1	Model-based species delimitation: are coalescent species reproductively isolated?
2	
3	Luke C. Campillo ^{1*} , Anthony J. Barley ¹ , Robert C. Thomson ¹
4	¹ Department of Biology, University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI, 96822
5	
6	*Corresponding Author: campillo@hawaii.edu
7	
8	Keywords: Multispecies Coalescent; BPP; genetic distance; Drosophila speciation
9	
10	ABSTRACT
11	A large and growing fraction of systematists define species as independently evolving lineages
12	that may be recognized by analyzing the population genetic history of alleles sampled from
13	individuals belonging to those species. This has motivated the development of increasingly
14	sophisticated statistical models rooted in the multispecies coalescent process. Specifically, these
15	models allow for simultaneous estimation of the number of species present in a sample of
16	individuals and the phylogenetic history of those species using only DNA sequence data from
17	independent loci. These methods hold extraordinary promise for increasing the efficiency of
18	species discovery, but require extensive validation to ensure that they are accurate and precise.
19	Whether the species identified by these methods correspond to the species that would be
20	recognized by alternative species recognition criteria (such as measurements of reproductive
21	isolation) is currently an open question, and a subject of vigorous debate. Here we perform an
22	empirical test of these methods by making use of a classic model system in the history of
23	speciation research, flies of the genus Drosophila. Specifically, we use the uniquely
24	comprehensive data on reproductive isolation that is available for this system, along with DNA
25	sequence data, to ask whether Drosophila species inferred under the multispecies coalescent
26	model correspond to those recognized by many decades of speciation research. We found that
27	coalescent based and reproductive isolation based methods of inferring species boundaries are
28	concordant for 77% of the species pairs. We explore and discuss potential explanations for these
29	discrepancies. We also found that the amount of prezygotic isolation between two species is a
30	strong predictor of the posterior probability of species boundaries based on DNA sequence data,
31	regardless of whether the species pairs are sympatrically or allopatrically distributed.

32 INTRODUCTION

33 Due to the complex nature of the processes that drive speciation, the development of an 34 operational species concept is difficult. For many years the Biological Species Concept (Mayr 35 1963), or some variation of it requiring high (but potentially incomplete) levels of reproductive 36 isolation between populations, was the standard (Coyne and Orr 2004). Starting in the late 1990s, 37 work echoing earlier evolutionary species concepts (Simpson 1951; Wiley 1978) led many 38 evolutionary biologists to recognize that species might best be recognized as "metapopulation lineages" using any number of data types (de Queiroz 1998, 2007). Under this metapopulation 39 40 conceptualization of species, the boundary between independent lineages (i.e., species) is 41 demarcated by any number of criteria, which may or may not include reproductive isolation. 42 Despite these conceptual changes, systematists remain in need of an operational framework for 43 species delimitation. One option for placing the practice of species delimitation in a more explicit framework is to use statistical models of evolutionary relationships among genetic loci. 44 45 One of the most widely used methods for doing so, BPP (Yang and Rannala 2014; Rannala and 46 Yang 2017), is a Bayesian method based on the multispecies coalescent model (MSC). BPP can 47 be employed to analyze variation in genealogies among many loci to identify independent coalescent lineages as species (Leaché and Fujita, 2010; Rannala and Yang, 2003). 48

These methods hold promise for greatly increasing the pace and accuracy of species description, although their utility depends on whether the lineages identified correspond to biologically defensible (or meaningful) species *and* the precision of these estimates. A number of studies have looked at the efficacy of the MSC for species tree inference (e.g., Fujita et al. 2012; Reid et al. 2014; Barley et al. 2018), but the concordance between independent coalescent lineages and species boundaries has been less well characterized in the literature. Relevant studies generally take one of two forms: 1) species boundaries identified under the MSC are

56 compared to those identified by alternative approaches, with concordance viewed as an 57 indication of accuracy (e.g., Camargo et al. 2012; Willis 2017); or 2) Data simulated under 58 known demographic scenarios are analyzed under the MSC and the results are used to identify 59 the relative over- or under-splitting of lineages by the model (Sukumaran and Knowles 2017; 60 Barley et al. 2018; Luo et al. 2018). Both types of studies frequently find that the MSC identifies 61 more lineages as species than some consider appropriate (Leaché et al. 2019). This discrepancy, 62 compounded by the lack of a fully objective species criterion, has led to an increasing wariness that MSC delimitation may inflate the number of species, often beyond what many systematists 63 64 find realistic.

65 These studies have been useful for characterizing the statistical performance of the MSC, 66 but can be difficult to interpret in the context of real species radiations. On one hand, there is the 67 possibility that the MSC identified genuine species that were missed by earlier studies because 68 they are morphologically cryptic or otherwise difficult to differentiate. On the other hand, in 69 simulation studies, the accuracy of results relies on the generating model (i.e., the simulation) 70 being an accurate representation of biological reality. If important aspects of species biology are 71 missing from the generating model we may draw inaccurate conclusions merely because our simulation study is overly simple relative to nature. The challenges associated with both of these 72 approaches might be averted by turning to an empirical system where extensive data on the 73 74 nature of species boundaries themselves are available. In such a system, we can examine the 75 correspondence between lineages identified as being independent under the MSC and other 76 criteria placed on species boundaries, such as reproductive isolation.

Here we make use of an empirical study system in which an extraordinarily rich
understanding of reproductive isolation has been established for many species pairs, the genus *Drosophila.* We use this to compare species identification based on reproductive isolation with

80 species delimitation under the MSC. Drosophila is an intensively studied model organism in 81 many disciplines, and arguably the most influential clade for understanding the consequences of 82 reproductive isolation as a mechanism of species formation and perpetuation. Much of this focus 83 stems from the fact that experimental lab crosses are possible between species, which provides 84 information on which species pairs show intrinsic reproductive isolation (lab crosses do not take extrinsic factors into account) and to what degree that isolation is complete. Two classic papers 85 by Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997) synthesized data on reproductive isolation derived from 86 87 experimental crosses and allozyme electrophoretic distance, which they used as a proxy for time 88 since divergence by assuming a constant molecular clock. These data were used to produce 89 estimates for the amount of total reproductive isolation (the combined accumulation of pre- and 90 postzygotic isolation) and time (using genetic distance as a proxy) required for complete 91 speciation. Here, complete speciation refers to a relaxed version of Mayr's Biological Species 92 Concept (Mayr 1963) that allows for low levels of gene flow between closely related species (see 93 also Coyne and Orr 2004).

These studies provide insight into the nature of how species boundaries themselves 94 95 become established. A central finding from Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997), and the one we focus on here, is that the amount of reproductive isolation increases with time since divergence. 96 Building off this idea, we examined several aspects of how species identified under the MSC 97 98 model matched those identified based on experimental quantification of reproductive isolation 99 and genetic distance. Specifically, we were interested in measuring the correlation between the 100 amount of reproductive isolation and genetic distance between two species, and the posterior 101 probability that those two species were identified as independent coalescent lineages. By 102 quantifying the relationship between reproductive isolation and coalescent lineages we stand to 103 gain a better understanding of the relationship between the biological processes that drive

104 speciation and promising statistical approaches to species delimitation. It should also be noted 105 that most studies of reproductive isolation look at comparisons between species, whereas most 106 practitioners of MSC species delimitation think about comparisons within species (i.e., at the 107 population level). This study is explicitly concerned with delimitation of nominal species. 108 Assessing the accuracy of species delimitation remains difficult because speciation is a 109 continuous process and species boundaries are not always discrete. However, utilizing 110 information on reproductive isolation allows us to assess the performance of these methods in a 111 more empirically grounded framework than is otherwise possible. With this in mind, the research 112 goals for this study were to: 1) examine the relationship between coalescent and reproductive 113 isolation based species delimitation; 2) quantify how varying levels of pre- and postzygotic 114 isolation in allopatric and sympatric species pairs affect our ability to identify species under the 115 MSC; 3) better understand the utility of MSC methods to increase the accuracy and precision of 116 species recognition in the presence of partial, or complete, reproductive isolation.

117

118 MATERIALS & METHODS

119 Dataset Assembly

120 The lists of species pairs studied by Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997) were combined to assemble a

set to be used in the present study (n = 108 pairwise comparisons). Values for pre- and

122 postzygotic isolation were compiled from Coyne and Orr's two studies (1989, 1997), and

updated based on isolation measures from a more recent study (Yukilevich 2012). Total

124 reproductive isolation (T; Coyne and Orr 1989) was calculated using the equation: T = Pre + T

125 $(1 - Pre) \times Post$. In keeping with previous work, if a species pair only had data on prezygotic

126 or postzygotic isolation, and that value was greater than 0.95 or 1.0, respectively, we considered

127 *T* to equal the measure for which there was data (Coyne and Orr 1997). Conversely, if a species

128 pair only had data for prezygotic or postzygotic isolation, and that value was less than 0.95 or 129 1.0, respectively, those species pairs were excluded from downstream analysis. Data on allozyme 130 genetic distance (D) comes originally from Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997), but more recently 131 updated by Yukilevich (2012). For the purpose of this study, we follow the species recognition thresholds proposed by 132 133 Coyne and Orr (1997). Specifically, they proposed minimum values on total reproductive 134 isolation (T \ge 0.903) and genetic distance (sympatric pairs: D \ge 0.04; allopatric pairs: D \ge 0.54) 135 required for maintenance of species boundaries. While we recognize that the use of any 136 particular threshold may raise concerns, we opted to use these for two reasons. First, by using the 137 same metrics employed by previous studies, we are able to make a direct comparison between 138 species delimitation based on reproductive isolation and delimitation based on MSC models. 139 Second, because MSC species delimitation has many practical implications, we wanted to focus 140 on values that would likely be the most relevant and widely used in empirical studies 141 We assembled a set of genes (n=8) that have been sequenced across a wide taxonomic 142 breadth within *Drosophila* (van der Linde and Houle 2008; Yang et al. 2012). We then 143 downloaded whatever sequence data was available from GenBank for this set of genes for all 144 species (n = 59) on the compiled list. Custom Python and R scripts (R Core Team 2013) were 145 used for data cleanup. Species pairs were then sorted into eleven species groups for analysis 146 (Coyne and Orr 1997). Here, "species group" refers to a term used in Drosophila literature to reference a monophyletic set of closely-related species (see O'Grady and DeSalle 2018). While a 147 large amount of mitochondrial data is available for Drosophila, we chose to include only one 148 mitochondrial gene (Cytochrome c oxidase subunit II: COII) for each species group because we 149 150 expect the entire mitochondrial genome to share a single coalescent history. We limited the final 151 data matrix for each group to include only those genes that were missing sequence data for no

152 more than two species. Because some intensively studied species have an abundance of sequence 153 data relative to the other species in their group (e.g., Drosophila subobscura has 137 COII 154 sequences available, while the other six species in the Obscura group combine for 30 available 155 sequences), we pruned sequences from overrepresented taxa to make the amount of data more 156 even across species. Specifically, for species that had >10 sequences at a given locus, we 157 randomly pruned sequences until the number that remained was equal to the next most densely 158 sampled species. Sequence data was aligned for each group using MUSCLE (Edgar 2004) and 159 converted to PHYLIP format using DendroPy 4.2.0 (Sukumaran and Holder 2010). These eleven 160 matrices, one for each species group, were analyzed independently in all downstream analyses. 161 To check for any difference in electrophoretic distance and genetic distances calculated from 162 DNA sequence data, we calculated Jukes-Cantor genetic distances across all species pairs for 163 COII in Geneious v 7.1.9 (Kearse et al. 2012) and then compared those to Nei's D (Fig. S1; 164 Table S1).

165

166 MSC Analysis

167 After assembling the dataset, we performed MSC species delimitation using BPP v 3.2 (Yang 168 and Rannala 2014) on each of the 11 species groups separately. BPP uses reversible-jump 169 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (rjMCMC) to estimate a Bayesian posterior distribution for different 170 species delimitation models. We jointly estimated the species tree topology and assignment of 171 individuals into species (referred to as "analysis A11" in BPP). Under this model we define a 172 starting tree, where each named species in the group is a "population", and then use the rjMCMC 173 to target the posterior distribution of possible models that may merge combinations of these 174 populations into a smaller number of species. This approach does not allow single populations to 175 be split more finely, and so the existing taxonomy within each species group (i.e., named species

176	from Coyne and Orr 1997) forms the upper limit on the total number of possible species in each
177	analysis. We specified a prior distribution that assigns equal probability for the number of
178	species (i.e., all populations merged into one species or a different species for each population)
179	and then divides that probability by the proportion of compatible labeled histories
180	(<i>speciesmodelprior</i> = 2; Yang 2015). We also set a prior that allows Θ (population size
181	parameter) to vary among loci according to specified heredity multipliers (Hey and Nielsen
182	2004) to account for the differences in effective population size between nuclear and
183	mitochondrial loci (<i>heredity</i> = 2; Yang and Rannala 2014).
184	Two central parameters of the MSC model are for population sizes (Θ) and species
185	divergence times (τ). These are specified as gamma distributed random variables in BPP. Our
186	goal was to set up a diffuse, but credible, prior distribution for both of these parameters. Here,
187	we constructed an empirical prior for Θ in <i>Drosophila</i> by using published estimates of this value,
188	if available, or published estimates of effective population size (N_e) and mutation rate (μ) to
189	solve for the equation: $\Theta = 4N\mu$ (Eyre-Walker et al. 2002; Wall et al. 2002; Tamura 2003; Yi et
190	al. 2003; Hey and Nielsen 2004; Haag-Liautard et al. 2007; Pascual et al. 2007; Cutter 2008;
191	Charlesworth 2009; Keightley et al. 2009, 2014; Legrand et al. 2009; Obbard et al. 2012; Smith
192	et al. 2012; Schrider et al. 2013). Similarly, to obtain an empirical prior for the τ parameter, we
193	used the online database TimeTree (www.timetree.org) to obtain an estimated root age for each
194	species group. Because each species group had different estimated root ages, there was a unique
195	combination of Θ and τ prior gamma distributions for each group. For both prior distributions,
196	we centered the mean of the gamma distribution on the empirical values, and set the variance of
197	the distribution to be wider than the distribution of all empirical values. We ran 204,000 MCMC
198	generations, discarding the first 4000 generations as burnin and then sampling every 20
199	generations until we reached 10,000 samples (BPP output files will be available on Dryad Digital

200 Repository upon publication). We repeated each analysis two times, checking that the results201 remained consistent across runs (Yang 2015).

202 The BPP manual (Yang 2015) explicitly states that there are no default priors for Θ and τ , 203 vet many studies employ a set of three prior gamma distributions originally used by Leaché and 204 Fujita (2010) as if they were. Here we explored prior sensitivity by performing additional BPP 205 runs on each dataset under this suite of priors (Leaché and Fujita 2010). For the sake of clarity, 206 we will refer to the set of priors from Leaché and Fujita (2010) as empirically "uninformed" and 207 our empirically derived priors as "informed". In total, we ran a BPP delimitation analysis on 208 each of the eleven species groups under four unique prior settings (one informed, three 209 uninformed) resulting in 44 independent BPP runs. Within the uninformed set of priors, we focus 210 on those that most closely matched our prior expectations about the coalescent history for 211 Drosophila (large ancestral population and shallow divergence among populations in this case). 212 This should minimize differences between informed and uninformed priors, thereby supplying a 213 realistic (and somewhat conservative) test of prior sensitivity. Full details for all prior settings 214 can be found in supplementary material (Table S2), including θ and τ priors for all groups and 215 BPP runs. We extracted posterior Θ values from each MCMC output file using a custom Python 216 script. To summarize the posterior distribution for τ , we used the R package Phytools v 0.6-60 217 (Revell 2012) to read the sampled trees in the MCMC output into R and calculate the tree height 218 of each (Python and R codes will be available on Dryad Digital Repository upon publication). 219 We visually inspected concordance between prior and posterior distributions of Θ and τ for the 220 informed and uninformed priors. Additionally, we investigated whether the number of species 221 delimited was sensitive to the alternative priors.

The A11 analysis in BPP estimates posterior probabilities for different delimitationmodels that may differ in number of species and the topology of the species phylogeny. Here, we

224 are specifically interested in the marginal posterior probability for the splitting, or lumping, of 225 each particular species pair, rather than the marginal posterior probability of any one delimitation 226 model. Because species pairs can be split or lumped in different configurations, we calculated the 227 marginal posterior probability of independence between each species in a given pair. We refer to 228 this value as the Posterior Probability of Independent Lineages (PPIL). PPIL values are 229 practically, and philosophically, the same measure as the "speciation probability" described in 230 Leaché and Fujita (2010). The difference is that we calculate these values from analyses that 231 marginalize across both species delimitations and species tree topologies, whereas Leaché and 232 Fujita (2010) only marginalized across species delimitations due to limitations of the software at that time which required the species tree be held constant (i.e., we do not employ a guide tree in 233 234 our analysis, as was done previously).

235 We calculated PPILs for all species pairs from Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997) where 236 sufficient sequence data was available to conduct the analysis, and for which information on 237 reproductive isolation was available (n = 108 pairwise comparisons. Using PPIL values, we 238 compared the number of independent lineages identified by the MSC to those based on 239 reproductive isolation and genetic distance documented by Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997). The two 240 species in each pair were considered independent lineages if they had a high PPIL (≥ 0.95) or met the criteria for total isolation (T \ge 0.903) and genetic distance (D_{allo} \ge 0.54; D_{symp} \ge 0.04) 241 242 from Coyne and Orr (1997).

243

244 Reproductive Isolation and Genetic Distance

Besides a cursory comparison in numbers of species delimited by either method, we were also
interested in how the components of speciation considered by Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997)
related to PPIL values in our present study. To accomplish this, we selected among a series of

248 generalized additive models (GAMs) to assess the impact of different predictor variables 249 (prezygotic isolation, postzygotic isolation, and genetic distance) on the PPIL for allopatrically 250 and sympatrically distributed species pairs. We chose not to include total reproductive isolation 251 in these models because it is a function of prezygotic and postzygotic isolation, which we already account for independently. We elected to use a GAM because the model can flexibly capture the 252 253 impact of a predictor variable through a smoother function, allowing for both linear and non-254 linear relationships. Because the dependent variable (i.e., PPIL) included 0 and 1, we performed 255 a logit transformation to normalize the data using the R package *car* (Fox and Weisberg 2011). 256 We then used the R package mgvc to construct and fit GAMs to the data (Wood 2011). We 257 calculated Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike 1974) values for each model and considered the 258 model with the smallest AIC to be the best fitting model. We further considered models with 259 $\Delta AIC \leq 2$ from the best model to be similarly plausible (Burnham et al. 2002).

We analyzed two independent sets of GAMs to: 1) explore the differences between allopatric and sympatric species pairs and 2) investigate the impact of predictor variables within allopatric and sympatric species pairs separately. The first series of GAMs compared models with one smoother function for all species pairs to models specifying separate smoothers for allopatric and sympatric species pairs. Improved fit for the latter model would indicate that range overlap between taxa differentially predicts PPIL values, and therefore these two types of species pairs (allopatric and sympatric) should be modelled separately in downstream analyses.

After confirming two smoothers based on geography was a better model, we fit the second series of GAMs on allopatric, sympatric, and closely related ($D \le 0.50$) allopatric and sympatric species pairs. For each set of species pairs, we fit a total of five GAMs, modelling the three predictor variables listed previously (prezygotic isolation, postzygotic isolation, and genetic distance) and two additive models (prezygotic isolation + genetic distance and postzygotic 272 isolation + genetic distance). We fit the GAMs on taxa with low genetic distance (D \leq 0.5) to 273 maintain consistency with Coyne and Orr (1989), and because they suggested closely related 274 sympatric species pairs should show the strongest signature of reinforcement. In this context, 275 evidence for reinforcement's effect would be that the model for prezygotic isolation is the 276 strongest predictor of PPIL among closely related sympatric species, followed closely by a 277 model of postzygotic isolation. Specifically, because reinforcement acts to increase prezygotic 278 isolation in order to counteract disadvantageous hybridization, there must be some level of 279 postzygotic isolation.

Because data from species pairs are phylogenetically non-independent, we also explored how this might impact our results. To do so, we extracted the maximum *a posteriori* tree from each of the BPP analyses using phytools v 0.6-60 (Revell 2012), setting branch lengths to their marginal posterior mean. We then assembled a reduced set of phylogenetically independent species pairs (i.e., only including pairs that are connected by paths on the tree that do not intersect with other pairs; see Felsenstein 2004, pg. 444). We then reran all the GAM analyses on this reduced but phylogenetically independent dataset.

287 Lastly, we investigated how PPIL values may vary with respect to levels of pre- and postzygotic isolation. To do this, we first constructed a reduced dataset that included all species 288 pairs with prezygotic (n = 100) or postzygotic (n = 74) isolation data. As outlined by Coyne and 289 Orr (1989, 1997), both of these values range from 0-1.0, with complete reproductive isolation 290 291 (pre- or postzygotic) equal to 1.0. We then performed an ANOVA to determine if PPIL differed 292 according to the levels of pre- and postzygotic isolation. Because the measures of postzygotic 293 isolation increased from 0 to 1.0 in 0.25 increments, we treated each level as a separate category 294 for the ANOVA. For prezygotic isolation, we binned the values based on the same levels (e.g., 0-295 0.25, 0.25-0.50, etc.). Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997) investigate what role Haldane's Rule

296 (Haldane 1922) may play in the speciation process and find it to be an important early step. We 297 checked whether it might also influence PPIL by assembling a reduced dataset containing only 298 those species pairs with 0.25-0.75 postzygotic isolation (n = 32), because at these levels of 299 postzygotic isolation the pair could either be in line with Haldane's Rule (i.e., the heterogametic 300 sex, males in this case, are either sterile or infertile for both crosses) or not (i.e., a male and 301 female, or both females are sterile/inviable). Information on sterility/infertility was taken from 302 Yukilevich (2012). We manually categorized species pairs as either conforming to Haldane's 303 Rule or not and performed a one-way t-test to look for differences between both categories of 304 species pairs.

305

306 **RESULTS**

307 Genetic dataset assembly and analysis

308 The final dataset included a total of 543 sequences from 8 genes. We were able to obtain 309 sequence data for all species from one gene, COII, totaling 160 sequences for that gene. The 310 median number of genes per species group was three. The Bipectinata group had the greatest gene diversity (n = 6), while the Buzzatii group was represented by only two genes. The mean 311 312 number of sequences compared between each species pair in each species group was 7.25, 313 ranging from an average of three sequences per pair in the Affinis group, up to 13.7 sequences 314 per pair in the Melanogaster group. Complete information on number of genes per group and loci 315 per species pair can be found in Supplementary Material (Table S3). The average genetic 316 distance across all species pairs was 0.82, ranging from 0.026 (D. heteroneura – D. silvestris) to 1.95 (recorded for multiple species pairs in the Obscura group). 317





Figure 1) Consensus species trees for each species group in this study. Branch lengths (in coalescent units) are based 320 on the average branch length from every MCMC tree that was topologically concordant with the highest probability 321 species tree (taken from BPP output). Note that the scale bar is a different length for each tree because it represents 322 the same value (0.002 coalescent units) for all trees. Backbone tree (top left) modified from Castillo (2017).

We ran the BPP analyses two times for each species group, and obtained similar results across runs. Consistency across runs indicates that mixing is likely adequate and the MCMC chain did not get stuck on any one model (Yang 2015). Species trees for each species group revealed varying levels of posterior probability support across nodes, but overall the species trees correspond with results from other phylogenetic studies (Fig. 1; van der Linde and Houle 2008; Yang et al. 2012).

329

330 Concordance of reproductively isolated species and coalescent species delimitation

331 The two approaches (i.e., threshold of genetic distance and reproductive isolation vs. PPIL 332 threshold) recognized 63 out of the 99 species pairs as comprising two independent lineages. An 333 additional 13 species pairs were not recognized as independent lineages by either approach. The 334 two approaches were therefore in agreement on the species status for 76 of 99 species pairs in 335 total (~77%; Fig. 2). Of the remaining 23 species pairs, 17 met the threshold for independent 336 lineages based on PPIL only, whereas the other six species pairs were considered to be distinct species based on total reproductive isolation (T) and genetic distance (D) only. Qualitatively 337 338 similar, but somewhat more discordant, results were recovered when using the uninformed priors 339 (68% agreement between methods). There was greater concordance between methods when 340 delimiting sympatric taxa than allopatric taxa (Fig. 2) and this pattern held true across the informed and uninformed priors. When lowering the admittedly arbitrary, but common, PPIL 341 342 threshold from 0.95 to 0.85 we recovered roughly the same amount of concordance (75 out of 99 343 species pairs in agreement; ~76% concordance). However, there were more lineages recognized 344 based on PPIL alone (Fig. S2). We also found greater discordance between methods for closely 345 related species pairs ($D \le 0.5$) than those more distantly related (D > 0.5; Fig. S3).



352 Reproductive Isolation and Genetic Distance

353 We recovered better predictive models of PPIL when considering sympatric and allopatric taxa 354 separately for prezygotic isolation and genetic distance, and similarly plausible models for 355 postzygotic isolation (Table 1). When fitting the second set of GAMs to the different types of 356 species pairs we found that the models of prezygotic isolation and genetic distance generally 357 explained more null deviance than those for postzygotic isolation, which essentially reduced to a 358 linear model (Fig. 3; plots for other GAM models are provided in Fig. S4 and Fig. S5). For 359 allopatric taxa, the combined effect of prezygotic isolation + genetic distance was the best predictor of PPIL, but the effect of prezygotic isolation alone was similarly plausible ($\Delta AIC =$ 360 361 1.11; Table 2). In sympatric taxa, prezygotic isolation was the best predictor of PPIL, followed closely by the similarly plausible combination model of prezygotic isolation + genetic distance 362 363 $(\Delta AIC = 0.21; Table 2)$. In the sympatric species pairs with low genetic distance (D < 0.5), we

364	found that the best predictor of PPIL was again prezygotic isolation, with models of genetic				
365	distance and postzygotic isolation + genetic distance similarly plausible ($\Delta AIC = 0.66 \& \Delta AIC$				
366	=0.58, respectively). We consistently found that the null deviance explained was low for the				
367	postzygotic isolation models (Table 2). These results remained qualitatively unchanged for the				
368	reduced phylogenetically independent datasets, with prezygotic isolation being the best predictor				
369	of PPIL in allopatry and sympatry. We present the results from the full dataset here, while				
370	complete results from the phylogenetically independent dataset can be found in the				
371	Supplementary Material (Table S4).				
372	When looking at species pairs with prezygotic isolation data (n=100), we recovered a				
373	significant difference between the level of prezygotic isolation and PPIL value, particularly				
374	between species pairs with lower levels of prezygotic isolation (ANOVA; F-stat = 15.79; p-value				
375	= 2.01×10^{-8} ; Fig. 4a). However, when considering all species pairs with postzygotic isolation				
376	data (n=74), we found that there was no statistical difference in PPIL among the five levels of				
377	isolation (ANOVA; F-stat = 1.144; p-value = 0.343; Fig. 4b). Additionally, although the mean				
378	PPIL for species pairs that follow Haldane's Rule was lower (0.927, $n = 21$) than those that do				
379	not (0.97; $n = 11$), there was no statistically significant difference in PPIL between the groups (t-				
380	test; p-value = 0.179; Fig. S6).				
381	Table 1)				

 -,	Prez. Isolation (n = 100)		Post. Is (n =	olation 74)	Gen. Distance (n = 108)	
Number of Smoothers	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.
One (Allo/Symp Together)	8.15	0.29	***	0.07	1.85†	0.22
Two (Allo/Symp Separate)	***	0.40	1.94†	0.07	***	0.27

382

Table 1) Results from a series of GAMs to test if relationships are different between allopatric and sympatric species

pairs, where *** means that model had the lowest AIC value and is therefore the most plausible model. The dagger (†) indicates a similarly plausible model ($\Delta AIC \le 2$; Burnham et al. 2002). The proportion of null deviance

explained by the model ("Dev. Exp.") is also provided.

387 Effect of the Priors

We did not see an effect of the informed versus uninformed priors on the mean number of 388 lineages delimited in a given group (i.e., BPP delimited a consistent number of species in each 389 390 group across different prior settings). However, we did see a difference in the variance (i.e., the 391 prior influenced how much uncertainty there was in the number of species in each group; Fig. 392 5b). Specifically, under the informed priors the MCMC samples were spread more evenly across possible delimitation models. We also observed a relatively large difference between the prior 393 394 and posterior distributions of Θ and τ for analysis under uniformed priors, which was not 395 observed in analyses under the informed prior (Fig. 5a). This indicates that the uninformed priors 396 are a relatively poor match for *Drosophila*, which has the effect of biasing the results to be 397 excessively certain. Moreover, this finding highlights that appropriate priors are important for 398 accurately estimating the variance of a random variable, in addition to accurately estimating its 399 mean.

400 **Table 2**)

Allo (n		patric Allo = 28) (D≤0.5		atric ; n = 15)	Symp (n =	oatric 42)	Sympatric (D≤0.50; n = 23)	
Explanatory Variable	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.	ΔΑΙΟ	Dev. Exp.
Prezygotic Isolation	1.11^{\dagger}	0.51	***	0.61	***	0.21	***	0.39
Postzygotic Isolation	14.80	0.08	8.22	0.07	1.25†	0.07	4.86	0.07
Genetic Distance	11.19	0.29	5.34	0.34	2.44	0.05	0.66^{\dagger}	0.33
Pre. Isol. + Gen. Dist.	***	0.57	4.52	0.40	0.21^{+}	0.23	2.23	0.33
Post. Isol. + Gen. Dist.	13.08	0.29	6.18	0.40	2.88	0.08	0.58^{\dagger}	0.39

⁴⁰¹

402 Table 2) Table of \triangle AIC values, where *** indicates the most plausible model (i.e., which explanatory variable best 403 explains PPIL value). The dagger (†) indicates a similarly plausible model (\triangle AIC \leq 2; Burnham et al. 2002). The 404 plus sign (+) between variables indicates a model of the additive effect of two predictors. The proportion of null 405 deviance explained by the model ("Dev. Exp.") is also provided.

406

407 **DISCUSSION**

408 Concordance of Species Boundaries Under the MSC

409 We assessed concordance between species that are delimited under population genetic models of

410 lineage divergence with a biologically important and widely used measure of species

distinctiveness, reproductive isolation. Specifically, we looked at species delimitations inferred
under the BPP implementation of the MSC (which we consider an operational framework for a
lineage-based species concept; Simpson 1951; Wiley 1978; De Queiroz 2007), and those
considered distinct species determined by the amount of reproductive isolation and genetic
distance between two lineages (i.e., a modified Biological Species Concept; Mayr 1963; Coyne
and Orr 2004).

417 We find that the methods do not return identical results, and the multispecies coalescent tends to more readily split species than measures of reproductive isolation and genetic distance 418 419 alone. This could result from the MSC recognizing genuine species that might be missed by 420 other approaches. Specifically, our results confirm that (if we take MSC delimitation as truth) 421 reproductive isolation does not need to be complete in order for lineages to be identifiable as 422 independent. Alternatively, recent studies have found the MSC may be prone to oversplitting and 423 might result in delimiting "population structure, not species" (Sukumaran and Knowles 2017; 424 Chambers and Hillis 2019). However, because we are attempting to delimit nominal species any population structure within species should not mislead our interpretations of the species 425 426 delimitation models. That being said, this also means that our results may provide a somewhat 427 optimistic view of MSC performance.

When using the PPIL ≥ 0.95 cutoff, both criteria agreed with one another in the majority, but far from all, cases (76% agreement; PPIL values for all species pairs found in Table S5). Of these species pairs, 63 were delimited by both methods and 13 were delimited by neither. The cases where neither delimitation model recognizes these nominal taxa as independent lineages represent scenarios in which the taxonomy may require reexamination. For example, none of the species pairs in the Auraria species complex were recognized as independent by either method, suggesting current taxonomy in this species complex may be recognizing too many species.

435 Watada et al. (2011) recently took one step in this direction, revising the taxonomy of D. 436 *quadraria* and suggesting it is better categorized as a junior synonym of *D. triauraria*. 437 Of the remaining species pairs (n = 23) for which there is disagreement between methods, 438 the majority (n=17) were pairs split under the MSC (i.e., high PPIL) but not under the Coyne and Orr criteria. Most of these high PPIL pairs did not have enough total reproductive isolation (n = 439 440 14) to meet the Coyne and Orr threshold, while the remaining three species pairs did not have 441 great enough genetic distance. These three species pairs are all allopatrically distributed. Due to 442 their high levels of reproductive isolation (between 0.94-1.0), we expect that they would remain 443 distinct upon secondary contact.

444 Of the 14 species pairs failing to meet the minimum total reproductive isolation 445 threshold, 10 were allopatrically distributed. Because laboratory tests on reproductive isolation 446 do not take geographic or environmental reproductive isolation into account, it is possible that 447 allopatric pairs have not evolved a high degree of pre- or postzygotic isolation simply because they are genetically isolated by virtue of their distribution (i.e., geographic isolation is a strong 448 449 barrier to gene flow, in itself). For example, the allopatric species pair of *D. americana* and *D.* 450 *virilis* had relatively low genetic distance (D = 0.54) and total isolation (T = 0.644), but were 451 never lumped under the MSC model (PPIL = 1.0). Furthermore, detailed crossing experiments 452 and QTL mapping have shown high levels of postmating, prezygotic isolation between these two species (Sweigart 2010), suggesting that genetic distance and total reproductive isolation may 453 454 take more time to evolve relative to isolation identified under a coalescent framework. The other 455 four species pairs with high PPIL but low reproductive isolation were all sympatric. These may 456 represent cases where BPP is identifying incipient species with (potentially) low levels of 457 ongoing or recent gene flow (Leaché et al. 2019), or cases where the amount of reproductive 458 isolation may have been underestimated. For example, the sympatric species pair D. lummei -D.

459 *virilis* would be considered independent lineages under the MSC (PPIL = 1.0) despite having the 460 lowest total isolation value in the entire dataset (T = 0.263). However, at least one source 461 (Heikkinen and Lumme 1991) reported high postzygotic isolation between the pair that was not 462 reflected in either Coyne & Orr (1989, 1997) or Yukilevich (2012), and therefore was not 463 included our calculation of total isolation for this species pair.

464 The remaining six species pairs in disagreement would be considered species based on reproductive isolation and genetic distance, but were not identified as independent lineages under 465 the MSC. At face value, this would indicate these are reproductively isolated species pairs that 466 467 cannot be identified as independently coalescing lineages. Of these, five are sympatric, and only 468 one is allopatric. For the only allopatric pair (D. mesophragmatic -D. pavani), the PPIL value 469 was barely below the 0.95 posterior probability cutoff (PPIL = 0.942), and probably represents a 470 valid split under both methods. We recovered a range of PPIL values for the five sympatric 471 species pairs (PPIL between 0.794-0.930). Additionally, we observed that for all the sympatric 472 species pairs with high reproductive isolation but PPIL < 0.95 one or both species in that pair have documented chromosomal inversions (Jha and Rahman 1973; Johnson 1985; Noor et al. 473 474 2001).

In principle, any of these discrepancies could be attributed to error in measures of 475 reproductive isolation, genetic distance, or PPIL (e.g., poor fit of the MSC to the data). 476 477 Widespread error in reproductive isolation measurements seems unlikely due to the controlled 478 laboratory conditions under which these data were collected. However, extrinsic isolating 479 mechanisms (e.g., ecological selection against hybrids) are not considered in a laboratory 480 environment, and may represent a greater source of discordance between laboratory and nature 481 than anything else. The amount of genetic distance could also have been overestimated or 482 underestimated, but this seems unlikely to be a systematic issue given that we found a strong

483 correlation between Nei's electrophoretic distance and Jukes-Cantor genetic distance based on 484 COII (Fig. S1). While it could be true that species pairs are not as distinct as the amount of 485 genetic distance and reproductive isolation between them might suggest, it is also possible that 486 we failed to delimit them due to a lack of statistical power, driven by a paucity of loci used to fit the MSC model. The lowest PPIL among reproductively isolated species (D. algonquin -D. 487 *athabasca*; PPIL = 0.79) was based on sequence data from only one individual per species for 488 489 two genes, which is among the lowest amount of data for any species pair in the entire dataset 490 (Table S3). Discordance between methods in these cases may simply be driven by the amount of 491 data available for analysis, rather than a true disagreement between methods. However, 492 performance in BPP is good even with a small number of loci (Rannala and Yang 2017), and we 493 found no relationship between the number of loci compared between species pairs and the PPIL value for that species pair (linear regression: $R^2 = 0.002$; p-value = 0.61; Fig. S7). 494

495

496 **Reproductive Isolation and GAMs**

We observed significant model improvement when specifying separate smoothers for sympatric
and allopatric taxa, rather than considering all taxa jointly, for most explanatory variables (Table
1). Based on these results, we subsequently explored the predictive power of three variables, and
two combinations of reproductive isolation and genetic distance (see Materials & Methods), to

501 predict PPIL values for sympatric and allopatric taxa separately. In allopatric taxa, we found that

502 the combination model of prezygotic isolation + genetic distance best predicted PPIL value, with



503 504 505

Figure 3) Fitted GAMs for allopatric (left) and sympatric (right) taxa. Note that the smooths are centered on zero to ensure model identifiability, meaning the y-axis is scaled relative to PPIL values but is not on the same scale (i.e., not from 0 - 1.0).

509 prezygotic isolation alone being found to be similarly plausible ($\Delta AIC = 1.11$). This indicates 510 that knowledge about prezygotic isolation, particularly in conjunction with genetic distance, is a 511 strong predictor of PPIL values for allopatric species pairs. Although this makes sense at face 512 value, it is interesting that prezygotic isolation represents a good predictor of speciation for taxa 513 whose ranges do not overlap and therefore do not have the potential to mate in nature (i.e., 514 prezygotic isolation does not matter if taxa are allopatrically distributed). Furthermore, the fact

515 that the model of postzygotic isolation was the worst predictor of PPIL for allopatric species 516 pairs ($\Delta AIC = 14.8$) suggests the fate of hybrids between allopatric taxa, either through lab trials 517 or secondary contact, says little about the independence of those lineages under the MSC. 518 Models of genetic distance and postzygotic isolation + genetic distance were also poor predictors 519 of PPIL in allopatric taxa. Taken together, this seems to imply that neither the time since two 520 species became geographically isolated (inferred from genetic distance) nor levels of hybrid 521 sterility/inviability are particularly indicative of lineage independence in allopatric taxa. 522 In sympatric taxa, we found that the model of prezygotic isolation alone was a better fit 523 than all other explanatory variables, although the combination model of prezygotic isolation + 524 genetic distance represented a similarly plausible alternative model ($\Delta AIC = 0.206$). This agrees 525 with the expectation that prezygotic isolation should be important in maintaining species 526 boundaries in sympatry. When looking at sympatric taxa at low genetic distance (D < 0.5), we 527 found the combined model of prezygotic isolation + genetic distance model best predicted PPIL. 528 This suggests that time since divergence (inferred from genetic distance), and not just the amount 529 of prezygotic isolation, is an important indicator of lineage independence among closely related 530 and recently diverged sympatric taxa. The model for postzygotic isolation was the worst 531 predictor of PPIL for closely related sympatric taxa ($\Delta AIC = 4.56$). Furthermore, in contrast to 532 the finding from Coyne and Orr (1989, 1997) we find that prezygotic isolation is the best 533 predictor of PPIL in closely related ($D \le 0.50$) allopatric and sympatric species pairs. Given that 534 reinforcement, by definition, does not occur in allopatry (i.e., there are no unfit hybrids), this 535 reaffirms the relative importance of prezygotic isolation throughout the speciation process, even 536 in the absence of any postzygotic isolation.

ANOVA tests revealed a significant difference between the level of prezygotic isolationand PPIL, but not between level of postzygotic isolation and PPIL, which recapitulates the

539 results of the GAM analysis. Furthermore, this shows that once a low level of prezygotic 540 isolation has been obtained (> 0.25) there is no statistical difference in PPIL values at higher 541 levels of prezygotic isolation. Lastly, here was no statistically significant difference in PPIL for 542 partially reproductively isolated species pairs (postzygotic isolation between 0.25-0.75) that do 543 or do not show signature of Haldane's Rule. Although there is abundant support for the 544 occurrence of Haldane's Rule in nature (Delph and Demuth 2016), sterility/infertility of the 545 heterogametic sex does not seem to serve as a strong predictor of whether two lineages are 546 identified as independent coalescent lineages.

547

548 Effect of the Prior

549 Overall, we observed relatively consistent PPIL values across all prior settings (Table S4), 550 indicating results from BPP analyses are not especially sensitive to the prior for either Θ or τ . As 551 we would expect, we observed larger differences between the prior and posterior distribution of 552 Θ and τ for the uninformed priors than the informed priors (Fig. 4a). The informed priors 553 allowed the MCMC to more widely explore topological space, both in terms of the number of 554 species in a given topology and the frequency of proposing a unique topology. Uniformed priors 555 are likely to depart strongly from empirically reasonable values for any particular dataset, which 556 can constrain how well the MCMC explores areas of parameters space that may have high 557 likelihoods (but very low prior probability). While we did not observe strong impacts on the 558 mean number of species that were inferred for these data, the misspecified priors did lead to 559 inflated estimates of certainty (Fig. 4b). Given the existing concerns regarding whether the MSC 560 tends to oversplit lineages, an exaggerated increase in precision, and presumably accuracy in 561 certain situations, would almost certainly exacerbate any innate complications of MSC species 562 delimitation (see also Leaché et al. 2019 for an alternative approach to better characterizing 563 uncertainty in MSC species delimitation).



565Figure 4) Boxplots depicting the results of ANOVA test across different levels of pre- or postzygotic isolation.566There was a significant difference for prezygotic isolation (p-value = 2.01×10^{-8}), but not for postzygotic isolation567(p-value = 0.343).

568

564

569 Implications for the practice of species delimitation

570 Here we present a detailed look at the difference between two species delimitation approaches in 571 a well-studied model organism, but our findings have implications beyond Drosophila 572 speciation. First, the overall amount of discordance between the two delimitation methods we 573 used here was much higher than we naïvely expected. If nominal taxa represent valid species, 574 then any model of species delimitation should recover them. Moreover, while the frequency of 575 speciation-collapse in nature is not yet well known, recent work has led to an increased 576 recognition that the evolutionary history of many species is reticulate in nature (i.e., periods of 577 gene flow during and/or after speciation; Burbrink and Gehara 2018; Marques et al. 2019) or 578 otherwise non-bifurcating (e.g., budding or anagenic speciation; Silvestro et al. 2018). Taken 579 together, our results confirm that (if we take MSC delimitation as truth) reproductive isolation does not need to be complete in order for lineages to be identifiable as independent. 580

581 Alternatively, the MSC model may not be able to pick up on reproductive isolating 582 mechanisms that are specific to particular regions of the genome (i.e., genomic islands of 583 divergence; Wolf and Ellegren 2016). In this study, we found that for sympatric species with 584 high reproductive isolation, but low PPIL value, chromosomal rearrangement could be 585 implicated in the maintenance of species boundaries. Moreover, while chromosomal 586 rearrangements have long been associated with reproductive isolation and speciation (Rieseberg 587 2001; Campbell et al. 2018), to our knowledge have not been formally investigated under a MSC model. Supposing chromosomal inversions drive a rapid increase in reproductive isolation, the 588 589 effects of localized genomic islands of divergence may not extend throughout the genome or be 590 reflected in the few loci being used for delimitation. Although selecting a number of genes from 591 a heterogeneous gene pool will often provide a useful approximation of species limits, if the only 592 difference between species are relatively small genomic islands of divergence (e.g., 593 chromosomal inversions) the results from MSC delimitation may be inconsistent with the levels

594 of reproductive isolated observed in nature.

595 This study also allowed us to reveal novel insight into the speciation process. Most 596 notably, we found that levels of prezygotic isolation were consistently related to PPIL, and found 597 no indication that postzygotic isolation was similarly informative. Although quantification of 598 pre- and postzygotic isolation are not readily available outside of model organisms, the implications of this finding potentially extends beyond the lab. Specifically, they may indicate 599 600 that prezygotic isolation evolves earlier in the speciation process and rapidly leads to identifiable 601 independent lineages, even under a relatively small amount of assortative mating (prezygotic 602 isolation ≥ 0.25). This may provide some insight into why hybridization appears to be more 603 common in nature than was previously appreciated (Taylor and Larson 2019). As long as most of 604 the gene flow is within species, the boundaries are maintained and the speciation process in not

disrupted. However, further work is needed to move beyond such speculation. Overall, our

results highlight the value of considering the processes that underlie speciation, in conjunction

607 with the assumptions of each species delimitation method employed, as a fruitful means for

understanding conflicts (see also Barley et al. 2018; Smith and Carstens 2018).



 $\begin{array}{c} 609 \\ 610 \\ 610 \\ 611 \\ 612 \\ 612 \\ 612 \\ 612 \\ 613 \\ 613 \\ 614 \\ 614 \\ 614 \\ 614 \\ 614 \\ 616 \\ 616 \\ 616 \\ 617 \\ 618 \\ 618 \\ 619 \\ 619 \\ 619 \\ 619 \\ 619 \\ 610 \\$

615

616 **CONCLUSION**

617 While reproductive isolation has long been a cornerstone of speciation research, it can rarely be

618 used as an operational delimitation method because collecting such data is not tractable for most

619 systems. Likewise, many practitioners of model-based species delimitation do not take

620 reproductive isolation into account because the data are unavailable. In this study, we focus on a

621 *Drosophila* dataset that is uniquely suited to address this divide in how species are understood.

622 Here, we formally investigated how species boundaries based on reproductive isolation compare

623 to model based species delimitation. We found that model based and reproductive isolation based

methods agreed on \sim 77% of species delimitations. MSC consistently delimited more species

625 pairs ($\sim 17\%$), while 6% of the species pairs were delimited based on reproductive isolation and 626 genetic distance alone. However, because our study design does not allow for within species 627 population structure to be misinterpreted as species boundaries, our results may provide a 628 somewhat optimistic view of MSC performance. Additionally, by using a set of informed and 629 uninformed prior settings we were able to qualitatively assess the accuracy and precision of MSC 630 species delimitation, as implemented by BPP. In accordance with earlier studies, BPP appears to 631 be relatively robust to prior misspecification, although we do find evidence that prior misspecification can lead to overconfidence in estimates of species boundaries. Lastly, based on 632 633 predictive GAM models, we found that the amount of postzygotic isolation between species pairs 634 was relatively uninformative as to whether or not those lineages can be recognized as 635 independent under the coalescent. We are not questioning that postzygotic isolation acts as a 636 strong reproductive barrier, certainly it does. However, it seems that prezygotic isolation 637 evolving early in the speciation process is closely tied to recognizably independent lineages. As 638 such, prezygotic isolation may be relatively more important in the incipient stages of speciation, 639 and possibly to the process as a whole. 640

641 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

642 Data available from the Dryad Digital Repository: XXXXXX

643

644 FUNDING

645 This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation (grant numbers DEB 1354506,

646 DEB 1754350, and DBI 1356796). This work was also supported by computational resources

647 provided by the University of Hawai'i Cyberinfrastructure group, as well as funding from the

648 Arnold and Mabel Beckman Foundation.

649 **REFERENCES**

- Akaike H. 1974. A new look at the statistical model identification. IEEE Transactions on
 Automatic Control. 19:716–723.
- Barley A.J., Brown J.M., Thomson R.C. 2018. Impact of Model Violations on the Inference of
 Species Boundaries Under the Multispecies Coalescent. Systematic Biology. 67:269–284.
- Burbrink F.T., Gehara M. 2018. The Biogeography of Deep Time Phylogenetic Reticulation.
 Systematic Biology. 67:743–755.
- Burnham K.P., Anderson D.R., Burnham K.P. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference:
 a practical information-theoretic approach. New York: Springer.
- Camargo A., Morando M., Avila L.J., Sites J.W. 2012. Species delimitation with ABC and other
 coalescent-based methods: a test of accuracy with simulations and an empirical example
 with lizards of the *Liolaemus darwinii* complex (Squamata: Liolaemidae): species
 delimitation with ABC. Evolution. 66:2834–2849.
- 662 Campbell C.R., Poelstra J.W., Yoder A.D. 2018. What is Speciation Genomics? The roles of
 663 ecology, gene flow, and genomic architecture in the formation of species. Biological
 664 Journal of the Linnean Society. 124:561–583.
- Castillo D.M. 2017. Factors contributing to the accumulation of reproductive isolation: A mixed
 model approach. Ecology and Evolution. 7:5808–5820.
- 667 Chambers E.A., Hillis D.M. 2019. The Multispecies Coalescent Over-Splits Species in the Case
 668 of Geographically Widespread Taxa. Systematic Biology.
- 669 Charlesworth B. 2009. Fundamental concepts in genetics: Effective population size and patterns
 670 of molecular evolution and variation. Nature Reviews Genetics. 10:195–205.
- 671 Coyne J.A., Orr H.A. 1989. Patterns of Speciation in *Drosophila*. Evolution. 43:362.
- 672 Coyne J.A., Orr H.A. 1997. "Patterns of Speciation in *Drosophila*" Revisited. Evolution. 51:295.
- 673 Coyne J.A., Orr H.A. 2004. Speciation. Sunderland, Mass: Sinauer Associates.
- 674 Cutter A.D. 2008. Divergence Times in *Caenorhabditis* and *Drosophila* Inferred from Direct
 675 Estimates of the Neutral Mutation Rate. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 25:778–786.
- Delph L.F., Demuth J.P. 2016. Haldane's Rule: Genetic Bases and Their Empirical Support.
 Journal of Heredity. 107:383–391.
- Edgar R.C. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high
 throughput. Nucleic Acids Research. 32:1792–1797.
- Eyre-Walker A., Keightley P.D., Smith N.G.C., Gaffney D. 2002. Quantifying the slightly
 deleterious mutation model of molecular evolution. Mol. Biol. Evol. 19:2142–2149.
- 682 Felsenstein J. 2004. Inferring phylogenies. Sunderland, Mass: Sinauer Associates.
- Fox J., Weisberg S. 2011. An R Companion to Applied Regression. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Fujita M.K., Leaché A.D., Burbrink F.T., McGuire J.A., Moritz C. 2012. Coalescent-based
 species delimitation in an integrative taxonomy. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 27:480–
 488.
- Haag-Liautard C., Dorris M., Maside X., Macaskill S., Halligan D.L., Charlesworth B.,
 Keightley P.D. 2007. Direct estimation of per nucleotide and genomic deleterious
 mutation rates in *Drosophila*. Nature. 445:82–85.
- Haldane J.B.S. 1922. Sex ratio and unisexual sterility in hybrid animals. Journal of Genetics.
 12:101–109.
- Heikkinen E., Lumme J. 1991. Sterility of male and female hybrids of *Drosophila virilis* and
 Drosophila lummei. Heredity. 67:1.
- Hey J., Nielsen R. 2004. Multilocus Methods for Estimating Population Sizes, Migration Rates
 and Divergence Time, With Applications to the Divergence of *Drosophila pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis*. Genetics. 167:747–760.

- Jha A.P., Rahman S.M. 1973. On crossing between *Drosophila bipectinata* and *Drosophila malerkotliana*. Cytologia (Tokyo). 38:425–436.
- Johnson D.L.E. 1985. Genetic differentiation in the *Drosophila athabasca* complex. Evolution.
 39:467–472.
- Kearse M., Moir R., Wilson A., Stones-Havas S., Cheung M., Sturrock S., Buxton S., Cooper A.,
 Markowitz S., Duran C., Thierer T., Ashton B., Meintjes P., Drummond A. 2012.
 Geneious Basic: An integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the
 organization and analysis of sequence data. Bioinformatics. 28:1647–1649.
- Keightley P.D., Ness R.W., Halligan D.L., Haddrill P.R. 2014. Estimation of the Spontaneous
 Mutation Rate per Nucleotide Site in a *Drosophila melanogaster* Full-Sib Family.
 Genetics. 196:313–320.
- Keightley P.D., Trivedi U., Thomson M., Oliver F., Kumar S., Blaxter M.L. 2009. Analysis of
 the genome sequences of three *Drosophila melanogaster* spontaneous mutation
 accumulation lines. Genome Research. 19:1195–1201.
- Leaché A.D., Fujita M.K. 2010. Bayesian species delimitation in West African forest geckos
 (*Hemidactylus fasciatus*). Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.
 277:3071–3077.
- Leaché A.D., Zhu T., Rannala B., Yang Z. 2019. The Spectre of Too Many Species. Systematic
 Biology. 68:168–181.
- Legrand D., Tenaillon M.I., Matyot P., Gerlach J., Lachaise D., Cariou M.-L. 2009. Species Wide Genetic Variation and Demographic History of *Drosophila sechellia*, a Species
 Lacking Population Structure. Genetics. 182:1197–1206.
- van der Linde K., Houle D. 2008. A supertree analysis and literature review of the genus
 Drosophila and closely related genera (Diptera, Drosophilidae). Insect Systematics &
 Evolution. 39:241–267.
- Luo A., Ling C., Ho S.Y., Zhu C. 2018. Comparison of Methods for Molecular Species
 Delimitation across a Range of Speciation Scenarios. Systematic Biology.
- Marques D.A., Meier J.I., Seehausen O. 2019. A Combinatorial View on Speciation and
 Adaptive Radiation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 34:531–544.
- 726 Mayr E. 1963. Animal species and evolution. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Noor M.A.F., Grams K.L., Bertucci L.A., Reiland J. 2001. Chromosomal inversions and the
 reproductive isolation of species. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
 98:12084–12088.
- Obbard D.J., Maclennan J., Kim K.-W., Rambaut A., O'Grady P.M., Jiggins F.M. 2012.
 Estimating Divergence Dates and Substitution Rates in the *Drosophila* Phylogeny.
 Molecular Biology and Evolution. 29:3459–3473.
- 733 O'Grady P.M., DeSalle R. 2018. Phylogeny of the Genus *Drosophila*. Genetics. 209:1–25.
- Pascual M., Chapuis M.P., Mestres F., Balanyà J., Huey R.B., Gilchrist G.W., Serra L., Estoup
 A. 2007. Introduction history of *Drosophila subobscura* in the New World: a
 microsatellite-based survey using ABC methods. Molecular Ecology. 16:3069–3083.
- de Queiroz K. 1998. The General Lineage Concept of Species, Species Criteria, and the
 Process of Speciation. In: Howard D.J., Berlocher S.H., editors. Endless Forms: Species
 and Speciation. Oxford University Press. p. 57–75.
- de Queiroz K. 2007. Species Concepts and Species Delimitation. Systematic Biology. 56:879–
 886.
- R Core Team. 2013. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,
 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

- Rannala B., Yang Z. 2003. Bayes estimation of species divergence times and ancestral
 population sizes using DNA sequences from multiple loci. Genetics. 164:1645–1656.
- Rannala B., Yang Z. 2017. Efficient Bayesian species tree inference under the multispecies
 coalescent. Systematic biology. 66:823–842.
- Reid N.M., Hird S.M., Brown J.M., Pelletier T.A., McVay J.D., Satler J.D., Carstens B.C. 2014.
 Poor Fit to the Multispecies Coalescent is Widely Detectable in Empirical Data.
 Systematic Biology. 63:322–333.
- Revell L.J. 2012. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things): phytools: R package. Methods in Ecology and Evolution. 3:217–223.
- Rieseberg L.H. 2001. Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. Trends in Ecology &
 Evolution. 16:351–358.
- Schrider D.R., Houle D., Lynch M., Hahn M.W. 2013. Rates and Genomic Consequences of
 Spontaneous Mutational Events in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics. 194:937–954.
- Silvestro D., Warnock R.C.M., Gavryushkina A., Stadler T. 2018. Closing the gap between
 palaeontological and neontological speciation and extinction rate estimates. Nature
 Communications. 9.
- 760 Simpson G.G. 1951. The Species Concept. Evolution. 5:285–298.
- Smith G., Lohse K., Etges W.J., Ritchie M.G. 2012. Model-based comparisons of
 phylogeographic scenarios resolve the intraspecific divergence of cactophilic *Drosophila mojavensis*: Phylogeography of *Drosophila mojavensis*. Molecular Ecology. 21:3293–
 3307.
- Smith M.L., Carstens B.C. 2018. Disentangling the process of speciation using machine learning.
 bioRxiv.
- Sukumaran J., Holder M.T. 2010. DendroPy: a Python library for phylogenetic computing.
 Bioinformatics. 26:1569–1571.
- Sukumaran J., Knowles L.L. 2017. Multispecies coalescent delimits structure, not species.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 114:1607–1612.
- Sweigart A.L. 2010. The Genetics of Postmating, Prezygotic Reproductive Isolation Between
 Drosophila virilis and *D. americana*. Genetics. 184:401–410.
- Tamura K. 2003. Temporal Patterns of Fruit Fly (*Drosophila*) Evolution Revealed by Mutation
 Clocks. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 21:36–44.
- Taylor S.A., Larson E.L. 2019. Insights from genomes into the evolutionary importance and prevalence of hybridization in nature. Nature Ecology & Evolution. 3:170–177.
- Wall J.D., Andolfatto P., Przeworski M. 2002. Testing models of selection and demography in
 Drosophila simulans. Genetics. 162:203–216.
- Watada M., Matsumoto M., Kondo M., Kimura M.T. 2011. Taxonomic study of the *Drosophila auraria* species complex (Diptera: Drosophilidae) with description of a new species:
 Drosophila auraria species complex. Entomological Science. 14:392–398.
- 782 Wiley E.O. 1978. The Evolutionary Species Concept Reconsidered. Systematic Zoology. 27:17.
- Willis S.C. 2017. One species or four? Yes!...and, no. Or, arbitrary assignment of lineages to
 species obscures the diversification processes of Neotropical fishes. PLOS ONE.
 12:e0172349.
- Wolf J.B.W., Ellegren H. 2016. Making sense of genomic islands of differentiation in light of
 speciation. Nature Reviews Genetics. 18:87–100.
- Wood S.N. 2011. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation
 of semiparametric generalized linear models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B).
 73:3–36.

- Yang Y., Hou Z.-C., Qian Y.-H., Kang H., Zeng Q.-T. 2012. Increasing the data size to
 accurately reconstruct the phylogenetic relationships between nine subgroups of the
 Drosophila melanogaster species group (Drosophilidae, Diptera). Molecular
 Phylogenetics and Evolution. 62:214–223.
- Yang Z. 2015. The BPP program for species tree estimation and species delimitation. Current
 Zoology. 61:854–865.
- Yang Z., Rannala B. 2014. Unguided Species Delimitation Using DNA Sequence Data from
 Multiple Loci. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 31:3125–3135.
- Yi S., Bachtrog D., Charlesworth B. 2003. A survey of chromosomal and nucleotide sequence
 variation in *Drosophila miranda*. Genetics. 164:1369–1381.
- Yukilevich R. 2012. Asymmetrical patterns of speciation uniquely support reinforcement in
 Drosophila: asymmetrical patterns of reinforcement speciation. Evolution. 66:1430–
 1446.