0000-0002-6323-6438
Iryna Kozeretska	0000-0002-6485-1408
Elena G. Pasyukova	0000-0002-6491-8561
Volker Loeschcke	0000-0003-1450-0754
Marta Pascual	0000-0002-6189-0612
Cristina P. Vieira	0000-0002-7139-2107
Svitlana Serga	0000-0003-1875-3185
Catherine Montchamp-Moreau	0000-0002-5044-9709
Jessica Abbott	0000-0002-8743-2089
Patricia Gibert	0000-0002-9461-6820
Damiano Porcelli	0000-0002-9019-5758
Nico Posnien	0000-0003-0700-5595

Sonja Grath	0000-0003-3621-736X
Élio Sucena	0000-0001-8810-870X
Alan O. Bergland	0000-0001-7145-7575
Maria Pilar Garcia Guerreiro	000-0001-9951-1879X
Banu Sebnem Onder	0000-0002-3003-248X
Eliza Argyridou	0000-0002-6890-4642
Lain Guio	0000-0002-5481-5200
Mads Fristrup Schou	0000-0001-5521-5269
Bart Deplancke	0000-0001-9935-843X
Cristina Vieira	0000-0003-3414-3993
Michael G. Ritchie	0000-0001-7913-8675
Bas J. Zwaan	0000-0002-8221-4998
Eran Tauber	0000-0003-4018-6535
Dorcas J. Orengo	0000-0001-7911-3224
Eva Puerma	0000-0001-7261-187X
Montserrat Aguadé	0000-0002-3884-7800
Paul S. Schmidt	0000-0002-8076-6705
John Parsch	0000-0001-9068-5549
Andrea J. Betancourt	0000-0001-9351-1413
Thomas Flatt	0000-0002-5990-1503
Josefa González	0000-0001-9824-027X

1213

1214

1215

1216

References

Adrian AB, Comeron JM (2013) The Drosophila early ovarian transcriptome provides insight to the molecular causes of recombination rate variation across genomes. *BMC Genomics*, **14**, 794.

Adrion JR, Hahn MW, Cooper BS (2015) Revisiting classic clines in *Drosophila melanogaster* in the age of genomics. *Trends in Genetics*, **31**, 434–444.

Alonso-Blanco C, Andrade J, Becker C *et al.* (2016) 1,135 Genomes Reveal the Global Pattern of Polymorphism in Arabidopsis thaliana. **166**, 481–491.

Anderson WW, Arnold J, Baldwin DG *et al.* (1991) Four decades of inversion polymorphism in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **88**, 10367–10371.

Andolfatto P (2001) Contrasting Patterns of *X*-Linked and Autosomal Nucleotide Variation in *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila simulans*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **18**, 279–290.

Aulard S, David JR, Lemeunier F (2002) Chromosomal inversion polymorphism in Afrotropical populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetic Research*, **79**, 49–63.

Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D *et al.* (2012) *SPAdes, a New Genome Assembly Algorithm and Its Applications to Single-cell Sequencing (7th Annual SFAF Meeting, 2012).* Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. 140 Huguenot Street, 3rd Floor New Rochelle, NY 10801 USA.

Barata A, Santos SC, Malfeito-Ferreira M, Loureiro V (2012) New insights into the ecological interaction between grape berry microorganisms and *Drosophila* flies during the development of sour rot. *Microbial ecology*, **64**, 416–430.

Bartolomé C, Maside X, Charlesworth B (2002) On the Abundance and Distribution of

Transposable Elements in the Genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution, **19**, 926–937.

Bastide H, Betancourt A, Nolte V *et al.* (2013) A genome-wide, fine-scale map of natural

pigmentation variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. (P Wittkopp, Ed,). *PLoS Genetics*,

9, e1003534.

Baudry E, Viginier B, Veuille M (2004) Non-African populations of *Drosophila*

melanogaster have a unique origin. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **21**, 1482–1491.

Becher PG, Flick G, Rozpędowska E *et al.* (2012) Yeast, not fruit volatiles mediate

Drosophila melanogaster attraction, oviposition and development. *Functional Ecology*,

26, 822–828.

Begun DJ, Aquadro CF (1992) Levels of naturally occurring DNA polymorphism correlate

with recombination rates in *D. melanogaster*. *Nature*, **356**, 519–520.

Begun DJ, Aquadro CF (1993) African and North American populations of Drosophila

melanogaster are very different at the DNA level. *Nature*, **365**, 548–550.

Begun DJ, Holloway AK, Stevens K *et al.* (2007) Population Genomics: Whole-Genome

Analysis of Polymorphism and Divergence in Drosophila simulans. *PLoS Biology*, **5**,

e310.

Behrman EL, Howick VM, Kapun M *et al.* (2018) Rapid seasonal evolution in innate

immunity of wild *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*

Biological Sciences, **285**, 20172599.

Beisswanger S, Stephan W, De Lorenzo D (2006) Evidence for a Selective Sweep in the

wapl Region of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **172**, 265–274.

Bergland AO, Behrman EL, O'Brien KR, Schmidt PS, Petrov DA (2014) Genomic Evidence of Rapid and Stable Adaptive Oscillations over Seasonal Time Scales in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Genetics*, **10**, e1004775.

Bergland AO, Tobler R, González J, Schmidt P, Petrov D (2016) Secondary contact and local adaptation contribute to genome-wide patterns of clinal variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**, 1157–1174.

Betancourt AJ, Kim Y, Orr HA (2004) A pseudohitchhiking model of X vs. autosomal diversity. *Genetics*, **168**, 2261–2269.

Betancourt AJ, Welch JJ, Charlesworth B (2009) Reduced effectiveness of selection caused by a lack of recombination. *Current biology*, **19**, 655–660.

Bivand R, Piras G (2015) Comparing Implementations of Estimation Methods for Spatial Econometrics. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **63**, 1–36.

Black WC IV, Black WC IV, Baer CF, Antolin MF, DuTeau NM (2001) Population genomics: genome-wide sampling of insect populations. *Annual Review of Entomology*.

Blumenstiel JP, Chen X, He M, Bergman CM (2014) An Age-of-Allele Test of Neutrality for Transposable Element Insertions. *Genetics*, **196**, 523–538.

Boitard S, Schlötterer C, Nolte V, Pandey RV, Futschik A (2012) Detecting Selective Sweeps from Pooled Next-Generation Sequencing Samples. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **29**, 2177–2186.

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

Boussy IA, Itoh M, Rand D, Woodruff RC (1998) Origin and decay of the P element-associated latitudinal cline in Australian *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetica*, **104**, 45–57.

Božičević V, Hutter S, Stephan W, Wollstein A (2016) Population genetic evidence for cold

adaptation in European *Drosophila melanogaster* populations. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**,

1175–1191.

Braithwaite DP, Keegan KP *matR: Metagenomics Analysis Tools for R*. https://CRAN.R-

project.org/package=matR.

Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH (2015) Fast and sensitive protein alignment using

DIAMOND. *Nature Methods*, **12**, 59–60.

Buser CC, Newcomb RD, Gaskett AC, Goddard MR (2014) Niche construction initiates the

evolution of mutualistic interactions. *Ecology Letters*, **17**, 1257–1264.

Bushnell B (2016) *BBMap short read aligner*. URL http://sourceforge. net/projects/bbmap.

Camus MF, Wolff JN, Sgrò CM, Dowling DK (2017) Experimental Support That Natural

Selection Has Shaped the Latitudinal Distribution of Mitochondrial Haplotypes in

Australian *Drosophila melanogaster. Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **34**, 2600–2612.

Caracristi G, Schlötterer C (2003) Genetic Differentiation Between American and

European *Drosophila melanogaster* Populations Could Be Attributed to Admixture of

African Alleles. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **20**, 792–799.

Casillas S, Barbadilla A (2017) Molecular Population Genetics. *Genetics*, **205**, 1003–1035.

Catania F, Kauer MO, Daborn PJ *et al.* (2004) World-wide survey of an Accord insertion

and its association with DDT resistance in *Drosophila melanogaster. Molecular*

Ecology, **13**, 2491–2504.

Cavalli-Sforza LL (1966) Population Structure and Human Evolution. *Proceedings of the*

Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, **164**, 362–379.

Chandler JA, James PM (2013) Discovery of trypanosomatid parasites in globally

distributed *Drosophila* species. *PLoS ONE,* **8**, e61937.

Chandler JA, Eisen JA, Kopp A (2012) Yeast communities of diverse *Drosophila* species:

comparison of two symbiont groups in the same hosts. *Applied and Environmental*

Microbiology, **78**, 7327–7336.

Chandler JA, Lang JM, Bhatnagar S, Eisen JA, Kopp A (2011) Bacterial communities of

diverse *Drosophila* species: ecological context of a host-microbe model system. *PLoS*

Genetics, **7**, e1002272.

Charlesworth B (2010) Molecular population genomics: a short history. *Genetical*

Research, **92**, 397–411.

Charlesworth B (2015) Causes of natural variation in fitness: evidence from studies of

Drosophila populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*

United States of America, **112**, 1662–1669.

Charlesworth B, Sniegowski P, Stephan W (1994) The evolutionary dynamics of repetitive

DNA in eukaryotes. *Nature*, **371**, 215–220.

Cheng C, White BJ, Kamdem C *et al.* (2012) Ecological genomics of *Anopheles gambiae*

along a latitudinal cline: a population-resequencing approach. *Genetics*, **190**, 1417–

1432.

Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL *et al.* (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.

Clement M, Posada D, Crandall KA (2000) TCS: a computer program to estimate gene

genealogies. *Molecular Ecology*, **9**, 1657–1659.

Clemente F, Vogl C (2012) Unconstrained evolution in short introns? – An analysis of

genome-wide polymorphism and divergence data from *Drosophila*. *Journal of*

Evolutionary Biology, **25**, 1975–1990.

Comeron JM, Ratnappan R, Bailin S (2012) The many landscapes of recombination in

Drosophila melanogaster. (DA Petrov, Ed,). *PLoS Genetics*, **8**, e1002905.

Consortium T (2015) A global reference for human genetic variation. **526**, 68–74.

Cooper BS, Burrus CR, Ji C, Hahn MW, Montooth KL (2015) Similar Efficacies of

Selection Shape Mitochondrial and Nuclear Genes in Both *Drosophila melanogaster*

and *Homo sapiens*. *G3 (Bethesda, Md.)*, **5**, 2165–2176.

Corbett-Detig RB, Hartl DL (2012) Population Genomics of Inversion Polymorphisms in

Drosophila melanogaster. *PLoS Genetics*, **8**, e1003056.

Cridland JM, Macdonald SJ, Long AD, Thornton KR (2013) Abundance and distribution of

transposable elements in two *Drosophila* QTL mapping resources. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution, **30**, 2311–2327.

Daborn PJ, Yen JL, Bogwitz MR *et al.* (2002) A single p450 allele associated with

insecticide resistance in *Drosophila*. *Science*, **297**, 2253–2256.

David JR, Capy P (1988) Genetic variation of *Drosophila melanogaster* natural

populations. *Trends in genetics : TIG*, **4**, 106–111.

de Jong G, Bochdanovits Z (2003) Latitudinal clines in *Drosophila melanogaster*: body

size, allozyme frequencies, inversion frequencies, and the insulin-signalling pathway.

Journal of Genetics, **82**, 207–223.

Dieringer D, Nolte V, Schlötterer C (2005) Population structure in African *Drosophila*

melanogaster revealed by microsatellite analysis. *Molecular Ecology*, **14**, 563–573.

Dobzhansky T (1970) *Genetics of the Evolutionary Process*. Columbia University Press.

Dray S, Dufour A-B (2007) The ade4 Package: Implementing the Duality Diagram for

Ecologists. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **22**.

Duchen P, Zivkovic D, Hutter S, Stephan W, Laurent S (2013) Demographic inference reveals African and European admixture in the North American *Drosophila melanogaster* population. *Genetics*, **193**, 291–301.

Ellegren H (2014) Genome sequencing and population genomics in non-model organisms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **29**, 51–63.

Endler JA (1977) *Geographic Variation, Speciation, and Clines*. Princeton University Press.

Fabian DK, Kapun M, Nolte V *et al.* (2012) Genome-wide patterns of latitudinal differentiation among populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* from North America. *Molecular Ecology*, **21**, 4748–4769.

Fabian DK, Lack JB, Mathur V *et al.* (2015) Spatially varying selection shapes life history clines among populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **28**, 826–840.

Fiston-Lavier A-S, Barrón MG, Petrov DA, González J (2015) T-lex2: genotyping, frequency estimation and re-annotation of transposable elements using single or pooled next-generation sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **43**, e22–e22.

Fiston-Lavier A-S, Singh ND, Lipatov M, Petrov DA (2010) *Drosophila melanogaster* recombination rate calculator. *Gene*, **463**, 18–20.

Flatt T, Amdam GV, Kirkwood TBL, Omholt SW (2013) Life-history evolution and the polyphenic regulation of somatic maintenance and survival. *The quarterly review of biology*, **88**, 185–218.

Fraley C, Raftery AE (2012) *mclust Version 4 for R: Normal Mixture Modeling for Model-Based Clustering, Classification, and Density Estimation*. Seattle.

Francalacci P, Sanna D (2008) History and geography of human Y-chromosome in Europe: a SNP perspective. *Journal of anthropological sciences*, **86**, 59–89.

Frichot E, Schoville SD, Bouchard G, François O (2013) Testing for associations between

loci and environmental gradients using latent factor mixed models. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution, **30**, 1687–1699.

Futschik A (2010) The next generation of molecular markers from massively parallel

sequencing of pooled DNA samples. *Genetics*, **186**, 207–218.

González J, Karasov TL, Messer PW, Petrov DA (2010) Genome-Wide Patterns of

Adaptation to Temperate Environments Associated with Transposable Elements in

Drosophila (HS Malik, Ed,). *PLoS Genetics*, **6**, e1000905.

González J, Lenkov K, Lipatov M, Macpherson JM, Petrov DA (2008) High Rate of Recent

Transposable Element–Induced Adaptation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS Biology*,

6, e251.

Goubert C, Modolo L, Vieira C *et al.* (2015) De Novo Assembly and Annotation of the

Asian Tiger Mosquito (*Aedes albopictus*) Repeatome with dnaPipeTE from Raw

Genomic Reads and Comparative Analysis with the Yellow Fever Mosquito (*Aedes*

aegypti). *Genome Biology and Evolution*, **7**, 1192–1205.

Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M *et al.* (2011) Full-length transcriptome assembly from

RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. *Nature Biotechnology*, **29**, 644–652.

Gramates LS, Marygold SJ, Santos GD *et al.* (2017) FlyBase at 25: looking to the future.

Nucleic Acids Research, **45**, D663–D671.

Green RM, Smart WM (1985) *Textbook on Spherical Astronomy*. Cambridge University.

Grenier JK, Arguello JR, Moreira MC *et al.* (2015) Global Diversity Lines-A Five-Continent

Reference Panel of Sequenced *Drosophila melanogaster* Strains. *G3 (Bethesda, Md.)*,

5, 593–603.

Haddrill PR, Charlesworth B, Halligan DL, Andolfatto P (2005) Patterns of intron sequence evolution in *Drosophila* are dependent upon length and GC content. *Genome Biology*, **6**, R67.

Hales KG, Korey CA, Larracuente AM, Roberts DM (2015) Genetics on the Fly: A Primer on the Drosophila Model System. *Genetics*, **201**, 815–842.

Hamilton PT, Votýpka J, Dostálová A *et al.* (2015) Infection Dynamics and Immune Response in a Newly Described *Drosophila*-Trypanosomatid Association. *mBio*, **6**, e01356–15.

Handu M, Kaduskar B, Ravindranathan R *et al.* (2015) SUMO-Enriched Proteome for *Drosophila* Innate Immune Response. *G3 (Bethesda, Md.)*, **5**, 2137–2154.

Harpur BA, Kent CF, Molodtsova D *et al.* (2014) Population genomics of the honey bee reveals strong signatures of positive selection on worker traits. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **111**, 2614–2619.

Haselkorn TS, Markow TA, Moran NA (2009) Multiple introductions of the *Spiroplasma* bacterial endosymbiont into *Drosophila*. *Molecular Ecology*, **18**, 1294–1305.

Hohenlohe PA, Bassham S, Etter PD *et al.* (2010) Population Genomics of Parallel Adaptation in Threespine Stickleback using Sequenced RAD Tags. *PLoS Genetics*, **6**, e1000862.

Hu TT, Eisen MB, Thornton KR, Andolfatto P (2013) A second-generation assembly of the *Drosophila simulans* genome provides new insights into patterns of lineage-specific divergence. *Genome Research*, **23**, 89–98.

Huang W, Massouras A, Inoue Y *et al.* (2014) Natural variation in genome architecture among 205 *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic Reference Panel lines. *Genome Research*, **24**, 1193–1208.

Hudson RR, Kreitman M, Aguadé M (1987) A test of neutral molecular evolution based on

nucleotide data. *Genetics*, **116**, 153–159.

Huszar T, Imler J-L (2008) *Drosophila* viruses and the study of antiviral host-defense.

Advances in virus research, **72**, 227–265.

Hutter S, Li H, Beisswanger S, De Lorenzo D, Stephan W (2007) Distinctly Different Sex

Ratios in African and European Populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* Inferred From

Chromosomewide Single Nucleotide Polymorphism Data. *Genetics*, **177**, 469–480.

Jorde LB, Watkins WS, Bamshad MJ (2001) Population genomics: a bridge from

evolutionary history to genetic medicine. *Human Molecular Genetics*, **10**, 2199–2207.

Kao JY, Zubair A, Salomon MP, Nuzhdin SV, Campo D (2015) Population genomic

analysis uncovers African and European admixture in *Drosophila melanogaster*

populations from the south-eastern United States and Caribbean Islands. *Molecular*

Ecology, **24**, 1499–1509.

Kapitonov VV, Jurka J (2003) Molecular Paleontology of Transposable Elements in the

Drosophila melanogaster Genome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

of the United States of America, **100**, 6569–6574.

Kapun M, Fabian DK, Goudet J, Flatt T (2016a) Genomic Evidence for Adaptive Inversion

Clines in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **33**, 1317–1336.

Kapun M, Schmidt C, Durmaz E, Schmidt PS, Flatt T (2016b) Parallel effects of the

inversion *In(3R)Payne* on body size across the North American and Australian clines in

Drosophila melanogaster. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, **29**, 1059–1072.

Kapun M, van Schalkwyk H, McAllister B, Flatt T, Schlötterer C (2014) Inference of

chromosomal inversion dynamics from Pool-Seq data in natural and laboratory

populations of *Drosophila melanogaster. Molecular Ecology*, **23**, 1813–1827.

Kassis JA, Kennison JA, Tamkun JW (2017) Polycomb and Trithorax Group Genes in *Drosophila*. *Genetics*, **206**, 1699–1725.

Kauer M, Zangerl B, Dieringer D, Schlötterer C (2002) Chromosomal patterns of microsatellite variability contrast sharply in African and non-African populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **160**, 247–256.

Keller A (2007) *Drosophila melanogaster*'s history as a human commensal. *Current Biology*, **17**, R77–R81.

Kimura M (1984) *The Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Knibb WR (1982) Chromosome inversion polymorphisms in *Drosophila melanogaster* II. Geographic clines and climatic associations in Australasia, North America and Asia. *Genetica*, **58**, 213–221.

Knibb WR (1986) Temporal variation of *Drosophila melanogaster Adh* allele frequencies, inversion freqencies, and population sizes. *Genetica*, **71**, 175–190.

Knibb WR, Oakeshott JG, Gibson JB (1981) Chromosome Inversion Polymorphisms in *Drosophila melanogaster*. I. Latitudinal Clines and Associations between Inversions in Australasian Populations. *Genetics*, **98**, 833–847.

Kofler R, Betancourt AJ, Schlötterer C (2012) Sequencing of pooled DNA samples (Pool-Seq) uncovers complex dynamics of transposable element insertions in *Drosophila melanogaster. PLoS Genetics*, **8**, e1002487.

Kofler R, Orozco-terWengel P, De Maio N *et al.* (2011) PoPoolation: A Toolbox for Population Genetic Analysis of Next Generation Sequencing Data from Pooled Individuals. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, e15925.

Kolaczkowski B, Hupalo DN, Kern AD (2011a) Recurrent adaptation in RNA interference genes across the *Drosophila* phylogeny. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **28**, 1033–1042.

Kolaczkowski B, Kern AD, Holloway AK, Begun DJ (2011b) Genomic Differentiation

Between Temperate and Tropical Australian Populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*.

Genetics, **187**, 245–260.

Korneliussen TS, Moltke I, Albrechtsen A, Nielsen R (2013) Calculation of Tajima's *D* and

other neutrality test statistics from low depth next-generation sequencing data. *BMC*

Bioinformatics, **14**, 289.

Kreitman M (1983) Nucleotide polymorphism at the alcohol dehydrogenase locus of

Drosophila melanogaster. *Nature*, **304**, 412–417.

Kriesner P, Conner WR, Weeks AR, Turelli M, Hoffmann AA (2016) Persistence of a

Wolbachia infection frequency cline in *Drosophila melanogaster* and the possible role

of reproductive dormancy. *Evolution*, **70**, 979–997.

Kühn I, Dormann CF (2012) Less than eight (and a half) misconceptions of spatial

analysis. *Journal of Biogeography*, **39**, 995–998.

Lachaise D, Cariou M-L, David JR *et al.* (1988) Historical Biogeography of the *Drosophila*

melanogaster Species Subgroup. In: *Evolutionary Biology*, pp. 159–225. Springer,

Boston, MA, Boston, MA.

Lack JB, Cardeno CM, Crepeau MW *et al.* (2015) The *Drosophila* genome nexus: a

population genomic resource of 623 *Drosophila melanogaster* genomes, including 197

from a single ancestral range population. *Genetics*, **199**, 1229–1241.

Lack JB, Lange JD, Tang AD, Corbett-Detig RB, Pool JE (2016) A Thousand Fly

Genomes: An Expanded *Drosophila* Genome Nexus. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,

33, msw195–3313.

Lang DT *RJSONIO: Serialize R objects to JSON, JavaScript Object Notation*.

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RJSONIO.

Langley CH, Stevens K, Cardeno C *et al.* (2012) Genomic variation in natural populations

of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **192**, 533–598.

Langmead B, Salzberg SL (2012) Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature*

Methods, **9**, 357–359.

Lawrie DS, Messer PW, Hershberg R, Petrov DA (2013) Strong Purifying Selection at

Synonymous Sites in *D. melanogaster*. *arXiv.org*, **q-bio.PE**, e1003527.

Levins R (1968) *Evolution in Changing Environments*. Princeton University Press.

Lewontin RC (1974) *The Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*. Columbia University

Press.

Li H (2013) Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-

MEM. *arXiv.org*.

Li H, Durbin R (2009) Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler

transform. *Bioinformatics*, **25**, 1754–1760.

Li H, Ruan J, Durbin R (2008) Mapping short DNA sequencing reads and calling variants

using mapping quality scores. *Genome Research*, **18**, 1851–1858.

Luikart G, England PR, Tallmon D, Jordan S, Tableret P (2003) The power and promise of

population genomics: from genotyping to genome typing. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **4**,

981–994.

Lyne R, Smith R, Rutherford K *et al.* (2007) FlyMine: an integrated database for

Drosophila and *Anopheles* genomics. *Genome Biology*, **8**, R129.

Machado HE, Bergland AO, O'Brien KR *et al.* (2016) Comparative population genomics of

latitudinal variation in *Drosophila simulans* and *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular*

Ecology, **25**, 723–740.

Mackay TFC, Richards S, Stone EA *et al.* (2012) The *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic

Reference Panel. *Nature*, **482**, 173–178.

Martin M (2011) Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing

reads. *EMBnet.journal*, **17**, 10–12.

Martino ME, Ma D, Leulier F (2017) Microbial influence on *Drosophila* biology. *Current*

Opinion in Microbiology, **38**, 165–170.

Mateo L, Rech GE, González J (2018) Genome-wide patterns of local adaptation in

Drosophila melanogaster: adding intra European variability to the map. *bioRxiv*. DOI:

10.1101/269332

Matthias P, Yoshida M, Khochbin S (2008) HDAC6 a new cellular stress surveillance

factor. *Cell Cycle*, **7**, 7–10.

McDonald JH, Kreitman M (1991) Adaptive protein evolution at the Adh locus in

Drosophila. *Nature*, **351**, 652–654.

McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E *et al.* (2010) The Genome Analysis Toolkit: A MapReduce

framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Research*,

20, 1297–1303.

Menozzi P, Piazza A, Cavalli-Sforza L (1978) Synthetic maps of human gene frequencies

in Europeans. *Science*, **201**, 786–792.

Messer PW, Petrov DA (2013) Population genomics of rapid adaptation by soft selective

sweeps. **28**, 659–669.

Mettler LE, Voelker RA, Mukai T (1977) Inversion Clines in Populations of *Drosophila*

melanogaster. Genetics, **87**, 169–176.

Meyer F, Paarmann D, D'Souza M *et al.* (2008) The metagenomics RAST server - a public

resource for the automatic phylogenetic and functional analysis of metagenomes. *BMC*

Bioinformatics, **9**, 386.

Micallef L, Rodgers P (2014) euler*APE*: drawing area-proportional 3-Venn diagrams using

ellipses. *PLoS ONE*, **9**, e101717.

Michalakis Y, Veuille M (1996) Length variation of CAG/CAA trinucleotide repeats in

natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* and its relation to the recombination

rate. *Genetics*, **143**, 1713–1725.

Moran PAP (1950) Notes on Continuous Stochastic Phenomena. *Biometrika*, **37**, 17.

Nei M (1987) *Molecular Evolutionary Genetics*. Columbia University Press.

Nolte V, Pandey RV, Kofler R, Schlötterer C (2013) Genome-wide patterns of natural

variation reveal strong selective sweeps and ongoing genomic conflict in *Drosophila*

mauritiana. *Genome Research*, **23**, 99–110.

Novembre J, Stephens M (2008) Interpreting principal component analyses of spatial

population genetic variation. *Nature Genetics*, **40**, 646–649.

Nunes MDS, Neumeier H, Schlötterer C (2008) Contrasting patterns of natural variation in

global *Drosophila melanogaster* populations. *Molecular Ecology*, **17**, 4470–4479.

Okonechnikov K, Conesa A, García-Alcalde F (2016) Qualimap 2: advanced multi-sample

quality control for high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*, **32**, 292–294.

Parsch J, Novozhilov S, Saminadin-Peter SS, Wong KM, Andolfatto P (2010) On the utility

of short intron sequences as a reference for the detection of positive and negative

selection in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **27**, 1226–1234.

Peel MC, Finlayson BL, McMahon TA (2007) Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger

climate classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, **11**, 1633–1644.

Petrov DA, Fiston-Lavier AS, Lipatov M, Lenkov K, González J (2011) Population

Genomics of Transposable Elements in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution, **28**, 1633–1644.

Pool JE (2015) The Mosaic Ancestry of the *Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel and the

D. melanogaster Reference Genome Reveals a Network of Epistatic Fitness

Interactions. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **32**, 3236–3251.

Pool JE, Nielsen R (2007) Population size changes reshape genomic patterns of diversity.

Evolution, **61**, 3001–3006.

Pool JE, Braun DT, Lack JB (2016) Parallel Evolution of Cold Tolerance Within *Drosophila*

melanogaster. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, msw232.

Pool JE, Corbett-Detig RB, Sugino RP *et al.* (2012) Population Genomics of Sub-Saharan

Drosophila melanogaster: African Diversity and Non-African Admixture. *PLoS*

Genetics, **8**, e1003080.

Powell JR (1997) *Progress and Prospects in Evolutionary Biology: The Drosophila Model*.

Oxford University Press.

R Development Core Team (2009) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical

Computing. *R-project.org*.

Rako L, Anderson AR, Sgrò CM, Stocker AJ, Hoffmann AA (2006) The association

between inversion *In(3R)Payne* and clinally varying traits in *Drosophila melanogaster.*

Genetica, **128**, 373–384.

Ramachandran S, Rosenberg NA, Zhivotovsky LA, Feldman MW (2004) Robustness of

the inference of human population structure: a comparison of X-chromosomal and

autosomal microsatellites. *Human genomics*, **1**, 87–97.

Rane RV, Rako L, Kapun M, LEE SF (2015) Genomic evidence for role of inversion *3RP*

of *Drosophila melanogaster* in facilitating climate change adaptation. *Molecular*

Ecology, **24**, 2423–2432.

Reinhardt JA, Kolaczkowski B, Jones CD, Begun DJ, Kern AD (2014) Parallel Geographic

Variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **197**, 361–373.

Richardson JL, Urban MC, Bolnick DI, Skelly DK (2014) Microgeographic adaptation and

the spatial scale of evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **29**, 165–176.

Richardson MF, Weinert LA, Welch JJ *et al.* (2012) Population Genomics of the *Wolbachia* Endosymbiont in *Drosophila melanogaster* (A Kopp, Ed,). *PLoS Genetics*, **8**, e1003129.

Rogers RL, Hartl DL (2012) Chimeric genes as a source of rapid evolution in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **29**, 517–529.

Rozas J, Ferrer-Mata A, Sánchez-DelBarrio JC *et al.* (2017) DnaSP 6: DNA Sequence Polymorphism Analysis of Large Datasets. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **34**, 3299–3302.

Salmela L, Schröder J (2011) Correcting errors in short reads by multiple alignments. *Bioinformatics*, **27**, 1455–1461.

Schlenke TA, Begun DJ (2003) Natural selection drives *Drosophila* immune system evolution., **164**, 1471–1480.

Schlötterer C, Neumeier H, Sousa C, Nolte V (2006) Highly structured Asian *Drosophila melanogaster* populations: a new tool for hitchhiking mapping? *Genetics*, **172**, 287–292.

Schlötterer C, Tobler R, Kofler R, Nolte V (2014) Sequencing pools of individuals - mining genome-wide polymorphism data without big funding. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **15**, 749–763.

Schmidt JM, Good RT, Appleton B *et al.* (2010) Copy number variation and transposable elements feature in recent, ongoing adaptation at the *Cyp6g1* locus. *PLoS Genetics*, **6**, e1000998.

Schmidt PS, Paaby AB (2008) Reproductive Diapause and Life-History Clines in North American Populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution*, **62**, 1204–1215.

Schmidt PS, Zhu CT, Das J *et al.* (2008) An amino acid polymorphism in the *couch potato* gene forms the basis for climatic adaptation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings*

of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, **105**, 16207–

16211.

Sella G, Petrov DA, Przeworski M, Andolfatto P (2009) Pervasive Natural Selection in the

Drosophila Genome? *PLoS Genetics*, **5**, e1000495.

Singh ND, Arndt PF, Clark AG, Aquadro CF (2009) Strong evidence for lineage and

sequence specificity of substitution rates and patterns in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Biology*

and Evolution, **26**, 1591–1605.

Staubach F, Baines JF, Künzel S, Bik EM, Petrov DA (2013) Host species and

environmental effects on bacterial communities associated with *Drosophila* in the

laboratory and in the natural environment. *PLoS ONE*, **8**, e70749.

Stephan W (2010) Genetic hitchhiking versus background selection: the controversy and

its implications. *Philosophical Transactions Of The Royal Society Of London Series B-*

Biological Sciences, **365**, 1245–1253.

Svetec N, Pavlidis P, Stephan W (2009) Recent strong positive selection on *Drosophila*

melanogaster HDAC6, a gene encoding a stress surveillance factor, as revealed by

population genomic analysis. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **26**, 1549–1556.

Tajima F (1989) Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA

polymorphism. *Genetics*, **123**, 585–595.

Trinder M, Daisley BA, Dube JS, Reid G (2017) *Drosophila melanogaster* as a High-

Throughput Model for Host-Microbiota Interactions. *Frontiers in microbiology*, **8**, 751.

Turner TL, Levine MT, Eckert ML, Begun DJ (2008) Genomic analysis of adaptive

differentiation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **179**, 455–473.

Umina PA, Weeks AR, Kearney MR, McKechnie SW, Hoffmann AA (2005) A rapid shift in

a classic clinal pattern in *Drosophila* reflecting climate change. *Science*, **308**, 691–693.

Unckless RL (2011) A DNA virus of *Drosophila*. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, e26564.

Voelker RA, Cockerham CC, Johnson FM *et al.* (1978) Inversions fail to account for

allozyme clines., **88**, 515–527.

Watterson GA (1975) On the number of segregating sites in genetical models without

recombination. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **7**, 256–276.

Webster CL, Longdon B, Lewis SH, Obbard DJ (2016) Twenty-Five New Viruses

Associated with the Drosophilidae (Diptera). *Evolutionary bioinformatics online*, **12**,

13–25.

Webster CL, Waldron FM, Robertson S *et al.* (2015) The Discovery, Distribution, and

Evolution of Viruses Associated with *Drosophila melanogaster. PLoS Biology*, **13**,

e1002210.

Weir BS, Cockerham CC (1984) Estimating *F*-Statistics for the Analysis of Population

Structure. *Evolution*, **38**, 1358–1370.

Werren JH, Baldo L, Clark ME (2008) Wolbachia: master manipulators of invertebrate

biology. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, **6**, 741–751.

Wickham H (2016) *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer.

Wilfert L, Longdon B, Ferreira AGA, Bayer F, Jiggins FM (2011) Trypanosomatids are

common and diverse parasites of *Drosophila*. *Parasitology*, **138**, 858–865.

Wittmann MJ, Bergland AO, Feldman MW, Schmidt PS, Petrov DA (2017) Seasonally

fluctuating selection can maintain polymorphism at many loci via segregation lift.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,

114, E9932–E9941.

Wolf JBW, Bayer T, Haubold B *et al.* (2010) Nucleotide divergence vs. gene expression

differentiation: comparative transcriptome sequencing in natural isolates from the

carrion crow and its hybrid zone with the hooded crow. *Molecular Ecology*, **19**, 162–

175.

Wolff JN, Camus MF, Clancy DJ, Dowling DK (2016) Complete mitochondrial genome

sequences of thirteen globally sourced strains of fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*)

form a powerful model for mitochondrial research. *Mitochondrial DNA. Part A, DNA*

mapping, sequencing, and analysis, **27**, 4672–4674.

Xiao F-X, Yotova V, Zietkiewicz E *et al.* (2004) Human *X*-chromosomal lineages in Europe

reveal Middle Eastern and Asiatic contacts. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, **12**,

301–311.

Yukilevich R, True JR (2008a) Incipient sexual isolation among cosmopolitan *Drosophila*

melanogaster populations. *Evolution*, **62**, 2112–2121.

Yukilevich R, True JR (2008b) African morphology, behavior and phermones underlie

incipient sexual isolation between us and Caribbean Drosophila melanogaster.

Evolution, **62**, 2807–2828.

Yukilevich R, Turner TL, Aoki F, Nuzhdin SV, True JR (2010) Patterns and processes of

genome-wide divergence between North American and African *Drosophila*

melanogaster. *Genetics*, **186**, 219–239.

Zanini F, Brodin J, Thebo L *et al.* (2015) Population genomics of intrapatient HIV-1

evolution. (AK Chakraborty, Ed,). *eLife*, **4**, e11282.

1695

 Figure legends

 Figure 1. The conceptual framework of the *DrosEU* consortium. By intensive spatio-

 temporal sampling of natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*, the European

 Drosophila Population Genomics Consortium (*DrosEU*; http://droseu.net/), aims to uncover

 the factors that shape the evolutionary dynamics and the genomes of this exemplary

 model organism. Each of the repeatedly and consistently sampled *DrosEU* populations is

 subject to evolutionary forces ("Evolution axis", from neutral to adaptive evolution) in

 interaction with the environment ("Environment axis", from local aspects to global patterns,

 including spatial factors). In addition, there are several dimensions along which the fly

 genomes can be studied, from single SNPs and genes to structural variants and co-

 evolving genomes ("Genomics axis"), both over short and long timescales ("Timescale

 axis").

 Figure 2. The geographic distribution of population samples. The map shows the

 geographic locations of all samples in the 2014 *DrosEU* dataset. The color of the circles

 indicates the sampling season for each location.

 Figure 3. Sampling and data analysis pipeline. The schematic diagram shows the

 workflow of data collection and processing (A) followed by bioinformatic approaches used

 for quality assessment and read mapping (B) as well as the downstream analyses (C)

 conducted in this study (see Materials and Methods for further information).

 Figure 4. SNP sharing. (A) Shared SNPs among *DrosEU* samples. Number and

 proportion of SNPs in different samples, ranging from one specific sample to being shared

among all 48 samples. (B) Shared SNPs among three worldwide populations. Elliptic Venn

diagram showing the number and proportion of SNPs overlapping among the 5,361,256

biallelic SNPs in *DrosEU* (Europe), 3,953,804 biallelic SNPs in DGRP (North America) and

4,643,511 biallelic SNPs in Zambia (Africa) populations.

Figure 5. Genome-wide estimates of genetic diversity and recombination rates. The

distribution of Tajima's π, Watterson's θ and Tajima's D (from top to bottom) in 200 kb

non-overlapping windows plotted for each chromosomal arm separately. Bold black lines

depict statistics which were averaged across all 48 samples and the upper and lower grey

area show the corresponding standard deviations for each window. Red dashed lines

highlight the vertical position of a zero value. The bottom row shows log-transformed

recombination rates (r) in 100kb non-overlapping windows as obtained from Comeron *et*

al. (2010).

Figure 6. Signals of selective sweeps. The central figure shows the distribution of

Tajima's D in 50 kb sliding windows with 40 kb overlap. The red and green dashed lines

highlight Tajima's D = 0 and Tajima's D = -1 respectively. The top panel shows the

magnification of a genomic region on chromosomal arm *2R* that harbors well-known

candidate loci for pesticide resistance, *Cyp6g1* and *Hen1* (highlighted in red), where strong

selection resulted in a selective sweep. This sweep is characterized by an excess of low-

frequency SNP variants, indicated by an overall negative Tajima's D in all samples. The

colored solid lines depict Tajima's D for each sample separately, whereas the black

dashed line shows Tajima's D averaged across all samples. (A legend for the color codes

of the samples can be found in the Supporting Information file in Figure S19). The bottom

figure shows a genomic region on *3L* which has not been identified as a potential target of

1746   selection but shows Tajima's D patterns similar to the top figure. Notably, both regions are

1747   also characterized by a strong reduction of genetic variation (Figure S10).

1748

Figure 7. Genetic differentiation among European populations. (A) isolation by

distance estimated by average genetic differentiation (F_{ST}) of 21,008 SNPs located in short

introns (<60 bp) plotted against geographic distance. Mantel tests and linear regression

(red dashed line and statistics in upper left box) indicate significance. (B) Average neutral

F_{ST} among populations. The center plot shows the distribution of average neutral F_{ST}

values for all 1,128 pairwise combinations. Mean neutral F_{ST} values were calculated by

averaging individual F_{ST} values from 20,008 genome-wide intronic SNPs for each pairwise

comparison. The plots on the left and the right show population pairs in the lower (blue)

and upper (red) 5% tails of the F_{ST} distribution. (C) Population structure of all *DrosEU*

samples as determined by PCA of allele frequencies of 20,008 SNPs located in short

introns (< 60 bp). The optimal number of five clusters was estimated by hierarchical model

fitting using the first four principal components. Cluster assignment of each population,

which was estimated by *k*-means clustering, is indicated by color.

1762

1763   **Figure 8. Mitochondria.** (A) TCS network showing the relationship of 5 common

1764   mitochondrial haplotypes; (B) estimated frequency of each mitochondrial haplotype in 48

1765   European populations;

1766

1767   **Figure 9. Transposable elements.** Relative abundances of repeats among pools**.**

1768   Proportion of each repeat class was estimated from sampled reads with dnaPipTE (2

1769   samples per run, 0.1X coverage per sample).

1770

1771 **Figure 10. Distribution of inversion frequencies.** Cumulative bar plots showing the

1772 absolute frequencies of six cosmopolitan inversions (*In(2L)t, In(2R)NS, In(3L)P, In(3R)C,*

1773 *In(3R)Mo, In(3R)Payne)* in all 48 population samples of the *DrosEU* dataset.

1774

1775 **Figure 11. Microbiome.** Relative abundance of *Drosophila* associated microbes as

1776 assessed by MGRAST classified shotgun sequences. Microbes had to reach at least 3%

1777 relative abundance in one of the samples to be presented.

1778 **Tables**

1779

1780 **Table 1. Sample information for all populations in the *DrosEU* dataset.** The table shows the origin, collection data and season and

1781 sample size (number of chromosomes: *n*) of the 48 samples in the *DrosEU* dataset. Additional information can be found in the supporting

1782 information in Table S1.

ID	Country	Location	Coll. Date	Number ID	Lat (°)	Lon (°)	Alt (m)	Season	n	Coll. name
AT_Mau_14_01	Austria	Mauternbach	2014-07-20	1	48.38	15.56	572	S	80	Andrea J. Betancourt
AT_Mau_14_02	Austria	Mauternbach	2014-10-19	2	48.38	15.56	572	F	80	Andrea J. Betancourt
TR_Yes_14_03	Turkey	Yesiloz	2014-08-31	3	40.23	32.26	680	S	80	Banu Sebnem Onder
TR_Yes_14_04	Turkey	Yesiloz	2014-10-23	4	40.23	32.26	680	F	80	Banu Sebnem Onder
FR_Vil_14_05	France	Viltain	2014-08-18	5	48.75	2.16	153	S	80	Catherine Montchamp-Moreau
FR_Vil_14_07	France	Viltain	2014-10-27	7	48.75	2.16	153	F	80	Catherine Montchamp-Moreau
FR_Got_14_08	France	Gotheron	2014-07-08	8	44.98	4.93	181	S	80	Cristina Vieira
UK_She_14_09	United Kingdom	Sheffield	2014-08-25	9	53.39	-1.52	100	S	80	Damiano Porcelli
UK_Sou_14_10	United Kingdom	South Queensferry	2014-07-14	10	55.97	-3.35	19	S	80	Darren Obbard
CY_Nic_14_11	Cyprus	Nicosia	2014-08-10	11	35.07	33.32	263	S	80	Eliza Argyridou
UK_Mar_14_12	United Kingdom	Market Harborough	2014-10-20	12	52.48	-0.92	80	F	80	Eran Tauber
UK_Lut_14_13	United Kingdom	Lutterworth	2014-10-20	13	52.43	-1.10	126	F	80	Eran Tauber

DE_Bro_14_14	Germany	Broggingen	2014-06-26	14	48.22	7.82	173	S	80	Fabian Staubach
DE_Bro_14_15	Germany	Broggingen	2014-10-15	15	48.22	7.82	173	F	80	Fabian Staubach
UA_Yal_14_16	Ukraine	Yalta	2014-06-20	16	44.50	34.17	72	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Yal_14_18	Ukraine	Yalta	2014-08-27	18	44.50	34.17	72	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Ode_14_19	Ukraine	Odesa	2014-07-03	19	46.44	30.77	54	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Ode_14_20	Ukraine	Odesa	2014-07-22	20	46.44	30.77	54	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Ode_14_21	Ukraine	Odesa	2014-08-29	21	46.44	30.77	54	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Ode_14_22	Ukraine	Odesa	2014-10-10	22	46.44	30.77	54	F	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Kyi_14_23	Ukraine	Kyiv	2014-08-09	23	50.34	30.49	179	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Kyi_14_24	Ukraine	Kyiv	2014-09-08	24	50.34	30.49	179	F	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Var_14_25	Ukraine	Varva	2014-08-18	25	50.48	32.71	125	S	80	Oleksandra Protsenko
UA_Pyr_14_26	Ukraine	Pyriatyn	2014-08-20	26	50.25	32.52	114	S	80	Oleksandra Protsenko
UA_Dro_14_27	Ukraine	Drogobych	2014-08-24	27	49.33	23.50	275	S	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Cho_14_28	Ukraine	Chornobyl	2014-09-13	28	51.37	30.14	121	F	80	Iryna Kozeretska
UA_Cho_14_29	Ukraine	Chornobyl Yaniv	2014-09-13	29	51.39	30.07	121	F	80	Iryna Kozeretska
SE_Lun_14_30	Sweden	Lund	2014-07-31	30	55.69	13.20	51	S	80	Jessica Abbott
DE_Mun_14_31	Germany	Munich	2014-06-19	31	48.18	11.61	520	S	80	John Parsch
DE_Mun_14_32	Germany	Munich	2014-09-03	32	48.18	11.61	520	F	80	John Parsch
PT_Rec_14_33	Portugal	Recarei	2014-09-26	33	41.15	-8.41	175	F	80	Jorge Vieira

ES_Gim_14_34	Spain	Gimenells (Lleida)	2014-10-20	34	41.62	0.62	173	F	80	Lain Guio
ES_Gim_14_35	Spain	Gimenells (Lleida)	2014-08-13	35	41.62	0.62	173	S	80	Lain Guio
FI_Aka_14_36	Finland	Akaa	2014-07-25	36	61.10	23.52	88	S	80	Maaria Kankare
FI_Aka_14_37	Finland	Akaa	2014-08-27	37	61.10	23.52	88	S	80	Maaria Kankare
FI_Ves_14_38	Finland	Vesanto	2014-07-26	38	62.55	26.24	121	S	66	Maaria Kankare
DK_Kar_14_39	Denmark	Karensminde	2014-09-01	39	55.95	10.21	15	F	80	Mads Fristrup Schou
DK_Kar_14_41	Denmark	Karensminde	2014-11-25	41	55.95	10.21	15	F	80	Mads Fristrup Schou
CH_Cha_14_42	Switzerland	Chalet à Gobet	2014-07-24	42	46.57	6.70	872	S	80	Martin Kapun
CH_Cha_14_43	Switzerland	Chalet à Gobet	2014-10-05	43	46.57	6.70	872	F	80	Martin Kapun
AT_See_14_44	Austria	Seeboden	2014-08-17	44	46.81	13.51	591	S	80	Martin Kapun
UA_Kha_14_45	Ukraine	Kharkiv	2014-07-26	45	49.82	36.05	141	S	80	Svitlana Serga
UA_Kha_14_46	Ukraine	Kharkiv	2014-09-14	46	49.82	36.05	141	F	80	Svitlana Serga
UA_Cho_14_47	Ukraine	Chornobyl Applegarden	2014-09-13	47	51.27	30.22	121	F	80	Svitlana Serga
UA_Cho_14_48	Ukraine	Chornobyl Polisske	2014-09-13	48	51.28	29.39	121	F	70	Svitlana Serga
UA_Kyi_14_49	Ukraine	Kyiv	2014-10-11	49	50.34	30.49	179	F	80	Svitlana Serga
UA_Uma_14_50	Ukraine	Uman	2014-10-01	50	48.75	30.21	214	F	80	Svitlana Serga
RU_Val_14_51	Russia	Valday	2014-08-17	51	57.98	33.24	217	S	80	Elena Pasyukova

1783

1784

Table 2. **Clinality of genetic variation and population structure.** Effects of geographic variables and/or seasonality on genome-wide

average levels of diversity (π, θ and Tajima's D; top rows) and on the first three axes of a PCA based on allele frequencies at neutrally

evolving sites (bottom rows). The values represent *F*-ratios from general linear models. Bold type indicates *F*-ratios that are significant

after Bonferroni correction (adjusted α'=0.0055). Asterisks in parentheses indicate significance when accounting for spatial

autocorrelation by spatial error models. These models were only calculated when Moran's *I* test, as shown in the last column, was

significant. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

1791

Factor	*Latitude*	*Longitude*	*Altitude*	*Season*	*Moran's I*
$\pi_{(X)}$	4.11*	1.62	**15.23*****	1.65	0.86
$\pi_{(Aut)}$	0.91	2.54	**27.18*****	0.16	-0.86
$\theta_{(X)}$	2.65	1.31	**15.54*****	2.22	0.24
$\theta_{(Aut)}$	0.48	1.44	**13.66*****	0.37	-1.13
$D_{(X)}$	0.02	0.38	5.93*	3.26	-2.08
$D_{(Aut)}$	0.09	0.76	5.33*	0.71	-1.45
PC1	0.06	**120.72***(***)**	5.35*(*)	2.53	4.15***
PC2	3.5	**10.22****	**15.21*****	1.97	-1.96

	PC3	0.14	0.11	0.01	1.29	0.22

1792

1793

1794 **Table 3**. **Clinality and/or seasonality of chromosomal inversions.** The values represent F-ratios from generalized linear models with

1795 a binomial error structure to account for frequency data. Bold type indicates deviance values that were significant after Bonferroni

1796 correction (adjusted α'=0.0071). Stars in parentheses indicate significance when accounting for spatial autocorrelation by spatial error

1797 models. These models were only calculated when Moran's I test, as shown in the last column, was significant. $*p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$; $***p$

1798 < 0.001

1799

Factor	Latitude	Longitude	Altitude	Season	Moran's I
In(2L)t	2.2	**10.09****	**43.94*****	0.89	-0.92
In(2R)NS	0.25	**14.43*****	2.88	2.43	1.25
In(3L)P	**21.78*****	2.82	0.62	3.6	-1.61
In(3R)C	**18.5***(***)**	0.75	1.42	0.04	2.79**
In(3R)Mo	0.3	0.09	0.35	0.03	-0.9
In(3R)Payne	**43.47*****	0.66	1.69	1.55	-0.89

1800

1801   **Figures**

1802

1803   **Figure 1**

1804

1805

1806   **Figure 2**

1807

1808

1809   **Figure 3**

1810

1811

1812   **Figure 4**

1813

1814

1815 **Figure 5**

1816

1817

Figure 6

Figure 7

1823   **Figure 8**

1824

1825

1826   **Figure 9**

1827

1828

1829   **Figure 10**

1830

1831

1832   **Figure 11**

1833

1834