1 **Gap genes are involved in inviability in hybrids** 2 **between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. santomea***

3

4 Wenhan Chang¹, Martin Kreitman¹, and Daniel R. Matute²

5

6 ¹Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Chicago

7 ²Biology Department, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

8

9

10

11 Correspondence:

12 Biology Department, University of North Carolina, 250 Bell Tower Road, Chapel Hill,

13 27599.

14 Tel: 919-962-2077

15 Fax: 919-962-1625

16 E-mail: dmatute@email.unc.edu

17

18

19 **Running title:** Gap genes cause hybrid inviability

20

ABSTRACT

Evolved changes within species lead to the inevitable loss of viability in hybrids. Inviability is also a convenient phenotype to genetically map and validate functionally divergent genes and pathways differentiating closely related species. Here we identify the *Drosophila melanogaster* form of the highly conserved essential gap gene *giant* (*gt*) as a key genetic determinant of hybrid inviability in crosses with *D. santomea*. We show that the coding region of this allele in *D. melanogaster*/*D. santomea* hybrids is sufficient to cause embryonic inviability not seen in either pure species. Further genetic analysis indicates that *tailless* (*tll*), another gap gene, is also involved in the hybrid defects. *giant* and *tll* are both members of the gap gene network of transcription factors that participate in establishing anterior-posterior specification of the dipteran embryo, a highly conserved developmental process. Genes whose outputs in this process are functionally conserved nevertheless evolve over short timescales to cause inviability in hybrids.

34
| 35

INTRODUCTION

The formation and persistence of species involves the buildup of barriers to gene flow as genome divergence accrues over time. These genetic barriers arise as species differentiate and involve breakdowns in a variety of cellular, developmental, and behavioral processes; eventually these barriers lead to reduced fitness of hybrids relative to pure species (Coyne and Orr 2004; Coughlan and Matute 2020). Hybrid inviability (HI), the condition in which interspecific hybrids do not achieve adulthood because of developmental defects, is one of these barriers. The question of how natural selection could allow such maladaptive and extreme phenotypes has been a subject of intense interest to evolutionary biologists and developmental geneticists alike (Darwin 1859; Weir 1885; Shull 1923).

Dobzhansky (Dobzhansky 1937) and Muller (Muller 1942) formulated a widely regarded genetic model in which hybrid defects, including HI, arise as a collateral effect of evolutionary divergence between populations that acquire incompatible changes in interacting loci, or Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities (DMIs; (Dobzhansky 1937; Muller 1942)). Because the divergent alleles at the DMIs loci only have fitness costs when they are forced together in hybrids, natural selection does not oppose the changes in each species. There is substantial evidence in support of the DM model (Maheshwari and Barbash 2011), including nearly a dozen instances in which HI alleles have been identified to the gene level (Wellbrock *et al.* 1998; Presgraves 2003; Brideau *et al.* 2006; Bomblies *et al.* 2007; Lee *et al.* 2008; Tang and Presgraves 2009; Ferree and Barbash 2009; Phadnis *et al.* 2015; Zuellig and Sweigart 2018; Powell *et al.* 2020; Moran *et al.* 2021). Some of these alleles have been shown to evolve through positive selection (Presgraves *et al.* 2003; Brideau *et al.* 2006; Bomblies *et al.* 2007; Tang and Presgraves 2009; Satyaki *et al.* 2014) while others show no clear signature of selection (Phadnis and Orr 2009). The variety of both the gene type in HI and the processes that drive allelic divergence indicates that HI can occur in a multitude of ways (Johnson 2010).

Developmental processes are generally guided by interacting regulatory genes and elements, making them a rich source of potential candidates for HI. The question arises, however, as to whether they evolve functionally at a sufficient pace to fuel the rapid

formation of DMIs in the speciation process. Developmental processes and their outputs are often deeply conserved phylogenetically, often displaying conserved functional attributes (reviewed in (Gordon and Ruvinsky 2012)). Large-effect mutations to developmental regulators are often incompatible with life, and these genes tend to be evolutionarily conserved both in sequence and phenotypic output (Manzanares *et al.* 2000; Gaunt 2002; Santini *et al.* 2003; Lee *et al.* 2006). While the developmental phenotypes in which these genes are involved generally remain similar across species, the genetic underpinnings of these crucial phenotypes may evolve (Weiss and Fullerton 2000; True and Haag 2001; Palmer and Feldman 2009; Rebeiz *et al.* 2009; Pavlicev and Wagner 2012), and if their pace of functional evolution is sufficiently fast, could contribute to HI.

Several lines of evidence elevate this possibility and thus challenge the notion that the conservation and selective constraints on regulatory genes, and the processes they direct, immunize them from possibly contributing to HI. First, recent work by us on a canonical example of a conserved regulatory gene and pathway — the gap gene *giant* in *Drosophila* and the process of pattern formation— shows contrary to expectations that this gene diverges functionally at a rapid and continuous pace in the genus, as evidenced by loss of viability in carefully controlled transgenic complementation experiments (Chang *et al.* 2021).

Second, several cases of embryonic hybrid lethality have been identified in *Drosophila*: female hybrid inviability in hybrids between *D. montana* females and *D. texana* males (Kinsey 1967), female lethality in hybrids of *D. melanogaster* females and *D. simulans* males (Sawamura and Yamamoto 1993; Sawamura *et al.* 1993b; a); and male embryonic lethality in hybrids of *D. melanogaster* females and *D. santomea* males ((Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013), see below).

Third, even for developmental phenotypes that remain similar across phylogeny, their genetic underpinnings change occasionally in substantial ways (Weiss and Fullerton 2000; True and Haag 2001; Palmer and Feldman 2009; Rebeiz *et al.* 2009; Pavlicev and Wagner 2012). Referred to as developmental systems drift —functional divergence of genes in developmental regulatory pathways with conserved outputs — has also been documented for nematode vulva induction (Wang and Sommer 2011; Sommer 2012), and

sex determination in frogs (Cauret *et al.* 2020). Developmental systems drift has also been proposed to lead to hybrid defects (Lynch 2009). If genetic changes occur in different directions in two species, their hybrids might not have a functional pathway to produce the required developmental phenotype. This is a simple—but to date unsubstantiated—way to explain HI.

RESULTS

We first explored whether *Drosophila* hybrids other than *mel/san* also showed embryonic hybrid inviability and abdominal ablations. We examined the embryonic lethality rates and associated cuticular phenotypes from hybrid crosses between various species within the *melanogaster* supercomplex and species of the *yakuba* subgroup (Figure 1, [Figure S1](#)). Hybrid embryos between *D. santomea* and the other species in the *yakuba* subgroup — *D. teissieri* and *D. yakuba* — are mostly viable and showed no abdominal ablations in any of the six possible reciprocal crosses (Table S1; (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013; Turissini *et al.* 2015, 2018; Cooper *et al.* 2017)). Embryonic inviability is rare among crosses between collections of these species (but see (Cooper *et al.* 2017)). Hybrid inviability is also non-existent in hybrids between collections of species of the *simulans* species group — *D. simulans* (*sim*), *D. mauritiana* (*mau*) and *D. sechellia* (*sec*) (Figure 1, (Turissini *et al.* 2018)). The embryonic viability of male *mel/sim* and *mel/mau* hybrids is high in all cases (Table S2, (Sturtevant 1920; Sawamura *et al.* 1993a; Presgraves 2003; Matute *et al.* 2014)). The few rare embryos that failed to develop and hatch showed no abdominal ablations (Table S2).

Crosses between females of two species of the *sim* clade (*sim* and *mau*) and *san* males showed high levels of hybrid inviability, especially of males (Figure S1). These dead hybrids show the characteristic abdominal ablation. This shared phenotype with *mel* in hybrids with *san* indicated that genetic changes that ultimately lead to abdominal ablations must have occurred before the split of the three species, approximately five million years ago (Tamura *et al.* 2004; Matute *et al.* 2010; Suvorov *et al.* 2021). Genetic analysis with these crosses also confirm that the locus involved in HI resides in the *X*-

chromosome. We next identified the genetic locus that causes hybrid inviability by abdominal ablation using genetic tools available in *D. melanogaster*.

Genetic mapping shows *giant* is involved in *mel/san* HI

To identify the *X*-linked allele involved in HI, we did a genome-wide association study using a panel of inbred *D. melanogaster* lines (i.e., DGRP, (MacKay *et al.* 2012; Huang *et al.* 2014)) and studied whether any genetic variant segregating in *D. melanogaster* was associated with total inviability in hybrids with *D. santomea*. In all crosses, the hybrid males die, but the females show differential rates of survival. We found a strong association between a 16.5 kb haplotype in the *X*-chromosome and high levels of HI (Figure 2A). This haplotype harbors two genes: *CG32797* and *gt*, and overlaps with a segment of the *D. melanogaster* *X*-chromosome (*X_{mel}*) previously associated with male HI (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014).

A similar GWAS for the incidence of abdominal ablations (Figure 2B) showed the frequency of abdominal ablations in *mel/san* hybrids (both sexes pooled) is associated with an *X_{mel}* haplotype that contains six genes (*CG32797*, *gt*, *tko*, *boi*, *z*, and *trol*; Figure 2B). This interval also overlaps with the region associated with HI. Gene(s) on the tip of *X_{mel}* cause both HI and abdominal ablations.

Next, we generated *mel/san* hybrid males with the *X*-chromosome from *D. santomea* (*X_{san}*) and studied whether introducing small segments of *X_{mel}* would cause HI. *mel/san* hybrid males with the abdominal ablation typically inherit a *X_{mel}* chromosome and a *Y* chromosome from *san* (*Y_{san}*). By using *mel* attached-*X* chromosomes (Figure S1), we manipulated chromosomal inheritance and generated hybrid F₁ males that inherit a *X_{san}* and a *D. melanogaster* *Y* chromosome (*Y_{mel}*). These animals do not manifest the abdominal ablation and are regularly viable (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014). We obtained a similar result when we crossed *sim* attached-*X* females to *san* males; the cross produces viable hybrid F₁ males with a *X_{san}* and a *D. simulans* *Y* chromosome. To refine the region of the *X_{mel}* chromosome carrying the determinant of the abdominal ablation phenotype, we introduced small segments of *X_{mel}* (containing *mel* alleles ranging from approximately 10 to 100 genes each; as in (Cook *et al.* 2010; Venken *et al.* 2010; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014) into the genetic makeup of

X_{san}/Y_{mel} hybrid F₁ males (crossing scheme shown in Figure S2; fly stocks listed in Table S3). Previous results had shown that the distal tip of X_{mel} contains an allele that causes inviability in hybrid males. Measuring the rates of hybrid embryonic lethality in the presence of nested $Dp(1;Y)$ and $Dp(1;3)$ duplications of the X_{mel} chromosome allowed us to refine the genomic interval to the region encompassing the cytological region 3A3 (dmel6: 2,410,000-2,580,000; (Dos Santos *et al.* 2015b)). Male hybrid embryos harboring X_{san} and Y_{mel} with duplications containing the 3A3 portion of X_{mel} routinely fail to hatch (Figure 2C). They also show the striking abdominal ablation common in *mel/san* hybrid males carrying the full-length X_{mel} and Y_{san} (Figure 2C; Figure S3). Previous results had shown that the distal tip of X_{mel} contains an allele that causes inviability in hybrid males. Measuring the rates of hybrid embryonic lethality in the presence of nested $Dp(1;Y)$ and $Dp(1;3)$ duplications of the X_{mel} chromosome allowed us to refine the genomic interval to the region encompassing the cytological region 3A3 (dmel6: 2,410,000-2,580,000; (Dos Santos *et al.* 2015b)). The comparison of $Dp(1;Y)$ and $Dp(1;3)$ duplications has two caveats worth noting. First, pure species *mel* $C(1)DX$, $Dp(1;3)/Dp(1;3)$ females are generally weaker than $C(1)DX$, $Dp(1;Y)$ and lay fewer eggs in conspecific and heterospecific crosses. We thus had lower power in crosses involving the former type of females (Table S4). Second, the rate of complementation of $Dp(1;3)$ and $Dp(1;Y)$ is not identical (Table S5) suggesting the existence of position effects.

Male hybrid embryos harboring X_{san} and X_{mel} duplications containing the 3A3 portion fail to hatch (Figure 2C). They also show the striking abdominal ablation common in *mel/san* hybrid males carrying the full-length X_{mel} and Y_{san} (Figure 2D, Figure S2). Notably, the overlapping region of the duplications that cause this ablation contains only one gene: *giant* (Figure S2). The ablation phenotype is not found in the presence of other lethality-inducing fragments from elsewhere on the X_{mel} chromosome (as found in this work and (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014)). gt_{mel} caused HI with abdominal ablation in hybrids with all examined lines from *D. santomea* confirming that the interaction is not a line specific effect (Figure S4; Table S6). These experiments suggest that introducing a gt_{mel} allele in a X_{san}/Y_{mel} male hybrid background is sufficient to cause lethality with abdominal ablation.

We also did similar genetic crosses using $Dp(1;Y)$ and $Dp(1;3)$ duplications to

assess whether the same *X*-chromosome segments (and therefore *gt_{mel}*) caused HI in crosses with four additional species, two from the *simulans* species complex (*mau* and *sim*), one from the *yakuba* species complex, *D. teissieri*, and *mel* itself. In no other interspecific hybrids did *gt_{mel}* have a deleterious effect (either reduced viability or abdominal ablations) suggesting that the hybrid lethal effects *gt_{mel}* are exclusive to *mel/san* hybrids (Figures S5-S6).

The *gt_{mel}* allele causes inviability in both male and female hybrids

The crosses described above address the effect of the presence of a *gt_{mel}* allele on HI in *mel/san* hybrids. Next, we studied the absence of a functional *gt_{mel}* allele using a *gt_{mel}* null-allele, *gt_{mel}^{X11}* (Perrimon *et al.* 1984; Petschek *et al.* 1987). Hybrid male embryos carrying *gt^{X11}* were less likely to be abdominally ablated compared to other *X^{mel}/Y^{san}* hybrids (mean number of *FM7/Y^{san}* ablated embryos: 80.33%, Figure 3A; mean proportion of *gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y^{san}* ablated embryos: 4.41%, Figure 4B; t-test comparing the frequency of ablations in *FM7/Y^{san}* males and *gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y^{san}* males: $t = 23.972$, $df = 21.614$, $P < 1 \times 10^{-10}$), and instead show other developmental defects (Figure S7).

X_{mel}/Y_{san} males with a null allele of *gt_{mel}* (i.e., *gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y_{san}*) do not show increased viability. This result is not surprising because *X_{mel}* harbors at least eight more dominant (or semidominant) factors that also cause embryonic inviability (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014), which may be specifically lethal to *mel/san* hybrids. In contrast, male hybrid embryos carrying a *X_{mel}* chromosome and null mutations of the genes adjacent to *gt* (*boi*, *trol*, and *tko*) show abdominal ablations (Figure S8). These experiments demonstrate that *gt_{mel}* is necessary for the abdominal ablation in *mel/san* hybrid males, but is not the only allele that can cause inviability in this hybrid individuals.

We also tested whether *gt_{mel}* had a deleterious effect on hybrid females by scoring whether any allele on *X_{mel}* between the cytological positions 2F1 and 3A4 affected the fitness of *mel/san* hybrid females. We used deficiency mapping and scored the number of *df(i)/san* hybrid females compared to their *FM7/san* sisters ((Coyne *et al.* 1998; Presgraves 2003), see Methods). Deviations from 1:1 expected ratio indicate the presence of alleles involved in HI. If *FM7/san* hybrids survive at a higher rate than *df(i)/san*, then the uncovered *san* segment contains a recessive allele involved in HI. If *FM7/san* hybrids

survive at a lower rate than *df(i)/san* hybrids, then the absent *mel* segment contains a dominant (or semi-dominant) allele involved in HI. The initial screening using the line *san* Carv2015.16 showed that hybrid females with a deletion for the *X_{mel}* region between 3A2 and 3A3 (which contains *gt_{mel}*) are more viable than hybrid females that carry the balancer chromosome with *gt_{mel}* (*df/san* to *FM7/san* ratio $\approx$ 2:1; Figure 3A). The minimal interval that harbors the female HI determinant contains six genes, one of them being *gt*.

We further refined the genetic analysis of this region by testing null alleles of the genes in the interval. Of the four genetically characterized genes in the mapped interval, 3A3, only mutants of *gt_{mel}* lead to an increase of female hybrid viability (Table S7). Females that carry *gt_{mel}* (*FM7::GFP/san*) emerged at a lesser frequency than their null allele-carrying sisters (*gt_{mel}^{x11}/san* Figure 3B, Table S7). This difference in viability holds when other *X*-chromosome balancers are used as well (Figure S9).

The abdominal ablation defect that is characteristic of *mel/san* males is also present in some proportion of *mel/san* female embryos that die (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014). We next tested whether *gt_{mel}* causes abdominal ablations in female as it does in male hybrids. *gt_{mel}*-carrying females (*FM7::GFP/san*; Figure 3B) have abdominal ablations more frequently than their *gt_{mel}^{x11}/san* sisters (Figure 5B; t-test comparing the frequency of ablations in *FM7/X^{san}* males and *gt^{x11}/X^{san}* females $t = 6.853$, $df = 16.147$, $P = 3.699 \times 10^{-6}$). These results indicate that *gt_{mel}*, the primary genetic determinant of the abdominal ablation in male *mel/san* hybrids, is sufficient to render some hybrid females inviable by inducing abdominal ablations. This trait varies across *san* lines, however, ranging from little inviability (e.g., *san* SYN2005, *df/san* to *FM7/san* ratio $\approx$ 1:1; Figure 3C) to almost complete inviability (e.g., *san* Rain42; *df/san* to *FM7/san* ratio $\approx$ 4:1; Figure 3C, Figure S4).

Two genes adjacent to *gt*, *CG32797* and *CG12496* have no available mutant stocks. The former, *CG32797*, is not expressed in embryos (Kaminker *et al.* 2002; Brown *et al.* 2014) and is an unlikely candidate to cause embryonic inviability in *mel/san* hybrids. *CG12496* is expressed in the early embryos (2-14 hours after egg laying, (Kaminker *et al.* 2002; Brown *et al.* 2014)), so an undetectable role in HI cannot be excluded. However, the results for the *gt^{mel}* allele explain a large proportion of the inviability and abdominal ablation phenotypes we observe with the larger deletion

(Figure 3B, Figure S10).

These effects of gt^{mel} are specific to the *mel/san* hybrid background, as crosses between $gt^{X11}/FM7::GFP$ and males from *D. simulans*, *D. mauritiana* (Figure S11), and multiple lines of *D. melanogaster* (Figure S12) all yielded the 1:1 expectation of balancer and null-allele progeny. Taken together, the mapping efforts are consistent and reveal that the gt^{mel} allele is: (1) necessary and sufficient to cause abdominal ablation defects; (2) contributes to hybrid inviability in both male and female *mel/san* hybrids; and (3) causes defects in that are specific to hybrids that have a *san* father.

Transgenic swaps confirm *D. melanogaster* *gt* causes hybrid inviability

To identify the specific region(s) of the *gt* locus responsible for causing *mel/san* hybrid inviability, we generated whole-locus *gt* transgenes from *mel* and *san*, as well as coding/noncoding chimeras between them, which we integrated into the *D. melanogaster* 3rd chromosome docking site attP2 (Groth *et al.* 2004; Bischof *et al.* 2007); we replaced the endogenous gt_{mel} with these *gt* transgenes in flies carrying the *gt* null allele gt_{mel}^{X11} (Figure S13). The whole-locus gt_{mel} , also designated $gt_{mel:mel}$ to identify the species source of coding and noncoding regions respectively, is a ~27kb segment of DNA that rescues lethality in the gt_{mel}^{X11} null mutant (Manu *et al.* 2013). First, we asked whether the *gt* transgenes might carry cryptic functional elements, different from *gt* itself, that might affect viability. To disrupt the function of *gt* specifically, a ~1.73kb removable piggyBac cassette was inserted into the 5'UTR of every *gt* transgene to conditionally eliminate the gene product (Figure S13B). All of them failed to restore viability in a gt_{mel}^{X11} mutant (Table S8). To restore the wildtype transgene allele, a piggyBac transposase was employed to remove the piggyBac cassette (Thibault *et al.* 2004). This precise excision, confirmed with sequencing, does not leave behind any additional DNA. Each pair of *gt* transgenes with or without the piggyBac cassette have identical genetic backgrounds. The restored *gt* transgenes rescue lethality in a gt_{mel}^{X11} mutant (Tables 1 and 2). Thus, transgene *gt* expression itself is necessary for viability in this rescue assay.

We carried out three sets of crosses with the pure-species and chimeric transgenes (Figure S13) to measure *gt* contribution in hybrids to embryonic viability (Figure S13C), and female adult viability (Figure S13D). We first measured the relative viability of

transgene alleles in *gt_{mel}^{X11}/san* hybrid embryos (sexes pooled). *mel/san* hybrids carrying *gt_{mel}^{X11}* and the *gt_{mel:mel}* transgene show a high prevalence of the embryonic lethal phenotype (Table 1). *gt_{san::mel}*, an allele with the *gt_{san}* non-coding DNA and the coding sequence from *gt_{mel}*, caused the embryonic lethality in *mel/san* hybrids at a similar rate than that caused by *gt_{mel:mel}* (Table 1). In contrast, *gt_{mel:san}*, an allele with the *gt_{mel}* non-coding and *gt_{san}* coding, increased viability compared to *gt_{mel:mel}* hybrids (Table 1). Notably, the *gt_{san::san}* allele, which has the full *gt_{san}* allele, shows viability comparable to that of *gt_{mel:san}* carriers ($X^2_1 = 0.075$, $P = 0.784$), but higher than chimeras carrying the *gt_{mel}* coding sequence (*gt_{san::mel}* and *gt_{mel::mel}*, $X^2_1 > 4.98$, $P < 0.026$; Table 1). These results point to the coding region of *gt_{mel}* alone as being necessary for embryonic hybrid inviability.

We next evaluated the effects of these *gt* transgenes on a different metric of hybrid fitness – female viability. We crossed *san* males to *mel* females that were homozygous for *gt_{mel}^{X11}* and hemizygous for each of the four *gt* transgenes; the resulting female progeny from this cross was hybrid females carries *gt_{mel}^{X11}/gt_{san}* *X*-chromosomes and either a *gt* transgene or a wildtype *3_{mel}* chromosome lacking a transgene (Figure S13D). The effect of the transgene on hybrid female viability can then be measured the ratio of flies with the transgene to flies with the wildtype *3_{mel}* chromosome. The results are largely consistent with the results from scoring embryonic lethality: one copy of the *gt_{mel:mel}* allele reduces hybrid female adult viability compared to hybrids females without the same transgene. This finding with transgenic *gt* is also consistent with the deficiency mapping results using *X*-chromosome balancers. Hybrid females with one *gt_{san:mel}* allele also show a reduction of viability similar to the one observed in *gt_{mel:mel}* carriers (Table 2); the reciprocal chimeric allele —*gt_{mel:san}*—, caused no reduction in relative viability. Finally, we find that the *gt_{san:san}* transgene increases hybrid female adult viability compared to the control (Table 2). This increase in viability can only be explained by an epistatic interaction between coding and noncoding regions of *gt_{san}*, as neither the coding nor the non-coding region of *gt^{san}* alone confers such an increase of hybrid female viability. These results collectively suggest that the inviability is mainly attributable to coding region of *gt_{mel}*, consistent with its predominant role in hybrid embryonic lethality.

*tll_{mel} exacerbates the hybrid inviability caused by *gt_{mel}**

Hybrid defects are usually caused by at least two interacting elements (reviewed in (Maheshwari and Barbash 2011; Nosil and Schluter 2011)). *Giant* is an essential factor in the gap gene regulatory network, a set of interacting genes expressed in the blastoderm embryo to establish anterior-posterior patterning (Petschek *et al.* 1987; Mohler *et al.* 1989; Eldon and Pirrotta 1991; Kraut and Levine 1991); its function in segmentation as a reciprocal transcriptional repressor of other gap genes (*Kruppel* and *knirps*; (Kraut and Levine 1991; Capovilla *et al.* 1992; Wu *et al.* 1998)) is conserved in arthropods. *giant* is itself repressed by the gene products of *hunchback* (Eldon and Pirrotta 1991; Kraut and Levine 1991; Struhl *et al.* 1992), *tailless* (Reinitz and Levine 1990), and *hucklebein* (Brönner *et al.* 1994). The proteins *Caudal* (Schulz and Tautz 1995) and *Bicoid* (Eldon and Pirrotta 1991; Rivera-Pomar *et al.* 1995) activate *gt*, which localizes to two broad stripes, one towards the anterior and one towards the posterior pole of the embryo (reviewed in (Jaeger 2011)). Given this knowledge, we hypothesized that gap genes interacting with *gt_{mel}* could be additional candidates contributing to inviability in *mel/san* hybrids.

Even though *gt_{mel}* is involved in generating abdominal ablations, hybrids with no functional *gt_{mel}* allele also show abdominal ablations but at lower frequency (Figure 3B, (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014)). This means that other alleles in the genome are involved in producing the maladaptive trait. We introgressed a *gt_{mel}^{X11}* allele into the background of 200 DGRP (*Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel) lines (Figure S14) to assess whether autosomal variants segregating within *mel*, other than those in *gt_{mel}*, would affect the frequency of abdominal ablations in hybrids. Using GWAS, we found a strong association between a 75.7kb haplotype in 3L which harbors nine genes: *cindr*, *CG15544*, *tll*, *Cpr100A*, *CG15545*, *CG15546*, *CG15547*, *CG12071*, and *Sap-r* (Figure 4). Of these nine, the only gene known to interact with *gt* is *tll*.

To determine whether the two genes interact genetically in causing HI, we generated double mutant females carrying loss of function mutations of *gt* and *tll* (*gt^{X11}/FM7::GFP*, *tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/TM3 Ser Sb*) and crossed them to *san* males. First, we scored whether the presence of *tll_{mel}* had any effect on hybrid female viability by itself. We found no effect of *tll_{mel}* in hybrid female viability in an otherwise heterozygote F1

background ($FM7::GFP/X_{san}, tll_{mel}^{AGFP}/3_{san}$ vs. $FM7::GFP/X_{san}, TM3 Sb/3_{san}$; Table 3).

Next, we scored whether the presence of tll_{mel} had an effect on hybrid female viability in a gt_{mel}^{x11} background. Hybrid mel/san females that have only a functional copy of gt_{san} (i.e., carry a gt_{mel}^{x11} allele) and are hemizygous for tll (i.e., only have tll_{san}) are more likely to survive to adulthood than gt_{mel}^{x11} -carrying females and a functional tll_{mel} ($gt_{mel}^{x11}/X_{san}, tll_{mel}^{AGFP}/3_{san}$ vs. $gt_{mel}^{x11}/X_{san}, TM3, Sb/3_{san}$ Table 3A). These results suggest that while removing tll_{mel} on its own has no major effect on HI, removing both gt_{mel} and tll_{mel} has a positive effect in viability that is larger than removing either allele individually.

tll_{mel} also has a role in the frequency of abdominal ablations. Abrogating tll_{mel} in a gt_{mel}/gt_{san} background has no detectable effect in the frequency of abdominal ablations in hybrid males or hybrid females with a functional copy of gt_{mel} ($FM7/X_{san}, tll_{mel}^{AGFP}/3_{san}$ vs. $FM7/X_{san}, TM3 Sb/3_{san}$, Table 3B and 3C). In a gt_{mel}^{x11} background, abrogating tll_{mel} decreases the proportion of male and female embryos showing abdominal ablations (Table 3). These results suggest —just as occurs with female viability— the absence of gt_{mel} and tll_{mel} together has a larger positive effect than the absence of each allele individually. Table S9 shows similar analyses with a different tll loss-of-function allele. Notably, in the conspecific crosses and the three possible interspecific crosses between *D. melanogaster* females and males from other species, gt_{mel}^{x11} and tll_{mel}^{AGFP} have no effects on viability (Table S10).

Finally, we tested the effect of disrupting the tll_{san} in hybrids. tll_{san}^{AdsRed} did not rescue tll_{mel}^{AGFP} in hybrids. In mel/san hybrids, the tll_{san}^{AdsRed} deletion had no effect on female viability when tested in hybrids with multiple mel backgrounds (Table S11). This result suggests that removing tll_{san} in mel/san hybrids has no effect on hybrid viability in an otherwise heterozygote hybrid background. Next, we tested the effect of tll_{san}^{AdsRed} in the null- gt_{mel} , gt_{mel}^{x11} background. We find that the tll_{san} deletion does not improve viability in gt_{mel}^{x11} -carrying mel/san females either (Table S12). These results suggests that even in the absence of a functional gt_{mel} allele, removing tll_{san} has no effect on hybrid female viability. Since the reciprocal deletion (removing tll_{mel} and exposing the tll_{san} allele) does improve female hybrid viability in gt_{mel}^{x11} -carriers, these results indicate that the presence of tll_{mel} , but not of tll_{san} , is involved in the HI of mel/san female hybrids.

376

377 *Molecular Evolution*

378 Gap genes *gt* and *tll* have phylogenetically conserved roles in pattern formation,
379 as evidenced by their functionally conserved outputs in blastoderm embryos of distantly
380 related *Drosophila* species (Hare *et al.* 2008a) and beyond (Bucher 2004; Wilson *et al.*
381 2010). Yet, they have diverged sufficiently between *mel* and *san* such that they
382 malfunction in hybrids. We therefore conducted analyses to assess the patterns and
383 mechanism of divergence of the *gt* coding sequence in the *melanogaster* species
384 subgroup and across the *Drosophila* genus.

385 Both *gt* and *tll* are highly conserved in their coding regions. The bZip domain that
386 confers Gt protein its ability to bind DNA is highly conserved across animals (Nitta *et al.*
387 2015) and shows no fixed differences among *Drosophila* species (Figure S15, Chang *et al.*
388 2021). Gt shows only thirteen single amino acid substitutions in the *melanogaster*
389 species subgroup (Figures S15 and S16), six of which occur on the branches connecting
390 *mel* and *san*. *Giant* also contains three low complexity regions (including polyQ) that
391 show extensive variation both within and between species (Figure S17). *tll* is also
392 conserved in the *melanogaster* species subgroup; only four residues differ between the *tll*
393 alleles in the *yakuba* clade and the *melanogaster* clade: Val509Asp, Arg1118Lys,
394 Ser1208Thr, Leu1246Met (Figure S18). Only Val509Asp represents a change in the type
395 of amino acid (a change from a nonpolar to an acidic residue).

396 We also investigated whether substitutions in these two genes might have been
397 driven by adaptive evolution. Both genes, *gt* and *tll*, fall within the slowest-evolving
398 quantile of genes comparing *mel* with *yak* or *san* (25% and 10% respectively) and, noting
399 the limited power to detect selection as a result, show no signature of accelerated
400 evolution (Table S13).

401 DMI partner(s) of *gt^{mel}* is (are) unique to the *D. santomea* lineage

402 The phylogenetic occurrence of developmental defects provides an additional
403 hypothesis to test: we next evaluated whether the unknown genetic element(s) in the *D.*
404 *santomea* genome that must interact with *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* (*gt_{sim}*) to cause HI are also
405 present in *D. teissieri* (a close relative of *D. santomea*, Figure 1A). The crosses ♀*mel* ×

406 ♂*tei*, ♀*sim* × ♂*tei* and ♀*mel* × ♂*tei* all produce viable adult females and males that die as
 407 late larvae/early pupae. Little embryonic lethality is observed in any of these two crosses
 408 and the rare embryos that die do not show abdominal ablations (Figure 1E, Figure S1).
 409 All *D. teissieri* lines showed similar levels of viability in each cross (Figure S19). These
 410 results suggest that at least one of the partners of this incompatibility is specific to *san*,
 411 and evolved after *san* and *tei* diverged.

412

413

DISCUSSION

Hybrid inviability is a strong barrier to gene exchange between species. While it is clear that this trait is often caused by epistatic interactions between alleles from different species, few examples have been identified to the gene level. Here, we identified two genes, *gt* and *tll*, which contribute to HI in hybrids between two *Drosophila* species. The two genes belong to the gap gene network, a highly conserved pathway that is in charge of establishing embryonic polarity in insects (Bucher 2004; Goltsev *et al.* 2004; Hare *et al.* 2008a; Wilson *et al.* 2010; Crombach *et al.* 2014; Wotton *et al.* 2015; Crombach *et al.* 2016). The *mel* alleles of these two genes are necessary and sufficient to cause a male abdominal ablation phenotype that is particularly common in hybrid males of the cross. We also find support for a third (or even more) elements that are exclusive to *D. santomea* and remain unidentified. Additional members of the gap gene network must have functionally diverged between the two species and contribute to HI. These are not the only alleles that contribute to inviability in the cross but are sufficient to cause the abdominal ablation defect that is particularly common in hybrid males of the cross (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014).

The involvement of *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* in HI indicates that one or more features of their function have diverged between relatively closely related species, despite their broad conservation across the Diptera ((Goltsev *et al.* 2004; Hare *et al.* 2008a; Crombach *et al.* 2014; Wotton *et al.* 2015); but see (García-Solache *et al.* 2010; Janssens *et al.* 2014; Crombach *et al.* 2016)), bees (Wilson *et al.* 2010) and beetles (Bucher 2004; Cerny *et al.* 2008). Our results confirm speculation that HI can arise in phylogenetically conserved gene networks regulating development (True and Haag 2001; Ludwig *et al.* 2005; Schiffman and Ralph 2021). The involvement of *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* in HI suggests that their function has diverged across *Drosophila* species. Consistent with this result, precise gene replacements have also shown that *gt* alleles from different species vary in the ability to complement in a *D. melanogaster* background (Chang *et al.* 2021). Natural selection has driven the evolution of regulatory elements of many developmental genes in *Drosophila* which has led to a rapid turnover (Hare *et al.* 2008a; b; He *et al.* 2011; Ni *et al.* 2012). Yet, neither *gt* nor *tll* show signatures of positive selection in their coding sequences. Our results also suggest that the evolution of the different components involved in the DMI occurred at different times and is unlikely to have had any role on speciation. The deleterious effects caused by *gt_{mel}* seem to be common to *D. melanogaster* and

the species in the *D. simulans* clade, suggesting that the allele necessary for the incompatibility evolved before these species split between three and five million years ago (Tamura *et al.* 2004; Suvorov *et al.* 2021). Because the presence of *gt^{mel}* has no quantifiable viability effect in *mel/tei* hybrids, at least one of the genetic factor(s) that interact with *gt^{mel}* to cause abdominal ablation in hybrid embryos must have arisen after *D. santomea* and *D. teissieri* split between 1 and 2.5 million years ago (Bachtrog *et al.* 2006; Turissini and Matute 2017). An alternative divergence scenario is that at least one of the genetic components of the DMI evolved in the *tei* branch to suppress HI. Regardless of which of these two scenarios is correct, the components of the DMI must have evolved at different times in the two lineages, and the interactions with *giant* that cause abdominal ablation could not have been involved with any speciation event in the *melanogaster* species subgroup (Figure S11). Instead, these loci must have evolved independently in each lineage, accumulating differences as the genomes diverged after speciation, a scenario in accord with the Dobzhansky Muller model (Dobzhansky 1937; Muller 1942; Coyne and Orr 2004; Matute *et al.* 2010; Moyle and Nakazato 2010; Wang *et al.* 2015). Mapping the allele(s) that interact with *gt^{mel}* and *tll^{mel}* in the *D. santomea* genome is the next step in describing how genomic divergence creates hybrid defects.

Previous comparative analyses of gap gene expression in dipterans indicates gene network evolution in spite of a conserved developmental phenotype (Wotton *et al.* 2015), which suggests continual fine-tuning of the genetic interactions in the gap gene network within species. Coevolved compensatory changes have been proposed to cause HI in instances in which the phenotypic output of a gene network is under moderate stabilizing selection (Kondrashov *et al.* 2002; Johnson and Porter 2007; Tulchinsky *et al.* 2014; Mack and Nachman 2017). Molecular functional evolution without phenotypic change, or developmental systems drift, has been hypothesized to underlie hybrid breakdown involving canalized traits such as embryogenesis and gametogenesis (True and Haag 2001). The HI involving *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* may exemplify compensatory changes resulting in a stable phenotype when comparing pure species, but in an aberrant phenotype in hybrids.

The introduction of a developmental genetics perspective to speciation studies has the potential to shed new light on the study of hybrid inviability (Cutter and Bundus 2020). Hybrid inviability is a natural experiment to test genetic interactions between diverging genomes: the molecular interactions that go awry in hybrids reveal evolutionary divergence of the genes involved, or the timing, location, or amount of their expression (Mack and Nachman 2017). The interactions between *gt_{mel}*, *tll_{mel}* and the unknown factors in the genome of *D. santomea*, had nothing to do with setting the speciation process in motion in the *melanogaster* species subgroup. They are also not involved in currently keeping species apart as *D. melanogaster* and *D. santomea* do not naturally hybridize. The results shown here should be viewed in the broad context of genome divergence and how genomes keep evolving long after speciation has occurred. This represents a path forward in terms of how to think about stability vs. change of different functional units within the genome and different developmental processes. The identification of *giant* and *tll* as genes involved in HI is the first indication that genes involved in early embryonic development, a canonical example of a conserved developmental process, functionally co-evolve at a pace sufficient to cause hybrid inviability.

FIGURE 1. All the *X* chromosomes from the *mel* supercomplex cause inviability in *mel/san* hybrids but not in *mel/tei* hybrids. Unlike pure species (**A.** *D. santomea*; **B.** *D. melanogaster*), F1 *mel/san* hybrid males show abdominal ablations (**C**). The nature of the defect in these hybrid males is identical to that seen in *sim/san* and *mau/san* hybrid males. Females from the same cross also show such ablations but more rarely and the majority of dead embryos show a complete abdomen (Figure S8). Hybrids between females from the *melanogaster* supercomplex and *D. teissieri* males show little embryonic lethality and among the few dead embryos there are no abdominal ablations (e.g., **D.** *mel/tei* hybrid male). The viability of each genotype is shown in Figure S1. **E.** Phylogenetic relationships between the species of the *melanogaster* species subgroup. The heatmap shows the relative occurrence of abdominal ablations in hybrid males. White: common, grey: absent. Black: pairs with complete behavioral isolation.

FIGURE 2. A *D. melanogaster* X-chromosome haplotype that encompasses gt^{mel} is associated with hybrid inviability and abdominal ablations in ♀ *D. melanogaster*/♂ *D. santomea* hybrid males. **A.** Genome-wide association study of the genetic causes of hybrid inviability in *mel/san* hybrids (both sexes pooled) using segregating variation within *D. melanogaster*. A haplotype of 54kb in the tip of the X-chromosome is strongly associated with the presence of abdominal ablations. The haplotype harbors six genes: *CG32797*, *gt*, *tko*, *boi*, *z*, and *trol*. **B.** Genome-wide association study of the genetic causes of abdominal ablations in *mel/san* hybrids (both sexes pooled) using segregating variation within *D. melanogaster*. A haplotype of 54kb in the tip of the X-chromosome is strongly associated with the presence of abdominal ablations. The haplotype harbors six genes: *CG32797*, *gt*, *tko*, *boi*, *z*, and *trol*. Green: insertions, blue: deletions, red: SNPs, purple: multinucleotide polymorphisms. Green: insertions (INS), blue: deletions (DEL), red: SNPs, purple: multinucleotide polymorphisms (MNP). **C.** We introduced small X^{mel} pieces attached to Y_{mel} to identify X_{mel} -linked alleles that cause hybrid inviability in *mel/san* hybrids males. For all $Dp(1;Y)$ duplications, we evaluated at least 50 embryos per cross were for viability. For $Dp(1;3)$ duplications, we evaluate between 20-56 embryos as $C(1) DX$, $Dp(1;3)/Dp(1;3)$ are weak. We narrowed down the allele that causes HI to an interval of X^{mel} comprising 3A3 which only contains *giant*. White bars show duplications with no abdominal ablations. The light grey bar shows a duplication with a moderate rate of abdominal ablations; dark grey show duplications with high levels of abdominal ablations. **D.** Relative frequency of abdominal defects in five different hybrid genotypes from *D. melanogaster* and *D. santomea* crosses. Pure species embryos show no abdominal defects and show little embryonic lethality. *mel/san* hybrid males (X^{mel}/Y^{san}) frequently show a lethal characteristic abdominal ablation (red points) that is also present in some *mel/san* hybrid females (blue points). The reciprocal *mel/san* hybrid males (X^{san}/Y^{mel}) routinely survive and the few embryos who die do not show abdominal ablations (red points). X^{san}/Y^{mel} males carrying X-Y translocations [i.e., $Dp(1;Y)$ in blue and $Dp(1;Y)$ in red] that harbor gt^{mel} also show this lethal ablation. $Dp(1;Y)BSC78$ (stock 29802); $Dps: Dp(1;Y)BSC79$ (stock 29803). A map showing the frequency of abdominal defects caused by multiple X^{mel} translocation is shown in Figure S2.

537

538

539 **FIGURE 3. *giant^{mel}* causes HI and abdominal ablations in *mel/san* females. A.**
540 Deficiency mapping and null-allele mapping revealed that *giant* also causes hybrid
541 inviability in hybrid females. Grey: deficiencies that increase viability of *mel/san* F1
542 hybrid females (Significant linear contrasts, $P < 0.05$ after multiple comparison
543 corrections). White: deficiencies that do not increase viability. **B.** When females fail to
544 hatch, it is not uncommon for them to be abdominally ablated. The presence of *gt^{mel}*
545 increases the frequency of abdominal ablations. **C.** Relative *gt^{mel}^{X11}*/*X_{san}* female viability
546 (i.e., proportion of *gt^{mel}^{X11}* carriers in hybrid crosses) in twenty *D. santomea* isofemale
547 lines. Boxes in the boxplot are ordinated from the lower median (left) to the highest
548 (right). S1: SYN2005; S2: sanCAR1490; S3: sanCOST1250.5; S4: sanCOST1270.1; S5:
549 sanOBAT1200; S6: sanOBAT1200.2; S7: sanRain39; S8: sanCAR1600.3; S9:
550 Carv2015.1; S10: Carv2015.5; S11: Carv2015.11; S12: Carv2015.16; S13: Pico1680.1;
551 S14: Pico1659.2; S15: Pico1659.3; S16: Amelia2015.1; S17: Amelia2015.6; S18:
552 Amelia2015.12; S19: A1200.7; S20: Rain42.

FIGURE 4. A *D. melanogaster* third-chromosome haplotype that encompasses *tll* is associated with the prevalence of abdominal ablations in *gt^{XII}* mutants. Association study of autosomal genetic variants associated with the frequency of abdominal ablations in *gt^{XII}/X^{san}* hybrids using segregating variation within *D. melanogaster*. A haplotype of 54kb in the tip of the *X*-chromosome is strongly associated with the presence of abdominal ablations in both males (**A**) and females (**B**). Each panel shows a different chromosome arm. The haplotype 9 genes: *cindr*, *CG15544*, *tll*, *Cpr100A*, *CG15545*, *CG15546*, *CG15547*, *CG12071*, and *Sap-r*. Of these nine, *tll* is the only one known to interact with *gt*. Green: insertions, blue: deletions, red: SNPs, purple: multinucleotide polymorphisms.

565

566

TABLE 1. The coding region of *gt_{mel}* causes embryonic lethality in *mel/san* hybrids.

All *gt* proteins were tagged with eGFP. We used a 2-sample test for equality of proportions to compare the proportion of dead embryos in *mel/san gt_{mel}^{X11}*, *gt_{mel:mel}* carriers with the other three transgenes. df=1 for all tests.

Allele	Non-coding	Coding	Hatched Embryos	Dead Embryos	Relative Embryonic Lethality	χ^2	P
<i>gt_{mel:mel}</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>mel</i>	40	17	0.298	NA	NA
<i>gt_{san:mel}</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>mel</i>	66	20	0.303	0.467	0.495
<i>gt_{mel:san}</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>san</i>	90	10	0.100	8.676	3.22×10^{-3}
<i>gt_{san:san}</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>san</i>	51	4	0.091	7.922	4.88×10^{-3}

TABLE 2. The coding region of *gt_{mel}* causes female inviability in hybrid *mel/san*

females. The coding region of while *gt_{san}* increases female hybrid viability. We used a χ^2 test to compare the number of females carrying the transgene and those without it. df=1 for all tests.

Allele	Non-coding	Coding	F ₁ females with a <i>gt</i> transgene	F ₁ females with a <i>3_{mel}</i> chromosome	Relative Hybrid Viability	χ^2	P
<i>gt_{mel:mel}</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>mel</i>	86	116	0.741	4.455	0.035
<i>gt_{san:mel}</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>mel</i>	143	188	0.761	6.118	0.013
<i>gt_{mel:san}</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>san</i>	173	180	0.961	0.139	0.710
<i>gt_{san:san}</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>san</i>	81	56	1.45	4.562	0.033

TABLE 3. *tll_{mel}* exacerbates the defects caused by *gt_{mel}* in *mel/san* hybrids. A.

Females that carry functional *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* alleles are more likely to die than females that carry an abrogation of *gt_{mel}* (regardless of the genotype at *tll*) or that carry a functional *gt_{mel}* and a null allele of *tll_{mel}*. Tests with a different *tll* loss of function allele

show similar results (Table S6). **B.** *mel/san* hybrid males with functional copies of *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* are more likely to show abdominal ablations than hybrid males with an abrogated copy of *tll_{mel}*, an abrogated copy of *gt_{mel}*, or abrogated copies of both. **C.** Similar to males, *mel/san* hybrid females with functional copies of *gt_{mel}* and *tll_{mel}* are more likely to show abdominal ablations than hybrid males with an abrogated copy of *tll_{mel}*, an abrogated copy of *gt_{mel}*, or abrogated copies of both. In all three cases, we used a χ^2 proportion test for the two pairwise comparisons.

A. Female hybrid viability				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /X_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /X_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>
	43	51	97	153
	$\chi^2_1=0.681$, P=0.409		$\chi^2_1=12.544$, P=3.975 × 10 ⁻⁴	
B. Proportion of male embryos showing abdominal ablations (100 embryos each)				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/Y_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/Y_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /Y_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /Y_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>
	94	88	23	9
	$\chi^2_1= 1.526$, P= 0.217		$\chi^2_1= 6.287$, P = 0.012	
C. Proportion of female embryos showing abdominal ablations (100 embryos each)				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /X_{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}; /X_{san};</i> <i>tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/3_{san}</i>
	48	35	16	6
	$\chi^2_1= 2.966$, P= 0.085		$\chi^2_1= 4.137$, P= 0.042	

592 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

593 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

594

595 **SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS**

596

597 **1. Stocks**

598 **1.1. *Drosophila melanogaster* mutants**

599 **1.1.1. *gt* alleles**

600 **1.1.2. *tll* alleles**

601 **1.1.3. Attached-X stocks**

602 **1.1.4. X-Y translocations**

603 **1.1.5. *gt* transgenics**

604 **1.2. Other species stocks**

605 **1.2.1. Isofemale lines**

606 **1.2.2. Other mutant stocks**

607 **2. INTERSPECIFIC GENETIC CROSSES**

608 **2.1. Wild-type crosses**

609 **2.2. Genome wide association studies**

610 **2.2.1. Hybrid inviability GWAS**

611 **2.2.2. GWAS restricted to the autosomes**

612 **2.3. Duplication mapping**

613 **2.4. Deficiency mapping**

614 **3. INTRASPECIFIC CROSSES: DOSAGE EFFECTS.**

615 **4. CUTICLE PREPARATION**

616 **4.1. Wild-type hybrids**

617 **4.2. *Dp(1;Y)* carrying male hybrids**

618 **4.3. *gt_{mel}^{x11}* carrying female hybrids**

619 **5. GENOME SEQUENCING**

620 **5.1. Stock collection**

621 **5.2. Sequencing: Genomic data**

622 **5.3. Sequencing: Read mapping and variant calling**

623 **5.4. Sequencing: Indel identification**

624 **5.5. Genomic Alignments**

625 **6. DETECTION OF NATURAL SELECTION**

626 **6.1. PAML**

627 **SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES**

628 **TABLE S1. Rates of ablation in F1 hybrids between the species of the *yakuba***

species complex.

TABLE S2. Hybrids between *D. melanogaster* females and *D. simulans* and *D. mauritiana* show no abdominal ablations or embryonic lethality.

TABLE S3. Mutant stocks used in this study

TABLE S4. *C(1)DX*, *Dp(1;3)/TM3* lay few eggs are thus not ideal to measure the magnitude of HI in crosses with *D. santomea*.

TABLE S5. The cross involved a *gt_{mel}^{X11}/FM7* female and a male hemizygote for the duplication.

TABLE S6. Isofemale lines from 4 species used to assess whether HI in *mel/san* hybrids was a species-specific phenomenon or a line specific phenomenon.

TABLE S7. Complementation mapping using loss-of function and hypomorphic alleles show that *gt* mutants are the only alleles in cytological region 3A3 that lead to an increase of female viability in *mel/san* hybrid.

TABLE S8. The *gt*-vector does not carry extraneous elements that rescue the viability of *D. melanogaster gt_{mel}^{X11}*-carriers.

TABLE S9. Confirmation that *tll^{mel}* exacerbates the defects caused by *gt^{mel}* in *mel/san* hybrids using a different *tll* mutant.

TABLE S10. Double mutant analysis of survival in hybrids between *D. melanogaster* females and three males from four different species (*D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, *D. mauritiana*, and *D. teissieri*).

TABLE S11. A *tll_{san}^{ΔdsRed}* has no effect on HI in crosses between *mel* females from four different backgrounds.

TABLE S12. Abrogating the *tll_{san}* allele has no viability effect in *gt_{mel}^{X11} mel/san* hybrids.

TABLE S13. *gt* and *tll* are slowly evolving genes as measured by the rate of aminoacid substitutions.

TABLE S14. Sequencing details and coverage for all the lines included in this study.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES.

FIGURE S1. *X_{mel}*, *X_{sim}* and *X_{mau}* cause abdominal ablations in hybrid males with *D.*

santomea.

FIGURE S2. Crossing design to assess whether small piece of the X^{mel} cause hybrid inviability and abdominal ablations.

FIGURE S3. Frequency of abdominal ablations caused by the X^{mel} translocations shown in Figure 1 in X^{san}/Y^{mel} hybrid males.

FIGURE S4. The presence of gt^{mel} causes HI in *mel/san* hybrids produced with all *D. santomea* lines but the magnitude of the inviability varies.

FIGURE S5. Crosses between *D. melanogaster* females harboring $Dp(1;Y)$ duplications and males from the *simulans* species group (*D. mauritiana*, and *D. simulans*) show no evidence of male embryo lethality or abdominal ablations.

FIGURE S6. Crosses between *D. melanogaster* females harboring $Dp(1;Y)$ duplications and males from different lines of *D. melanogaster* show no evidence of male embryo lethality or abdominal ablations.

FIGURE S7. Hybrid male embryos carrying a gt_{mel}^{X11} *D. melanogaster* allele show a variety of developmental defects.

FIGURE S8. *mel/san* hybrids carrying a *D. melanogaster* chromosome and null alleles for *boi*, *trol*, or *tko* show similar levels of hybrid viability, embryonic lethality, and abdominal ablations at the same rate than $FM7::GFP/san$.

FIGURE S9. The X-chromosome balancer has no effect on the quantification of hybrid inviability in *mel/san* hybrid females.

FIGURE S10. Frequency of abdominal ablations in each deficiency cross shown in Figure 2.

FIGURE S11. gt^{mel} has no effect on the viability of *mel/tei*, *mel/mau*, and *mel/sim* hybrid females.

FIGURE S12. gt^{mel} has no effect on the viability of *D. melanogaster* F1 females.

FIGURE S13. *gt* transgene, removable piggyBac cassette design and crossing schemes involving *gt* transgenes.

FIGURE S14. Introgression of the $FM7::GFP$ and gt^{X11} alleles into 200 lines of the DGRP lines.

FIGURE S15. *gt* alleles from six different species in the *melanogaster* species

690 complex.

691 **FIGURE S16. Maximum-likelihood ancestral sequence reconstruction of GT**
692 **protein, excluding polyQ.**

693 **FIGURE S17. The polyglutamine repeats (polyQ) show differences among the**
694 ***melanogaster* subspecies complex species.**

695 **FIGURE S18. *tll* alleles from six different species in the *melanogaster* species**
696 **complex.**

697 **FIGURE S19. Embryonic hybrid inviability does not occur in *mel/tei* hybrids.**

698 **FIGURE S20. Divergence in *giant* in the *melanogaster* species subgroup.**

699 **FIGURE S21. Experimental design to generated a GFP-mediated disruption of *tll_{mel}*.**

700

701

702

703

METHODS AND MATERIALS

1. STOCKS

1.1. *Drosophila melanogaster* mutants

With two exceptions (see 1.1.2. *tll* alleles and 1.1.5. *gt* transgenics), all *D. melanogaster* mutant stocks used in this study were originally obtained from the Bloomington Stock Center (BSC) and are listed in Table S1.

1.1.1. *gt* alleles. We obtained multiple *gt* mutant alleles from BSC but we focused on a null allele: *gt_{mel}^{X11}* (*y¹ sc¹ gt^{X11}/FM6*; BDSC stock #1529). The *gt_{mel}^{X11}* has a frameshift mutation that abrogates the bZIP DNA-binding domain (Chang *et al.* 2021). First, we confirmed that this stock did not complement a deficiency of *giant* (*Df(1)Exel6231*; BDSC stock #7706) and verified *gt^{X11}* was indeed a loss-of-function allele. To differentiate between embryos carrying the *gt* allele or the balancer, we rebalanced each stock with a *FM7 Actin::GFP* to allow for genotypic distinctions in all further crosses.

1.1.2. *tll* alleles. We used two *tll_{mel}* alleles. The first one was a loss-of-function allele of *tll*: *tll¹* which was procured from the Bloomington Stock center (*st¹ e¹ tll¹/TM3, Sb¹*; BDSC stock #2729). We also obtained a CRISPR-mediated *tll_{mel} GFP* disruption: *tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}*. Construct design, construction were performed by Rainbow Transgenics (Camarillo, CA). The design for the disruption is shown in Figure S21. The construct was then injected into a *y w¹¹¹⁸ D. melanogaster* stock. 105 larvae were injected and one showed a GFP integration. Heterozygote transformants were identified by the GFP marker. These heterozygote flies (*tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/tll⁺*) were then crossed to a *TM3, Sb/TM6B* stock to obtain *tll_{mel}^{ΔGFP}/TM3, Sb* flies.

1.1.3. *Attached-X* stocks. We used two different attached-*X* stocks: *C(1)RM* and *C(1)DX*. These two stocks differ in the way that the two *X*-chromosomes are attached to each other. *C(1)RM*, or reverse metacentric, is a fusion of the *X*-chromosomes joint at their heterochromatic regions (Lindsley and Zimm 1992). *C(1)DX* is a fusion of *X*-chromosomes with a reverse acrocentric fusion (Lindsley and Zimm 1992). These chromosomes are a fusion of two *X*-chromosomes with

the centromere at one end and the two joint *X* chromosomes fused in opposite directions.

1.1.4. *X-Y translocations.* (*Dp(1;Y)*) duplications and deficiencies are described below in sections 2.2 and 2.3 respectively.

1.1.5. *gt transgenics.* We generated *gt* alleles that carried either the non-coding region and coding region of *gt_{mel}* and *gt_{san}* using the phiC31 targeted transgene integration system. Our goal was to generate four transgenes: one with the *mel* non-coding and coding sequences, one with the *san* non-coding and coding sequences, one with the *mel* non-coding sequences and the *san* coding sequence, and one with the *san* non-coding sequences and the *mel* coding sequence. The protocol to generate *gt* chimeric alleles is described elsewhere (Chang *et al.* 2021). Briefly, the *gt_{mel}* transgene contains a 1.422kb interval encoding the *gt* protein (CDS), ~25kb of flanking non-coding DNA. The corresponding orthologous whole-locus *gt* from *D. santomea*, *gt^{san:san}* is approximately ~27kb in length, containing 1.43kb coding region and ~26kb non-coding sequence. To generate the transgenics, we used long-range PCR and amplified DNA fragments of approximately 5kb. Besides the coding and non-coding elements described above, we included two additional tags on each transgene. First, we included a piggyback insertion on the 5' UTR of each chimeric allele. Second we included an eGFP tag at the C-terminus. We used Sanger sequencing to verify the amplification had introduced no extraneous mutations. Figure S13 shows a scheme with the transgene design. These segments were then merged using Gibson assembly (NEB E2611, (Gibson *et al.* 2009)) to generate all transgenics. Injections of the transgenes were done by GenetiVision (Houston, TX). The piggyback insertion was removed by crossing to a by crossing the transformed lines to a line expressing a PiggyBac transposase ((Thibault *et al.* 2004), BDSC stock #8285). While the transgenic flies with the piggyback insertion do not rescue viability a *gt_{mel}^{X11}* mutant (Table S8), the lines with the excised insertion do rescue viability, at least partially (Table 3). Please note that the *san* *gt* locus has a single short intron, 75bp and 71bp for *gt^{mel}* and *gt^{san}*, respectively, with identical intron-exon splice junction sequences. Although we cannot rule out the possibility that the

small ~70bp intron region of *gt* CDS may contribute to the functional divergence between *gt^{mel}* and *gt^{san}*, it is unlikely as this intron region does not harbor any known regulatory elements that might significantly affect *gt* expression. To compare the proportion of inviable embryos across genotypes we used 2-sample tests for equality of proportions with continuity correction as implemented in the R function *prop.test* (library *stats*, (R Core Team 2016)).

1. 2. Other species stocks.

Initial surveys of HI alleles used outbred lines (i.e., lines derived from combined individuals from several isofemale lines) for interspecific crosses. In this report, we used isofemale lines collected in nature. This allowed us to survey whether HI was a line-specific or a species-wide phenomenon.

1.2.1 *Isofemale lines.* For interspecific crosses involving *D. melanogaster*

gt^{mel}^{X11}/FM7::GFP and *D. melanogaster df(BSC)/FM7::GFP* we used 25 *D. santomea* isofemale lines collected in the island of São Tomé. We also quantified hybrid viability for hybrids from hybrids between females from these two *D. melanogaster* mutant crosses with 25 *D. mauritiana*, 25 *D. teissieri*, and 25 *D. simulans* lines. All lines, including their collection details, are listed in Table S6.

1.2.2. *Other mutant stocks.* Finally, we used five mutant stocks from three other species from *D. melanogaster*. Attached *X* stocks from *D. simulans* (*y w*, (Coyne 1985) reviewed in (Presgraves and Meiklejohn 2021)) were donated by D. Presgraves. Attached *X* from *D. yakuba* (*y*) were produced by J. Coyne (Coyne *et al.* 2004). Attached *X* from *D. santomea* (*gn*) were donated by A. Llopart (Coyne *et al.* 2004; Turissini *et al.* 2015; Llopart *et al.* 2018). *yellow* stocks from *D. simulans*, and *D. mauritiana* were obtained from the San Diego stock Center (now Cornell Stock Center).

2. INTERSPECIFIC GENETIC CROSSES

2. 1. Wild-type crosses

Pure species males and females of each species were collected as virgins within 8 hours of eclosion under CO₂ anesthesia and kept for three days in single-sex groups of 20 flies in 30mL, corn meal food-containing vials. Flies were kept at 24°C under a 12 h light/dark cycle. On day four, we assessed whether there were larvae in the media. If the inspection revealed any progeny, the vial was discarded.

On the morning of day four after collection, we placed forty males and twenty females together at room temperature (21°–23°C) to mate *en masse* on corn meal media. To produce hybrid adults, vials were inspected every five days to assess the presence of larvae and/or dead embryos. In order to maximize the lifespan of the parental, we kept all the vials laying on their side. We transferred all the pure species adults to a new vial (without anesthesia) every five days. This procedure was repeated until the cross stopped producing progeny (i.e., females were dead). Once L₂ larvae were observed in a vial, we added a solution of 0.05% propionic acid and a KimWipe (Kimberly Clark, Kimwipes Delicate Task, Roswell, GA) to the vial. We counted the hybrids as they hatched by anesthetizing them with CO₂.

To quantify embryonic lethality, we mixed males and females as described above in a 30mL plastic vial with corn-meal or molasses food. After two days, we transferred the adults from the vials that showed larvae to an oviposition cage with apple juice media and yeast. The plates were inspected every 48 hours for the presence of viable eggs. To quantify embryonic lethality, we counted the number of egg cases (viable embryos) and the number of brown eggs (dead embryos) in each oviposition cage. Rates of embryonic lethality were calculated as the proportion of brown eggs over the total number of eggs. For all interspecific crosses within the *yakuba* species complex (*D. santomea*, *D. yakuba*, and *D. teissieri*), we only used lines that have been shown to be infected by *Wolbachia* (wB) to minimize any possible effect of endosymbionts on hybrid inviability (Cooper *et al.* 2017).

2. 2. Genome wide association studies (GWAS)

2.2.1. Hybrid inviability GWAS. We identified polymorphisms segregating in *D. melanogaster* associated with hybrid inviability and penetrance of abdominal ablations in

mel/san F1 hybrids. We leveraged the *Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel (DGRP) genotype information (MacKay *et al.* 2012; Huang *et al.* 2014) to identify variants within *D. melanogaster* associated with the presence of abdominal ablations when crossed to *D. santomea* males. In total, we used 200 *D. melanogaster* lines, all of which are listed in Table S1. In order to identify SNPs associated with abdominal ablations in hybrids, we mated females from each of the *D. melanogaster* lines with *D. santomea* males following the procedure described in 2.1 (immediately above). The response phenotype was the percentage of larvae that showed abdominal ablations (scored as described above).

We submitted the percentage of ablated embryos of the 200-line study, not sexed, to the web portal dgrp2.gnets.ncsu.edu for analysis. Since we could not differentiate between female and male embryos (DGRP lines do not carry a *y*⁺ marker), we collected a single ablation score per line, combining the two sexes. Associations between the phenotype (i.e. percentage of ablated embryos) and genome wide polymorphisms within *D. melanogaster* were calculated by the DGRP algorithm, using a linear mixed model, which accounts for any effects of *Wolbachia* infection, common polymorphic inversions, and cryptic relatedness in the DGRP lines, as described in detail in (MacKay *et al.* 2012). This GWAS incorporates information from 1.9 million SNP variants. The genome-wide significant threshold at the 5% significance level was determined after a Bonferroni correction for multiple testing (Johnson *et al.* 2010) and adjusting the critical P-value for significance to as 2.60×10^{-8} (0.05/1,900,000).

2.2.2. GWAS restricted to the autosomes. Next, we assessed if any of the autosomal segregating variants in the DGRP modified the effects of *gt_{mel}^{X11}*. To this end, we introgressed an *FM7::GFP* balancer and the null allele of giant, *gt_{mel}^{X11}* into 200 lines from the DGRP. The introgression protocol is shown in Figure S18 and involved introgressing *FM7::GFP* (10 generations of backcrossing) by following the *Bar* and *GFP* markers of the balancer (Figure S18A). On generation 11, and for each DGRP stock, *gt_{mel}^{X11}/FM7* females, were crossed to a male from each of the DGRP stocks that carried a *FM7::GFP* (from the first round of introgression). F1 females with yellow mouth parts carried *gt_{mel}^{X11}* and *FM7::GFP* and were again crossed to DGRP males carrying *FM7::GFP*. This procedure was repeated for 10 generations (Figure S18B). The result

from this crosses was having $FM7::GFP/y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}$ in 200 different genetic backgrounds.

Next, we assessed the effects of the different DGRP genetic backgrounds on the penetrance of gt_{mel}^{X11} in *mel/san* hybrids. We crossed females from each of these 200 stocks to *D. santomea* sanCAR1600.3 males. We separated the progeny into four different categories. Females have black mouthparts (i.e., $FM7::GFP/X_{san}$ and $y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}/X_{san}$; y_{san} rescue y_{mel}^-); males (either $FM7::GFP/Y_{san}$ or $y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y_{san}$) have brown mouthparts. Balancer carriers (i.e., $FM7::GFP/X_{san}$ and $FM7::GFP/Y_{san}$) have a *GFP* marker. The goal of this experiment was to find autosomal factors that would affect the frequency of abdominal ablations in a gt_{mel}^{X11} background in both females and males; we scored the percentage of ablated embryos in $y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y_{san}$ males and $y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}/X_{san}$ hybrid females apart. Because of the experimental design (introgression of a full $y_{mel}^- gt_{mel}^{X11}$ X-chromosome on multiple autosomal backgrounds), we did not study possible X-linked modifiers of the penetrance of gt_{mel}^{X11} . Association mapping was done as described immediately above but splitting the two sexes and excluding markers from the X-chromosome (section 2.2.1. Hybrid inviability GWAS).

2.3. Duplication mapping.

Duplication mapping identifies dominant (or semidominant) alleles in the *D. melanogaster* X-chromosome (X^{mel}) that cause inviability in hybrids resulting from interspecific crosses. The technique uses stocks provided by Bloomington Stock Center in which segments of the X-chromosome have been duplicated and attached to the Y-chromosome by BAC recombineering (Venken *et al.* 2010). We used two classical *Drosophila* techniques—attached-X females (described in section 1.1.2), and X-Y chromosome fusions—to finely characterize the identity of HI alleles in the X_{mel} . *Drosophila melanogaster* attached-X females carry two X-chromosome fused together which carry recessive alleles for easy identification. We used two genotypes of attached-X females: *C(1)DX* and *C(1)RM*. Unless otherwise noted, all crosses used *C(1)DX*. These females can carry a Y_{mel} chromosome and remain morphologically female. When these females carry both an attached-X and a Y chromosome, they produce attached-X gametes and Y_{mel} gametes.

Previous experiments have shown that when *C(1)DX* (or *C(1)RM*) females are crossed with *D. santomea* males the only viable genotype are F₁ hybrid males with genotype $X_{san} Y_{mel}$ (Figure S1, (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014)). *Drosophila melanogaster C(1)DX* females can also be crossed to *D. simulans* (Orr 1993), *D. mauritiana* (Cattani and Presgraves 2012), and *D. teissieri*. In the first two cases, the cross produces viable hybrid males with an *X*-chromosome from the father, and a Y_{mel} . In the cross with *D. teissieri* males, *C(1)DX* females produce viable larvae from both sexes that die before molting into pupae.

We addressed whether the introduction of small pieces of X_{mel} in *mel/san* hybrid males cause HI. We used a panel of small X_{mel} -chromosome fragments attached to the *Y*-chromosome [*Dp(1;Y)*] that tilled the cytological bands 2, 3 and 4 in the *X*-chromosome (12 duplications). These segments also carry two phenotypic markers: y_{mel}^{+} , and *Bar*. Despite the multiple genetic modifications these stocks carry, the viability of these crosses has been validated with several lines of wild-caught *D. melanogaster* (see below, Section 3. Intraspecific crosses: dosage effects).

Since the procedure to produce interspecific hybrid males for the four species (*D. santomea*, *D. teissieri*, *D. mauritiana*, and *D. simulans*) is identical, we only describe the protocol for only one of them, *D. santomea*. We crossed attached- X_{mel} females [*C(1)DX*] to *D. melanogaster Dp(1;Y)* males that carry small fragments of X_{mel} on their *Y*-chromosome. The female progeny [*mel C(1)DX/Dp(1;Y)*] will carry both the attached-*X* and the *Y*-chromosome with the small fragment of *X* to be tested. These virgin females were then crossed to *D. santomea* males to produce F₁ hybrid males harboring an X_{san} and a (Y_{mel} , *Dp(1;Y)*) chromosomes. The crossing scheme to identify these dominant alleles on the X_{mel} chromosome is shown in Figure S1. The effect of the X_{mel} fragment was assessed by counting how many individuals survive the transition between three developmental stages (embryo, larvae, pupae). This approach (shown in Figure S1) has been used to identify alleles from X_{mel} that cause hybrid inviability (Sawamura and Yamamoto 1993; Cattani and Presgraves 2012; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014).

A parallel set of *X*-duplications, was not attached to the *Y*-chromosome but the third chromosome instead (*Dp(1;3)*; (Venken *et al.* 2010)). We introgressed these duplications into a *C(1)DX*, *TM3/+* background by repeated backcrossing (4 generations)

to produce *C(1)DX; Dp(1;3)/ Dp(1;3)* females. The effect of the *Dp(1;3)* was measured in the same manner as described above for *Dp(1;Y)* by measuring transition rates across developmental stages. Interspecific crosses using *C(1)DX, TM3* or *C(1)DX, TM6B* stocks yielded very low numbers of progeny which were not enough for embryo collection (Nagy *et al.* 2018).

2. 4. Deficiency mapping.

Traditionally, deficiency mapping has been used to find recessive alleles in the genome of the other species that are lethal when the *D. melanogaster* allele is deleted (Coyne *et al.* 1998; Presgraves 2003; Matute *et al.* 2010). We took a different approach and focused on dominant alleles: those that when removed increased hybrid viability. We used *mel* females from stocks containing known genomic deletions, or “deficiencies” (*df*, Bloomington *Drosophila* Fly Stock Center) maintained as heterozygotes against a balancer (*Bal*) chromosome carrying a dominant homozygous lethal mutation, to *D. santomea* (*san*) males. Seven deficiencies encompass *gt_{mel}* (listed in Table S1). Virgin *D. melanogaster* females were crossed to *D. santomea* males following previously described procedures (Matute *et al.* 2010; Miller and Matute 2017). (Behavioral isolation seems to be complete in the reciprocal direction (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013).) Crosses were kept until no more progeny was produced out of each vial, usually 45 days after they were set up. The effect of each hemizygous region on the viability of hybrid female offspring was measured by comparing the ratio of *df/san* to *Bal/san* hybrid females. The significance of the departure was assessed by a χ^2 test followed by a Sidak’s multiple comparison correction. P-values were considered significant lower than 0.007 ($P < 0.05$ adjusted for 7 multiple comparisons). If the deletion has no effect on hybrid viability, the ratio of F_1 *df/san* to the total number of progeny (F_1 *Bal/san* + F_1 *df/san*) will not differ from 0.5. If the deletion reveals alleles in the *san* genome that cause complete inviability, the ratio will be equal to 0 (only progeny carrying the *Balancer* will survive). If the *D. melanogaster* deficiency uncovers a recessive region of the *D. santomea* genome that compromises hybrid fitness but does not cause complete lethality, the ratio (F_1 *df/san* /Total) will be greater than 0 and significantly lower than 0.5. Finally, and the target of this study, if the ratio (F_1 *df/san* /Total) is significantly higher than 0.5, then the *df* is

removing a dominant (or semidominant) contributor to HI. This last category must be seen with caution as Balancer chromosomes carry deleterious alleles that might bias the ratio upwards. To minimize the potentially deleterious effect of any given balancer, we used seven different *X*-chromosome balancers to replicate crosses involving *gt^{X11}* and *df(gt): FM6::GFP, Binscy, Basc, Bascy, Binsn, Binsncy, FM4* and *FM7a*.

3. INTRASPECIFIC CROSSES: DOSAGE EFFECTS.

We tested whether any of the mutants caused phenotypic defects or inviability by dosage effects. This is important because *Dp(1;Y)* carrying males have two copies of the genes under study while wild-type males only have one copy. Similarly, *df*-carrying females only have a single copy of a gene (i.e., they are hemizygous) while wild-type females have two copies of that gene.

We studied whether any of the used duplications cause inviability in males for being diploid (when they are normally hemizygous). All crosses were done as described in section 2.3. (Duplication mapping) but instead of using heterospecific males, we used males from 25 different *D. melanogaster* isofemale lines. The list of isofemale lines used for these experiments is shown in Table S2. If there is a dosage effect (i.e., carrying *Dp(1;Y)* and thus two copies of a gene while being male is deleterious), one would expect inviability and/or developmental defects in these crosses.

We did a similar analysis to assess for potential haploinsufficiency in *df*-carrying females. We tested whether any of the used deficiencies cause inviability in females for being hemizygous (when they are normally diploid) in the same twenty-five *D. melanogaster* backgrounds described immediately above. We measured the ratios of *df*- and *Balancer*-carrying females using the methods described above.

4. CUTICLE PREPARATION

We generated cuticles for wild-type (i.e., progeny produced by crossing wild-type stocks), *Dp(1;Y)*-carrying and *gt^{X11}*-carrying hybrids. The details for the production of the three types of cuticles are described as follows.

4.1 Wild-type hybrids.

To collect sex-specific hybrid cuticles, we used *D. melanogaster* a $y^l w$ stock. *Drosophila melanogaster* $y^l w$ females were crossed to *D. santomea* males. Inseminated females were allowed to deposit on apple juice plates overnight and embryos were aged for 24 hours before scoring. To prepare cuticles, we used a slightly modified the protocol described in (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014a) . Briefly, we dechorionated embryos using double-sided scotch tape. To devitellinize brown (dead) embryos. We made a cut on the vitelline membrane and removed the rest of the cuticle with a tungsten dissection needle and placed them in a 3:1 solution of acetic acid and glycerol for 48 hours. After this period, cuticles were mounted on a pre-clean glass slide (VMR VistaVision™, VWR; cat. no. 16004-422; Radnor, PA) on 20μl of a 1:1 solution of Hoyer's media (kindly donated by Dr. Daniel McKay) and acetic acid. Embryos without pigmentation of the mouth hooks were scored as male with the genotype $y^l w / Y_{san}$. Embryos with black mouth parts were identified as females (y^l / y_{san}) as the y^l allele is complemented by the homologous y_{san} . Embryos were visualized and imaged with an Olympus BX61 dark-field microscope at the Microscopy facility of the Pathology department at UNC.

4.2. *Dp(1;Y)* carrying male hybrids.

To collect $X_{san} Y_{mel} (Dp1;Y)$, we followed a similar procedure to that described immediately above (section 4.1). Individuals with brown mouth parts were concluded to be females carrying $C(1)DX$ (y^-/y^- homozygotes). Individuals with black mouth parts had two possible genotypes: metafemales carrying three X chromosomes ($C(1)DX y^-$ and $X_{san}; y^-/y^-/y_{san}$) or X_{san}/Y_{mel} , $Dp(1,Y)$ males (y_{san}). Since metafemales (i.e., $C(1)DX y^-/X_{san}$ females) are thought to show a low rate of embryonic defects (Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014b), the pooling of these two categories underestimates the penetrance of the alleles responsible for the ablation. This bias is not a concern as it should occur at a similar rate in all crosses involving $C(1)DX$. All rates of penetrance using $C(1)DX$, $Dp1;Y$ females should then be considered an underestimation.

4.3 *gt^{mel^{x11}}* carrying female hybrids.

We used a similar approach to collect cuticles for hybrids carrying a *gt*-null allele (*gt^{mel^{x11}}*). To score hybrid defects on *gt*-carriers, we used *y^l sc^l gt^{x11}*. This stock was purchased as *y^l sc^l gt^{x11}/FM6* (Table S1, Row 1). We rebalanced the stock over a *y^l FM7* chromosome carrying an *Gal4-Actin::UAS-GFP* reporter. To produce *gt^{x11}/san* cuticles, *gt^{x11}/FM7Actin::GFP D. melanogaster* females were crossed to *D. santomea* males. *GFP* minus embryos that failed to hatch were separated and prepared for cuticle mounting using standard procedures (see (Gavin-Smyth and Matute 2013)). Both, *GFP* minus embryos (*gt^{x11}*-carriers) and *GFP* plus embryos (*FM7* carriers) were separated by the color of their mouth-hooks as described above to identify by sex. Cuticles of other interspecific crosses (e.g., *mel/tei*, *mel/mau*, *mau/sim*) were collected, prepared, and imaged using the same scheme.

5. GENOME SEQUENCING

We next studied the patterns of polymorphism in *gt* across the nine species of the *melanogaster* species subgroup. This involved (i) collecting flies in nature, (ii) sequencing their genomes, and (iii) aligning them. These three steps are described in detail as follows.

5.1. Stock collection

We collected lines from five species in the *melanogaster* group in their natural habitat. *Drosophila santomea* and *D. yakuba* were collected in the volcanic island of São Tomé. *Drosophila teissieri* was collected in the highlands of the island of Bioko, Equatorial Guinea. *Drosophila simulans* was collected in Bioko, São Tomé and Zambia. In all cases, single females were collected with banana traps, anesthetized with FlyNap (triethylamine, Carolina Biological Supply Co.) for 2-5 minutes. Individual females were then placed in plastic vials with instant potato fly media (Carolina Biological Supply Co.) and were allowed to oviposit until their death. Vials with progeny were hand carried to the USA (USDA permit: P526-150127-009) and progeny was transferred to a corn-meal diet in 100 mL vials. *Drosophila mauritiana* stocks were kindly donated by D. Presgraves.

5.2. Sequencing: Genomic data

All the genomes of the lines used in this study were previously published. We downloaded available raw reads (FASTQ files) for *D. yakuba* (Rogers *et al.* 2014, 2017; Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini *et al.* 2018), *D. santomea* (Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini *et al.* 2018), *D. teissieri* (Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini *et al.* 2018), *D. mauritiana* (Garrigan *et al.* 2012; Brand *et al.* 2013), *D. sechellia* (Schrider *et al.* 2018; Turissini *et al.* 2018), *D. simulans* (Garrigan *et al.* 2012; Serrato-Capuchina *et al.* 2021), and *D. melanogaster* (Pool 2015; Lack *et al.* 2016) from NCBI and mapped them to the corresponding reference genome (see below). All the accession numbers are listed in Table S14.

5.3. Sequencing: Read mapping and variant calling

Reads were mapped to the closest reference genome using bwa version 0.7.12 (Li and Durbin 2009; Li 2013). Reads from *D. yakuba*, *D. teissieri*, and *D. santomea* were mapped to the *D. yakuba* genome version 1.04 (Drosophila 12 Genomes Consortium *et al.* 2007), and reads from *D. simulans*, *D. sechellia*, and *D. mauritiana* were mapped to the *D. simulans* *w⁵⁰¹* genome (Hu *et al.* 2013). We used Samtools version 0.1.19 (Li *et al.* 2009) to merge Bam files. We used GATK version 3.2-2 RealignerTargetCreator and IndelRealigner functions to identify indels and polymorphic sites (McKenna *et al.* 2010; DePristo *et al.* 2011). Read mapping and SNP genotyping were done independently for the *D. yakuba* and *D. simulans* clades using GATK UnifiedGenotyper but in both cases we used similar parameters and files. The parameter *het* was set to 0.01. We also used the following filters to all resulting vcf files: QD = 2.0, FS_filter = 60.0, MQ_filter = 30.0, MQ_Rank_Sum_filter = -12.5, and Read_Pos_Rank_Sum_filter = -8.0. If a site had a coverage below five reads or above than the 99th quantile of the genomic coverage distribution for the given line, that site was assigned an ‘N’.

5.4. Sequencing: Indel identification

We studied the positions of indels in the giant locus across the *melanogaster* species subgroup. To genotype indels, we used GATK UnifiedGenotyper with the -glm INDEL

flag for just the sequence orthologous to the *D. melanogaster giant* gene. We then generated fasta files for the *giant* locus. No coverage thresholds were used for indel genotypes.

5.5. Genomic Alignments.

We next generated genome alignments that included *D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans* and *D. yakuba*. The *D. yakuba* and *D. simulans* reference genomes were separately aligned to the *D. melanogaster* genome using nucmer version 3.23 with parameters $-r$ and $-q$. Next, we used the dmel6.01 annotation:

ftp.flybase.net/genomes/Drosophila_melanogaster/dmel_r6.01_FB2014_04/gff/dmel-all-r6.01.gff.gz

(Dos Santos *et al.* 2015a) to identify the *giant* coding region (*D. melanogaster* X chromosome: 2,427,113 – 2,429,467). These alignments were used to extract polymorphism data for this region for 8 species in the *melanogaster* species subgroup. In total, we included data for 903 sequences. The subsequent alignment was visually inspected using Mesquite version 3.04 (Maddison and Maddison 2010) to ensure indels were aligned and did not disrupt codons.

6. DETECTION OF NATURAL SELECTION

6.1. PAML

Next, we studied whether the *giant* locus had evolved through natural selection. The first approach to detect positive selection was to count the number of synonymous (dS) and non-synonymous (dN) substitutions in each branch and calculate the ratio between these two variables. First, we generated a consensus sequence for each of the species in the *melanogaster* species subgroup. Next, we ran PAML version 4.8 (Yang 1997, 2007) to calculate dN/dS ratios. We used four sets of parameters: basic model (model=0), free ratios (model=1), 3 ratios (model=2, tree = ((mel, (sim, sech, mau) \$2)\$1, ((yak, san), tei) \$3);), and 2 ratios (model=2, tree = ((mel, (sim, sech, mau))\$1, ((yak, san), tei) \$2)). A dN/dS ratio significantly higher than 1 means positive selection, while a dN/dS ratio significantly lower than 1 means negative/purifying selection ((Yang 1997, 2007) but see

(Venkat *et al.* 2018)). dN/dS values not significantly different from zero represent neutral evolution.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE S1. Rates of ablation in F1 hybrids between the species of the *yakuba* species complex. None of the six possible F1 hybrids show abdominal ablations.

Cross	Scored embryos	Dead embryos	Ablated embryos
♀ <i>D. santomea</i> × ♂ <i>D. santomea</i>	120	2	0
♀ <i>D. yakuba</i> × ♂ <i>D. yakuba</i>	162	4	0
♀ <i>D. teissieri</i> × ♂ <i>D. teissieri</i>	149	7	0
♀ <i>D. santomea</i> × ♂ <i>D. yakuba</i>	102	16	0
♀ <i>D. santomea</i> × ♂ <i>D. teissieri</i>	110	21	0
♀ <i>D. yakuba</i> × ♂ <i>D. santomea</i>	123	19	0
♀ <i>D. yakuba</i> × ♂ <i>D. teissieri</i>	98	16	0
♀ <i>D. teissieri</i> × ♂ <i>D. santomea</i>	101	15	0
♀ <i>D. teissieri</i> × ♂ <i>D. yakuba</i>	98	10	0

1104 **TABLE S2. Hybrids between *D. melanogaster* females and *D. simulans* and *D.***
1105 ***mauritiana* show no abdominal ablations or embryonic lethality.** The reciprocal
1106 crosses ($\text{♀} D. simulans \times \text{♂} D. melanogaster$; $\text{♀} D. mauritiana \times \text{♂} D. melanogaster$) show
1107 high levels of female embryonic lethality but death occurs before embryogenesis starts.

Cross	Hatched embryos	Dead brown embryos	Ablated embryos
$\text{♀} D. melanogaster \times \text{♂} D. melanogaster$	110	6	0
$\text{♀} D. simulans \times \text{♂} D. simulans$	105	5	0
$\text{♀} D. sechellia \times \text{♂} D. sechellia$	88	8	0
$\text{♀} D. mauritiana \times \text{♂} D. mauritiana$	121	4	0
$\text{♀} D. melanogaster \times \text{♂} D. simulans$	98	5	0
$\text{♀} D. melanogaster \times \text{♂} D. mauritiana$	74	5	0
$\text{♀} D. melanogaster \times \text{♂} D. sechellia$	99	41	0
$\text{♀} D. simulans \times \text{♂} D. melanogaster$	101	6	0
$\text{♀} D. simulans \times \text{♂} D. sechellia$	78	1	0
$\text{♀} D. simulans \times \text{♂} D. mauritiana$	95	2	0
$\text{♀} D. sechellia \times \text{♂} D. melanogaster$	73	2	0
$\text{♀} D. sechellia \times \text{♂} D. simulans$	77	4	0
$\text{♀} D. sechellia \times \text{♂} D. mauritiana$	71	6	0
$\text{♀} D. mauritiana \times \text{♂} D.$	83	4	0

<i>sechellia</i>			
♀ <i>D. mauritiana</i> × ♂ <i>D. simulans</i>	99	2	0
♀ <i>D. mauritiana</i> × ♂ <i>D. melanogaster</i>	68	4	0

1108

1109

1110 **TABLE S3. Mutant stocks used in this study.**

1111

	Stock number	Genotype
1	53	gt1 wa
2	54	gt[13z]/Dp(1;2;Y)w[+]/C(1)DX, y[1] f[1]
3	1528	gt[Q292] rst[6]/FM7a
4	1529	y[1] sc[1] gt[X11]/FM6
5	1530	y[1] gt[E6] rst[6]
6	35	dor4/C(1)RM, y1 w1 f1
7	?	C(1)DX
8	17003	P{EP}boiEP1385 w1118
9	13245	y1 P{SUPor-P}boiKG03233
10	4283	tko3/FM7a/Dp(1;2;Y)w+
11	59642	y1 Mi{MIC}tkoMI15120 w*/FM7h
12	52400	y1 tkoA w* P{neoFRT}19A/FM7c, P{GAL4-Kr.C}DC1, P{UAS-GFP.S65T}DC5, sn+
13	52401	y1 tkoB w* P{neoFRT}19A/FM7c, P{GAL4-Kr.C}DC1, P{UAS-GFP.S65T}DC5, sn+
14	?	FM7::GFP
15	29799	Dp(1;Y)BSC75, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)ED6630, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED6630 w[1118]/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)1Ac[1], sc[J1] sc[8]
16	29801	Dp(1;Y)BSC77, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)ED6630, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED6630 w[1118]/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)1Ac[1], sc[J1] sc[8]
17	29803	Dp(1;Y)BSC79, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)ED6630, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED6630 w[1118]/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)1Ac[1], sc[J1] sc[8]
18	29804	Dp(1;Y)BSC80, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)ED6630, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED6630 w[1118]/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)1Ac[1], sc[J1] sc[8]

		Dp(1;Y)BSC81, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)ED6630, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED6630
19	29805	w[1118]/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC82, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
20	29806	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC83, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
21	29807	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC84, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
22	29808	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC85, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
23	29809	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC87, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
24	29811	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC88, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3, B[S]/Df(1)Exel6233, w[1118] P{w[+mC]=XP-U}Exel6233/C(1)RA,
25	29812	In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] Dp(1;Y)BSC90, y[+] P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}BSC3,
26	29814	B[S]/winsey/C(1)RA, In(1)sc[J1], In(1)sc[8], l(1)lAc[1], sc[J1] sc[8] w[1118]; Dp(1;3)DC454, PBac{y[+mDint2]
27	32295	w[+mC]=DC454}VK00033/TM6C, Sb[1] w[1118]; Dp(1;3)DC045, PBac{y[+mDint2]
28	30233	w[+mC]=DC045}VK00033 w[1118]; Dp(1;3)DC107, PBac{y[+mDint2]
29	30751	w[+mC]=DC107}VK00033 w[1118]; Dp(1;3)RC013, PBac{y[+mDint2]
30	38476	w[+mC]=RC013}VK00033/TM6C, Sb[1] w[1118]; Dp(1;3)DC405, PBac{y[+mDint2]
31	31455	w[+mC]=DC405}VK00033 w[1118]; Dp(1;3)DC453, PBac{y[+mDint2]
32	32294	w[+mC]=DC453}VK00033/TM6C, Sb[1] Df(1)ED409, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED409
33	8950	w[1118]/FM7h Df(1)ED11354, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED11354
34	9345	w[1118]/FM7h Df(1)ED11354, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED11354
35	9054	w[1118]/FM7h Df(1)ED411, P{w[+mW.Scer\FRT.hs3]=3'.RS5+3.3'}ED411
36	8031	w[1118]/FM7j, B[1] Df(1)BSC717, P+PBac{w[+mC]=XP3.RB5}BSC717
37	26569	w[1118]/FM7h/Dp(2;Y)G, P{w[+mC]=hs-hid}Y
38	7705	Df(1)Exel6230, P{XP-U}Exel6230 w1118/FM7c

39

7706 Df(1)Exel6231, P{XP-U}Exel6231 w1118/FM7c

1112

1113

TABLE S4. *C(1)DX*, *Dp(1;3)/TM3* lay few eggs are thus not ideal to measure the magnitude of HI in crosses with *D. santomea*. The second and third column show the number of eggs produced by a singly-mated female when mated to a *w¹¹¹⁸* male over 4 days.

Duplication	Stock	<i>C(1)DX</i> , <i>Dp(1;3)/Dp(1;3)</i>	<i>C(1)DX</i> , <i>Dp(1;3)/TM3,Sb</i>	<i>C(1)DX</i> , <i>Dp(1;Y)</i>
Dp(1;3)DC405	31455	47	7	NA
Dp(1;3)DC301	31452	51	24	NA
Dp(1;3)DC112	31445	43	15	NA
Dp(1;3)DC272	30389	24	20	NA
Dp(1;Y)BSC87	29811	NA	NA	56
Dp(1;Y) BSC170	32117	NA	NA	68
Dp(1;Y)BSC58	29782	NA	NA	53
Dp(1;Y)BSC14	29782	NA	NA	64

1120 **TABLE S5. The cross involved a $gt_{mel}^{X11}/FM7$ female and a male hemizygote for the**
 1121 **duplication.** In the case of $Dp(1;Y)$ duplications, the male had a $X_{mel}/Y_{mel}Dp(1;Y)$
 1122 genotype. In the case of $Dp(1;3)$ duplication, the male had a $X_{mel}/Y_{mel}, Dp(1,3)/TM3,Sb$
 1123 genotype.

1124

Genotype	Stock	$Dp(1;Y)$ or $Dp(1;3)?$	F1 male genotypes		Rescue Rate	X^2	P
			gt^{X11}/Dp	$FM7/Dp$			
$Dp(1;Y)BSC74$	29798	$Dp(1;Y)$	81	73	0.526	0.117	0.732
$Dp(1;Y)BSC78$	29802	$Dp(1;Y)$	53	48	0.525	0.045	0.833
$Dp(1;3)DC405$	31455	$Dp(1;3)$	41	75	0.353	4.511	0.034
$Dp(1;3)RC013$	38476	$Dp(1;3)$	16	37	0.302	3.545	0.060

1125

1126

1127

TABLE S6. Isofemale lines from four species used to assess whether HI in *mel/san* hybrids was a species-specific phenomenon or a line specific phenomenon. All lines were collected by D. R. Matute with the exception of the three *D. teissieri* lines marked with an asterisk. Those three lines were donated by J.R. David.

Species	Line	Notation in Figures S4 and S19	Location	Year
<i>D. santomea</i>	Thenas	S1	São Tomé	2005
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCAR1490	S2	São Tomé	2005
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCOST1250.5	S3	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCOST1270.1	S4	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanOBAT1200	S5	São Tomé	2005
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanOBAT1200.2	S6	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanRain39	S7	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCAR1600.3	S8	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	Carv2015.1	S9	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Carv2015.5	S10	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Carv2015.11	S11	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Carv2015.16	S12	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Pico1680.1	S13	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Pico1659.2	S14	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Pico1659.3	S15	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Amelia2015.1	S16	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Amelia2015.6	S17	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	Amelia2015.12	S18	São Tomé	2015
<i>D. santomea</i>	A1200.7	S19	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. santomea</i>	Rain42	S20	São Tomé	2009
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Balanca_1	T1	Bioko, Equatorial	2013

<i>D. teissieri</i>	Balancha_2	T2	Guinea Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Balancha_3	T3	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	House_Bioko_0	T4	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	House_Bioko_1	T5	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	House_Bioko_2	T6	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	La_Lope_Gabon*	T7	Gabón	~1975
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Selinda*	T8	Gabón	~1975
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Zimbabwe*	T9	Gabón	~1975
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_1	T10	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_2	T11	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_4	T12	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_1	T13	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_2	T14	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_3	T15	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_4	T16	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_5	T17	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013

<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_6	T18	Bioko, Equatorial Guinea	2013
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Bata_2	T19	Bata, Equatorial Guinea	2009
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Bata_8	T20	Bata, Equatorial Guinea	2009

1133

1134

TABLE S7. Complementation mapping using loss-of function and hypomorph alleles show that *gt* mutants are the only alleles in cytological region 3A3 that lead to an increase of female viability in *mel/san* hybrid. *mutant/san* refers to the number of F1 hybrids carrying the mutant allele. *gt^{X11}* is a loss of function (amorphic) allele (Eldon and Pirrotta 1991; Chang *et al.* 2021). Both *boi^{d04197}* and *boi^{e01708}* shows significantly lower RNA production than wild-type flies (Hartman *et al.* 2010). *trol^{G0271}* is a hypomorph (Skeath *et al.* 2017). *tko³* is null allele. Carriers of the allele die as larvae but are able to complete embryogenesis (Toivonen *et al.* 2001).

Gene	Allele	<i>FM7::GFP/san</i>	<i>mutant/san</i>	Ratio (F1 mutant/san)/Total
<i>giant</i>	<i>gt^{X11}</i>	256	610	0.704
<i>boi</i>	P{XP} <i>boi^{d04197}</i>	440	478	0.521
<i>boi</i>	PBac{RB} <i>boi^{e01708}</i>	561	610	0.521
<i>troll</i>	<i>trol^{G0271}</i>	510	464	0.476
<i>tko</i>	<i>tko³</i>	501	457	0.477

1144 **TABLE S8. The *gt*-vector does not carry extraneous elements that rescue the**
1145 **viability of *D. melanogaster* *gt_{mel}^{X11}*-carriers.** When the *gt* alleles are disrupted by a
1146 piggyBac stop cassette , none of the transgenics causes rescue of a *gt_{mel}^{X11}* null allele.

1147

Allele	Non-coding	Coding	F1 male genotypes		Rescue Rate
			<i>gt^{X11}/Y</i> ; transgene/+	FM6/Y; transgene/+	
<i>gt_{mel}:mel-STOP</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>mel-STOP</i>	0	150	0
<i>gt_{san}:mel-STOP</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>mel-STOP</i>	0	221	0
<i>gt_{mel}:san-STOP</i>	<i>mel</i>	<i>san-STOP</i>	0	180	0
<i>gt_{san}:san-STOP</i>	<i>san</i>	<i>San-STOP</i>	0	300	0

1148

TABLE S9. Confirmation that *tll^{mel}* exacerbates the defects caused by *gt^{mel}* in *mel/san* hybrids using a different *tll* mutant. The analysis is similar to that shown in Table 1 with the difference that the χ^2 test has 4 degrees of freedom and not two as the tests in Table 1. **A.** Female viability **B.** Frequency of abdominal ablations in hybrid males. **C.** Frequency of abdominal ablations in hybrid females.

A. Female hybrid viability				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X^{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X^{san};</i> <i>tll^l/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; TM3,</i> <i>Act::GFP, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; tll^l/3^{san}</i>
	18	22	34	54
	$\chi^2_1=0.40$, P=0.527		$\chi^2_1=4.55$, P=0.033	
B. Proportion of male embryos showing abdominal ablations (100 embryos each)				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/Y^{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/Y^{san};</i> <i>tll^l/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /Y^{san}; TM3,</i> <i>Act::GFP, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /Y^{san}; tll^l/3^{san}</i>
	94	88	23	9
	$\chi^2_1= 1.526$, P= 0.217		$\chi^2_1= 6.287$, P = 0.012	
C. Proportion of female embryos showing abdominal ablations (100 embryos each)				
	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X^{san};</i> <i>TM3, Act::GFP,</i> <i>Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>FM7;</i> <i>sqh::mCherry/X^{san};</i> <i>tll^l/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; TM3,</i> <i>Act::GFP, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; tll^l/3^{san}</i>
	48	35	16	6
	$\chi^2_1= 2.966$, P= 0.08505		$\chi^2_1= 4.137$, P= 0.0420	

TABLE S10. Double mutant analysis of survival in hybrids between *D. melanogaster* females and three males from four different species (*D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, *D. mauritiana*, and *D. teissieri*). Individuals that are hemizygote for both alleles do not show different viability from individuals that are hemizygote for one allele and heterozygote for the other one, or heterozygote for both alleles.

<i>tll^l</i>							
	<i>FM7; sqh::mCherry/X^{san}; TM3, Act::GFP, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>FM7; sqh::mCherry/X^s_{an}; tll^l/3^{san}</i>	χ^2	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; TM3, Act::GF P, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; tll^l/3^{sa}_n</i>	χ^2 , df =3	P-value
<i>D. melanogaster</i>	95	104		121	98	1.869 5	0.599 9
<i>D. simulans</i>	34	31		28	29	0.338 64	0.952 6
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	52	41		39	41	1.143 6	0.766 6
<i>D. teissieri</i>	19	22		15	20	0.715 74	0.869 5
<i>tll^{ΔGFP}</i>							
	<i>FM7; sqh::mCherry/X^{san}; TM3, Act::GFP, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>FM7; sqh::mCherry/X^s_{an}; tll^l/3^{san}</i>	χ^2	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; TM3, Act::GF P, Ser/3^{san}</i>	<i>gt^{X11}; /X^{san}; tll^l/3^{sa}_n</i>	χ^2	
<i>D. melanogaster</i>	104	87		99	78	2.142 8	0.543 3

<i>D. simulans</i>	42	36		39	44	0.460 75	0.927 4
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	51	38		49	43	1.181 5	0.757 5
<i>D. teissieri</i>	20	25		21	26	0.567 22	0.903 9

TABLE S11. A tll_{san}^{dsRed} has no effect on HI in crosses between *mel* females from four different backgrounds.

	$tll^{dsRed}/3_{mel}$	$3_{san}/3_{mel}$	χ^2	P-value
<i>mel AkLa</i>	31	36	0.067	0.795
<i>mel Zs2</i>	62	74	1.600	0.206
<i>mel Senegal</i>	49	41	0.200	0.654
<i>mel NC103</i>	62	71	0.184	0.668

TABLE S12. Abrogating the tll_{san} allele has no viability effect in gt_{mel}^{X11} *mel*/san hybrids.

A. Female hybrid viability				
	<i>FM7; Act::GFP/X_{san}; 3_{mel}, tll_{san}^{dsRed}</i>	<i>FM7; Act::GFP/X_{san}; 3_{mel}, 3_{san}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}/X_{san}; 3_{mel}, tll_{san}^{dsRed}</i>	<i>gt_{mel}^{X11}/X_{san}; 3_{mel}, 3_{san}</i>
	12	20	41	44
	$\chi^2_1=0.571$, P=0.450		$\chi^2_1=0.006$, P=0.939	

TABLE S13. *gt* and *tll* are slowly evolving genes as measured by the rate of aminoacid substitutions. We show K_A/K_S values for two species comparisons (*D. melanogaster* vs. *D. santomea*, and *D. melanogaster* vs. *D. yakuba*) and the quantiles of the K_A/K_S values compared to the rest of the genome. We used four different parametrizations in PAML (listed in the first column). *D. melanogaster*: *mel*, *D. santomea*: *san*; *D. yakuba*: *yak*.

<i>Giant</i>									
Parameter model	CG	K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_A/K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	Quantile K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	K_A/K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	Quantile K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>
2_ratios	CG7952	0.0062	0.2192	0.0283	0.2227	0.0060	0.2074	0.0289	0.2281
3_ratios	CG7952	0.0062	0.2189	0.0283	0.2427	0.0060	0.2071	0.0290	0.2499
basic_model	CG7952	0.0055	0.2218	0.0248	0.1869	0.0052	0.2102	0.0247	0.1862
free_ratios	CG7952	0.0055	0.2222	0.0248	0.2278	0.0044	0.2139	0.0206	0.1960
<i>Tailless</i>									
Parameter model	CG	K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_A/K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	Quantile K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>san</i>	K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	K_A/K_S <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>	Quantile K_A <i>mel</i> vs. <i>yak</i>
2_ratios	CG1378	0.0045	0.384	0.012	0.095	0.0045	0.376	0.012	0.0977
3_ratios	CG1378	0.0034	0.395	0.009	0.086	0.0034	0.383	0.009	0.0872
basic_model	CG1378	0.0037	0.389	0.010	0.075	0.0037	0.380	0.010	0.076
free_ratios	CG1378	0.0028	0.389	0.007	0.087	0.0028	0.381	0.007	0.091

TABLE S14. Sequencing details and coverage for all the lines included in this study.

Species	Line	Read type	Average coverage	Source	SRA
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	mau12w	pe	153.67	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRR1555246, SRR1560430, SRR1560444, SRR483621
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	MauKiti	se	13.86		
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	mauST	se	3.11		
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	MS17	se,pe	60.56		SRR556195, SRR556206, SRR556199, SRR556196
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R23	pe	115.98		SRR1560090, SRR1560089, SRR1560087
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R31	pe	99.96		SRR1560098, SRR1560097, SRR1560095
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R32	pe	120.55		SRR1560102, SRR1560100, SRR1560103
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R39	pe	116.33		SRR1560110, SRR1560109, SRR1560108
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R41	pe	145.38		SRR1560130, SRR1560132, SRR1560131
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R44	pe	122.59		SRR1560147, SRR1560146, SRR1560133
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R56	pe	121.66		SRR1560150, SRR1560149, SRR1560148
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R61	pe	140.32		SRR1560268, SRR1560267, SRR1560269
<i>D. mauritiana</i>	R8	pe	90.27		SRR1560276, SRR1560275
<i>D. santomea</i>	Qiuja630.39	se	24.16		SRX3029341

<i>D. santomea</i>	Quija37	se	11.74	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029336
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanC1350.14	se	18.62	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029340
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCAR1490.5	se	15.77	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029339
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCOST1250.5	se	13.27	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029322
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanCOST1270.6	se	14.76	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029337
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanOBAT1200.13	se	14.47	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029334
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanOBAT1200.5	se	16.82	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029332
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanRain39	se	15.81	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029333:
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanSTO7	se	15.29	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029335
<i>D. santomea</i>	sanThena5	se	12.98	(Turissini and Matute 2017; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029338
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B1	pe	36.85	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029286
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B2	pe	34.56	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029285
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B3	pe	38.75	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029281
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B5	pe	38.36	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029270
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B6	pe	33.48	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029283

<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B7	pe	39.25	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029301
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Anro_B8	pe	34.84	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029373
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Denis124	se	24.73	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029315
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Denis135	se	32.4	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029275
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Denis7_2	se	28	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029314
<i>D. sechellia</i>	Denis7_8	se	28	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029277
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisAMT	se	14.44	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029303
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisAT3	se	28.03	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029317
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisDNJ6	se	22.63	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029319
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisJT1	se	23.99	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029316
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisMCL	se	46.04	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029276
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF100	se	10.12	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029307
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF123	se	13.07	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029306
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF13	se	24.12	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029313
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF134	se	14.45	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029302

<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF155	se	15.84	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029321
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNF66	se	27.16	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029312
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNoni10	se	14.63	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029320
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNoni101	se	25.07	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029278
<i>D. sechellia</i>	DenisNoni60	se	19.35	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029318
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD11_sech	pe	44.37	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029282
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD12	pe	37.29	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029284
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD13	pe	45.52	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029289
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD14	pe	34.93	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029288
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD15	pe	49.06	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029362
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD16	pe	40.63	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029290
<i>D. sechellia</i>	LD8	pe	41.54	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029364
<i>D. sechellia</i>	mariane_1	pe	49.51	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029287
<i>D. sechellia</i>	maria_3	pe	39.82	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029376
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF10	pe	34.48	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029280

<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF11	pe	39.12	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029279
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF3	pe	46.24	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029272
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF4	pe	32.94	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029363
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF5	pe	41.99	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029273
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF7	pe	28.88	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029271
<i>D. sechellia</i>	PNF8	pe	55.93	(Schrider <i>et al.</i> 2018; Turissini <i>et al.</i> 2018)	SRX3029274
<i>D. simulans</i>	Bioko_cascade_1	pe	38.1	(Serrato-Capuchina <i>et al.</i> 2020, 2021)	SRX7116491
<i>D. simulans</i>	Bioko_H1	pe	38.4	(Serrato-Capuchina <i>et al.</i> 2020, 2021)	SRX7116492
<i>D. simulans</i>	Bioko_LB1	pe	38.26	(Serrato-Capuchina <i>et al.</i> 2020, 2021)	SRX7116493
<i>D. simulans</i>	Bioko_Riaba_9	pe	32.7	(Serrato-Capuchina <i>et al.</i> 2020, 2021)	SRX7116489
<i>D. simulans</i>	Bioko_Riaba_mixed	pe	32.53	(Serrato-Capuchina <i>et al.</i> 2020, 2021)	SRX7116490
<i>D. simulans</i>	Kib32	se,pe	52.05	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRR580348, SRR580347, SRR580350, SRR580349
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD06	pe	128.34	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458044
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD105	pe	101.25	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458047
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD106	pe	104.11	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458049
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD15	pe	115.94	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458052
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD199	pe	128.89	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX8034374
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD221	pe	115.61	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458058

<i>D. simulans</i>	MD233	pe	139.25	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458061
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD251	pe	133.51	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458064
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD63	pe	64.75	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458067
<i>D. simulans</i>	MD73	pe	130.06	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458070
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS05	pe	135.43	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458073
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS113	pe	125.58	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458076
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS137	pe	111.69	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458078
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS33	pe	125	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458081
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS39	pe	136.06	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458084
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS40	pe	136.32	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458087
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS50	pe	131.23	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458090
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS67	pe	139.1	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458093
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS78	pe	136.03	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458096
<i>D. simulans</i>	NS79	pe	135.12	(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458099
<i>D. simulans</i>	tsimbazaaa	pe	38.11		SRR869580, SRR869579
<i>D. simulans</i>	w501	pe	26.35	(Hu <i>et al.</i> 2013)	SRR520350
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Balanca_1	pe	30.37	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029331
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Bata2	se	20.7	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029370
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Bata8	se	18.56	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029369
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_1	pe	29.2	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029323
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_2	pe	33.88	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029330
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_2_4	pe	26.91	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029324
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_1	pe	27.07	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029328
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_2	pe	39.54	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029374
<i>D. teissieri</i>	cascade_4_3	pe	23.26	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029329
<i>D. teissieri</i>	House_Bioko	pe	35.7	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029325
<i>D. teissieri</i>	La_Lope_Gabon	pe	36.6	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029375
<i>D. teissieri</i>	Selinda	pe	27.74	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029326

<i>D. yakuba</i>	1_19	se	18.51	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029345
<i>D. yakuba</i>	1_5	se	19.27	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3518253
<i>D. yakuba</i>	1_6	se	20.16	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029348
<i>D. yakuba</i>	1_7	se	22.01	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029297
<i>D. yakuba</i>	2_11	se	19.51	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029350
<i>D. yakuba</i>	2_14	se	19.15	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029347
<i>D. yakuba</i>	2_6	se	23.43	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029353
<i>D. yakuba</i>	2_8	se	20.38	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029343
<i>D. yakuba</i>	3_16	se	19.82	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029344
<i>D. yakuba</i>	3_2	se	21.89	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029356
<i>D. yakuba</i>	3_23	se	22.11	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029291
<i>D. yakuba</i>	4_21	se	22.44	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029299
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Abidjan_12	se	23.79	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029360
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Airport_16_5	se	20.11	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029355
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Anton_1_Principe	se	19.54	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029295
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Anton_2_Principe	se	21.38	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029361
<i>D. yakuba</i>	BAR_1000_2	se	21.23	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029367
<i>D. yakuba</i>	BIOKO_NE_4_6	se	17.17	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029351
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Bosu_1235_14	se	17.22	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029300
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Cascade_18	se	23.96	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029354
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Cascade_19_16	se	16.5	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029342
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Cascade_21	se	20.59	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029368
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Cascade_SN6_1	se	18.85	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029358
<i>D. yakuba</i>	COST_1235_2	se	17.69	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029296
<i>D. yakuba</i>	COST_1235_3	se	15.42	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029349
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457979, SRX6457980 , SRX6457981, SRX6457982
	CY01A	pe	196.72		

<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457983,
	CY02B5	pe	69.98		SRX6457984,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457985
	CY04B	pe	157.94		SRX6457986,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457987,
	CY08A	pe	75.04		SRX6457988,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457989
	CY13A	pe	72.72		SRX6457990,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457991,
	CY17C	pe	193.88		SRX6457992
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457990,
	CY20A	pe	183.65		SRX6457991,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457992
	CY21B3	pe	173.17		SRX6457996,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457997,
	CY22B	pe	69.84		SRX6457998,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6457999
	CY28	pe	110.16		SRX6458000,
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Montecafe_17_17	se	19.97	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX6458001,
					SRX6458002
					SRX6458003,
					SRX6458004,
					SRX6458005
					SRX6458006,
					SRX6458007,
					SRX6458008
					SRX6458009,
					SRX6458010,
					SRX6458011
					SRX3029359

<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX6458037,
	NY141	pe	143.54		SRX6458038,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX6458039
	NY42	pe	118.02		SRX6458040,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458041
	NY48	pe	84.99		SRX6458013,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458014,
	NY56	pe	88.65		SRX6458015
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458016,
	NY62	pe	94.51		SRX6458017,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458018
	NY65	pe	91.46		SRX6458019,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458020,
	NY66	pe	148.65		SRX6458021
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458022,
	NY73	pe	92.08		SRX6458023,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458024
	NY81	pe	148.42		SRX6458025,
<i>D. yakuba</i>				(Rogers <i>et al.</i> 2014, 2017)	SRX6458026,
	NY85	pe	99.03		SRX6458027
<i>D. yakuba</i>	OBAT_1200_5	se	22.7	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX6458028,
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SanTome_city_14_26	se	22.75	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX6458029,
					SRX6458030
					SRX6458031,
					SRX6458032,
					SRX6458033
					SRX6458034,
					SRX6458035,
					SRX6458036
					SRX3029357
					SRX3029372

<i>D. yakuba</i>	SA_3	se	18.64	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029294
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SJ14	se	15.77	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029293
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SJ4	se	25.82	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029292
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SJ7	se	19.51	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029352
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SJ_1	se	21.35	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029371
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SN7	se	23.66	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029366
<i>D. yakuba</i>	SN_Cascade_22	se	21.78	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029365
<i>D. yakuba</i>	Tai_18	se	22.17	(Turissini and Matute 2017)	SRX3029298

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

FIGURE S1. X_{mel} , X_{sim} and X_{mau} cause abdominal ablations in hybrid males with *D. santomea*. Hybrid males from the $\text{♀}sim \times \text{♂}san$ and $\text{♀}mau \times \text{♂}san$ crosses show high frequency of abdominal ablations similar to those observed in than in $\text{♀}mel \times \text{♂}san$ hybrids. Hybrid females from the same crosses show a lower frequency of ablations. The nature of the defect in these hybrid males is identical to that seen in *mel/san* hybrid males, a characteristic ablation of abdominal segments (as shown in Figure 1).

FIGURE S2. Crossing design to assess whether small piece of the X_{mel} cause hybrid inviability and abdominal ablations. Blue bars represent *D. santomea* chromosomes; yellow bars represent *D. melanogaster* chromosomes. Solid colors: sex chromosomes, stripped bars: autosomes. This approach is a modified version of (Sawamura and Yamamoto 1993; Cattani and Presgraves 2012; Matute and Gavin-Smyth 2014).

FIGURE S3. Frequency of abdominal ablations caused by the X_{mel} translocations shown in Figure 2 in X_{san}/Y_{mel} hybrid males.

Each Bloomington stock number is shown within the bar. The precise genotype of each stock is shown in Table S1.

FIGURE S4. The presence of *gt_{mel}* causes HI in *mel/san* hybrids produced with all *D. santomea* lines but the magnitude of the inviability varies. We measured frequency of abdominal ablations in hybrid X_{mel}/Y_{san} males (A). The magnitude of the frequency of abdominal ablations and of hybrid female inviability are correlated among lines (panel B; $\rho = 0.1734$, $P = 0.0141$). Boxes in the boxplot are ordinated from the lower median (left) to the highest (right). S1: Thena5; S2: sanCAR1490; S3: sanCOST1250.5; S4: sanCOST1270.1; S5: sanOBAT1200; S6: sanOBAT1200.2; S7: sanRain39; S8: sanCAR1600.3; S9: Carv2015.1; S10: Carv2015.5; S11: Carv2015.11; S12: Carv2015.16; S13: Pico1680.1; S14: Pico1659.2; S15: Pico1659.3; S16: Amelia2015.1; S17: Amelia2015.6; S18: Amelia2015.12; S19: A1200.7; S20: Rain42.

FIGURE S5. Crosses between *D. melanogaster* females harboring *Dp(1;Y)* duplications and males from the *simulans* species group (*D. mauritiana*, and *D. simulans*) show no evidence of male embryo lethality or abdominal ablations. *Dp(1;Y)* duplications containing *gt_{mel}* cause no embryonic defects and do not cause heightened hybrid inviability. The color code is the same as used in Figure 2C. The lack of gray bars indicates that none of the duplications caused hybrid inviability in any of the crosses. Please note that embryonic lethality is low in all these crosses and consequently the number of dissected embryos (Panels D-F) is also low.

FIGURE S6. Crosses between *D. melanogaster* females harboring *Dp(1;Y)* duplications and males from different lines of *D. melanogaster* show no evidence of male embryo lethality or abdominal ablations. *Dp(1;Y)* duplications containing *gt^{mel}* cause no embryonic defects and do not cause heightened hybrid inviability. The color code is the same as used in Figure 2C. The lack of gray bars indicates that none of the duplications caused hybrid inviability in any of the crosses. Please note that embryonic lethality is exceptionally low in all these crosses and consequently the number of dissected embryos (Panels D-F) is also low.

FIGURE S7. Hybrid male embryos carrying a gt_{mel}^{X11} *D. melanogaster* allele show a variety of developmental defects.

gt_{mel}^{X11}/Y_{san} males are inviable and show a variety of developmental defects (A-C). Some individuals also show abdominal ablations (D).

FIGURE S8. *mel/san* hybrids carrying a *D. melanogaster* chromosome and null alleles for *boi*, *trol*, or *tko* show similar levels of hybrid viability. This is in contrast to males also carrying a *D. melanogaster* chromosome but a *gt* null allele (*gt_{mel}^{X11}*) which show a significant reduction in abdominal ablations (shown in Figure 2). These three genes have no effect in hybrids between *D. melanogaster* and three more species (*D. teissieri* [B], *D. simulans* [C], and *D. mauritiana* [D]).

FIGURE S9. The X-chromosome balancer has no effect on the quantification of hybrid inviability in *mel/san* hybrid females. We found no heterogeneity in the relative viability of gt_{mel}^{X11} when different balancer chromosomes are used (One-way ANOVA, $F_{6,109}=0.694$, $P=0.655$). We used seven different X-chromosomes balancers and none of them had a major effect on the quantification of the relative frequency of gt_{mel}^{X11} viability in any of the hybrid crosses.

FIGURE S10. Frequency of abdominal ablations in each deficiency cross shown in Figure 2. Deficiency chromosomes that contain a functional *gt_{mel}* (e.g., 8031, 9054, and 8950) were prone to show abdominal ablations than deficiencies that harbored other genes. On the other hand, deficiency chromosomes with no functional copy of *gt_{mel}* show reduced rates of abdominal ablations. The mean proportion of abdominal ablation in *X_{mel}/X_{san}* hybrid females is 0.420.

FIGURE S11. *gt^{mel}* has no effect on the viability of *mel/tei*, *mel/mau*, and *mel/sim* hybrid females. We used the same deficiency chromosomes reported to detect the effect of *gt^{mel}* in *mel/san* hybrid females (Figure 3A). In all three cases, *df/FM7::GFP* crossed to males of each of the species led to 1:1 ratios in female progeny. The color code is the same as in Figure 3A but since no deficiency departed from the 1:1 expected (i.e., no *gt^{mel}* effect on hybrid viability), there are no gray bars.

FIGURE S12. *gt_{mel}* has no effect on the viability of pure-species *D. melanogaster* F1 females. We used the same deficiency chromosomes reported to detect the effect of *gt_{mel}* in *mel/san* hybrid females (Figure 3A). In all three types of crosses (three isofemale lines), *df/FM7::GFP* crossed to males of each of the species led to 1:1 ratios in female progeny. The color code is the same as in Figure 3A but since no deficiency departed from the 1:1 expected (i.e., no *gt_{mel}* effect on hybrid viability), there are no gray bars. No cross showed any abdominal ablation.

FIGURE S13. *gt* transgene, removable piggyBac cassette design and crossing schemes involving *gt* transgenes. Panel **A** shows the general experimental design to generate the four chimeric alleles included in this study and the insertion site for their integration (attP2 site in the 3rd chromosome). Panel **B** shows a detail of the 5' UTR common to all the four alleles with piggyBac cassette. Panel **C** shows the crosses used in Table 1 when measuring giant's effects on hybrid embryonic lethality. Panel **D** shows the crosses used in Table 2 when measuring the effects of different alleles of *giant* on adult hybrid female lethality.

A.

B.

C.

$$\text{♀♀ } \frac{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}; \frac{P\{D.mel\ gt\}attP2}{P\{D.mel\ gt\}attP2} \times \text{♂♂ } \frac{X_{D.san}}{Y_{D.san}}; \frac{+D.san}{+D.san}$$

Count the number of dead embryos in F1s

Sex	Genotype	Embryonic Lethality
Both Sex Pooled	$\frac{X_{D.san} \text{ or } Y_{D.san}}{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}; \frac{+D.san}{P\{D.mel\ gt\}attP2}$	$\frac{\# \text{Dead Embryos}}{\# \text{Total Embryos}}$

D.

$$\text{♀♀ } \frac{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}; \frac{P\{D.mel\ gt\}attP2}{+} \times \text{♂♂ } \frac{X_{D.san}}{Y_{D.san}}; \frac{+D.san}{+D.san}$$

Count number of different genotypes by fluorescent markers in hybrid F1 females

Genotype	Expectation
$\frac{X_{D.san}}{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}; \frac{+D.san}{+D.mel}$	1
$\frac{X_{D.san}}{gt_{D.mel}^{X11}}; \frac{+D.san}{P\{D.mel\ gt\}attP2}$	Relative Viability

FIGURE S14. Introgression of the *FM7::GFP* and *gt^{X11}* alleles into 200 lines of the DGRP lines. Each bar represents a chromosome. Short bars are the *X*-chromosome while longer bars represent the autosomes (only one set of autosomes shown). The bar with dashed lines represents the *FM7::GFP* balancer. Solid yellow represent the *FM7::GFP* background. Red bars represent each of the DGRP genetic backgrounds. Dashed blue lines represent the *gt^{X11}* chromosome, while solid blue lines represent the autosomal background of the *gt^{X11}* stock. **A.** The first step of the experimental design involves introgressing the *FM7::GFP* balancer into each of the 200 DGRP backgrounds. After ten generations of repeating backcrossing, we obtained both females and males that carried the balancer and the DGRP background. **B.** Males from the cross shown in **A** (carriers of the *FM7::GFP* balancer) were crossed the *gt^{X11}/FM7::GFP* females. This cross produces females that carry the *gt^{X11}* chromosome, the *FM7::GFP* balancer and a mixed genetic background. These females were crossed to males that had the DGRP autosomal background and a *FM7::GFP* balancer (**C**). We repeated this backcrossing approach for ten generations. After, 11 generations we obtained *gt^{X11}/FM7::GFP* females with DGRP autosomal backgrounds. These females were then crossed to *D. santomea* and the percentage of ablated progeny were scored.

FIGURE S15. *gt* alleles from six different species in the *melanogaster* species complex. We found no major differences at the coding portion of the gene between the *melanogaster* species supercomplex (*D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, and *D. sechellia*) and that the *D. santomea*/*D. yakuba* species pair is the structure of poly-glutamine repeats. melgt: *D. melanogaster*, simgt: *D. simulans*, sechgt: *D. sechellia*, sangt: *D. santomea*, eregt: *D. erecta*. Asterisks show residues that are conserved across the whole group.

```
neigt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
singt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
seegt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
yakt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
sangt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
ceegt      1  MLMEKLMAG QFFDLKTRK PLMHHHQYQH HQQP LHL P HS QLPVQSSL
*****

neigt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
singt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
seegt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
yakt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
sangt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
ceegt      51  GLPKMDLT TA YAYQQLLGA ALSQQQQQQ Q-----Q QH---QQLQQ
*****

neigt      91  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
singt      90  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
seegt      91  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
yakt      93  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
sangt      93  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
ceegt      90  QHTSSAEVLD LSRRCD SVET PRKTP SPYQT SYVSGSGSP ASPTSMLLYA
*****

neigt      141 AOMQQQHQ- 00000000 QLASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
singt      140 AOMQQQHQ- 00000000 -LASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
seegt      141 AOMQQQHQ- 00000000 -LASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
yakt      143 AOMQQQHQH 00000000 -LASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
sangt      143 AOMQQQHQH 00000000 -LASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
ceegt      140 AOMQQQHQH 0000-00- -LASLYPAFY YSNIKQEQAT PTAAFPKVT
*****

neigt      186 TANLLQTFAA ASAAAAAAS ASTNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
singt      186 TANLLQTFAA ASAAA--AAA ASTNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
seegt      187 TANLLQTFAA ASAAAAAAS ASTNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
yakt      190 TANLLQTFAA ASAAAAAAS ASATNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
sangt      190 TANLLQTFAA ASAAAAAAS ASATNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
ceegt      186 TANLLQTFAA ASAAAAAAS ASTNSPRPA SWASTMIDV LBNPQSPAVE
*****

neigt      240 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
singt      234 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
seegt      237 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
yakt      240 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
sangt      240 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
ceegt      236 ATPTTSSSG EAGKNTRPFK AFPRDPLVIA ANFAATDVL DNPFRVRYTE
*****

neigt      284 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
singt      284 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
seegt      287 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
yakt      290 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
sangt      290 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
ceegt      286 YKRVLEQIR SSGGSRVYT NPKMRTNSR SGVNEGSSS NNNSESDRA
*****

neigt      340 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
singt      334 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
seegt      337 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
yakt      340 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
sangt      340 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
ceegt      336 AAEESDCCD S QAGFEGKSA TSSSNLANA TAANS GISSG SQVKDAAYYE
*****

neigt      384 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
singt      384 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
seegt      387 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
yakt      390 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
sangt      390 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
ceegt      386 RRRKNNAAAK KSRDRRIKE DEIAIRAAYL ERQNIELLCQ IDALKAQLAA
*****

neigt      440 FTSKAVTTA
singt      434 FTSKAVTTA
seegt      437 FTSKAVTTA
yakt      440 FTSKAVTTA
sangt      440 FTSKAVTTA
ceegt      436 FTSKAVTTA
*****
```

FIGURE S16. Maximum-likelihood ancestral sequence reconstruction of GT protein, excluding polyQ. All ancestral sites could be reconstructed with high confidence (posterior probability > 0.98), except for polyQ tracks. Ancestral substitutions beyond D. ere were not displayed. AA positions based on *D. melanogaster* GT protein.

Maximum-Likelihood Ancestral Sequence Reconstruction (excluding 2 polyQ tracks)

AA postion based on *D. mel* gt protein

FIGURE S17. The polyglutamine repeats (polyQ) show differences among the *melanogaster* subspecies complex species.

Maximum-parsimony ancestral sequence reconstruction of 2 polyQ tracks of gt protein. The conserved H within polyQ tracks helps to delineate both polyQ tracks to two parts. Due to the lack of proper substitution models, this maximum-parsimony based ancestral reconstruction for polyQ tracks may subject to bias due to alignment error, arbitrary choice of polyQ unit etc.

Maximum Parsimony Ancestral Sequence Reconstruction for 2 polyQ Tracks

FIGURE S18. *tll* alleles from six different species in the *melanogaster* species complex. We found no major differences at the coding portion of the gene between the *melanogaster* species supercomplex (*D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, and *D. sechellia*) and that the *D. santomea*/*D. yakuba* species pair is the structure of poly-glutamine repeats. melgt: *D. melanogaster*, simgt: *D. simulans*, sechgt: *D. sechellia*, sangt: *D. santomea*, eregt: *D. erecta*. Asterisks show residues that are conserved across the whole group.

```

tll_mel  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_sim  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_mau  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_ere  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_tel  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_san  MQSS EGSFDMMQKYNVRLSPAASSRIL YHVFC KVC RD NSSGKHYGIACDGCAGFFKR GD
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_sim  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_mau  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_ere  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_tel  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_san  SIRRSQGVCKSQGSLCVVDKTEFWQCACRLRKCFEVMGNKD AVQHE RGPKNSTLRRH 120
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_sim  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_mau  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_ere  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_tel  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_san  MAMYKDAMMGAGEMPQIPAEILMNTAALTGFPGVMPMP GLPQAGHHPAIDMAAFCPPPS 180
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_sim  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_mau  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_ere  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_tel  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_san  AAAVLDLSVPFVPHHPVHGHHGFFSPTAAZMNALATRALPPTFLMAAEHIKETAAEHL 240
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_sim  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_mau  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_ere  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_tel  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_san  FKNVWNKISVRAFTLPMFDQLLLLEESWKEFFILAMAQYLMPMHFAQLLPVTESEHANR 300
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_sim  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_mau  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_ere  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_tel  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_san  EIMGMYTREVHAFQVVLNQLCHLWIDSTEYECRLAISLPKSPPSASSTEDLANSSILTG 360
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_sim  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_mau  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_ere  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_tel  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_san  SGSPNSSASAESGELLESGKVAAMHNDAKSALHNWYIQRTHFSQPMRFQTLIGVVQMMHKV 420
tll_yak  *****

tll_mel  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_sim  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_mau  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_ere  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_tel  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_san  SSPTIEELFFRKTIIGDITIVKLISIMYSQRKI 452
tll_yak  *****

```

FIGURE S19. Embryonic hybrid inviability does not occur in *mel/tei* hybrids. No line of *D. teissieri* showed either embryonic inviability or abdominal ablations when crossed with *D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, or *D. mauritiana* females. The vast majority of assays revealed no dead embryos. **A.** *mel/tei* male hybrids. **B.** *sim/tei* male hybrids. **C.** *mau/tei* male hybrids. **D.** *mel/tei* female hybrids. **E.** *sim/tei* female hybrids. **F.** *mau/tei* female hybrids. tei1: Balancha_1; tei2: Balancha_2, tei3: Balancha_3, tei4: House_Bioko_0, tei5: House_Bioko_1, tei6: House_Bioko_2, tei7: La_Lope_Gabon, tei8: Selinda, tei9: Zimbabwe, tei10: cascade_2_1, tei11: cascade_2_2; tei12: cascade_2_4, tei13: cascade_4_1, tei14: cascade_4_2, tei15: cascade_4_3, tei16: cascade_4_4, tei17: cascade_4_5, tei18: cascade_4_6, tei19: Bata_2, tei20: Bata_8.

FIGURE S20. Divergence in *giant* in the *melanogaster* species subgroup. A. The evolutionary timing of gt^{mel} and its interactor leading to HI. The gt allele responsible for HI in hybrids with *D. santomea* evolved before *mel*, *sim*, and *mau* had a common ancestor (Blue branch). At least one of the interactors of gt^{mel} is not shared with *D. teissieri* which indicates that such element must have evolved after the last common ancestor of *D. santomea* and *D. teissieri* speciated (Red branch).

FIGURE S21. Experimental design to generated a GFP-mediated disruption of *tlh_{mel}*.

REFERENCES

- Bachtrog D., K. Thornton, A. Clark, and P. Andolfatto, 2006 Extensive introgression of mitochondrial DNA relative to nuclear genes in the *Drosophila yakuba* species group. *Evolution* 60: 292–302.
- Bischof J., R. K. Maeda, M. Hediger, F. Karch, and K. Basler, 2007 An optimized transgenesis system for *Drosophila* using germ-line-specific ϕ C31 integrases. *PNAS* 104: 3312–3317.
- Bomblies K., J. Lempe, P. Epple, N. Warthmann, C. Lanz, *et al.*, 2007 Autoimmune response as a mechanism for a Dobzhansky-Muller-type incompatibility syndrome in plants. *PLoS Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050236>
- Brand C. L., S. B. Kingan, L. Wu, and D. Garrigan, 2013 A selective sweep across species boundaries in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst123>
- Brideau N. J., H. A. Flores, J. Wang, S. Maheshwari, X. Wang, *et al.*, 2006 Two Dobzhansky-Muller Genes interact to cause hybrid lethality in *Drosophila*. *Science* 314: 1292–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1133953>
- Brönner G., Q. Chu-LaGraff, C. Q. Doe, B. Cohen, D. Weigel, *et al.*, 1994 Sp1/egr-like zinc-finger protein required for endoderm specification and germ-layer formation in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 369: 664–668. <https://doi.org/10.1038/369664a0>

Brown J. B., N. Boley, R. Eisman, G. E. May, M. H. Stoiber, *et al.*, 2014 Diversity and dynamics of the *Drosophila* transcriptome.

Nature 512: 393–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12962>

Bucher G., 2004 Divergent segmentation mechanism in the short germ insect *Tribolium* revealed by giant expression and function.

Development 131: 1729–1740. <https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.01073>

Capovilla M., E. D. Eldon, and V. Pirrotta, 1992 The giant gene of *Drosophila* encodes a b-ZIP DNA-binding protein that regulates the expression of other segmentation gap genes. Development (Cambridge, England) 114: 99–112.

Cattani M. V., and D. C. Presgraves, 2012 Incompatibility between *X* chromosome factor and pericentric heterochromatic region causes lethality in hybrids between *Drosophila melanogaster* and its sibling species. Genetics 191: 549–559.

Cauret C. M. S., M.-T. Gansauge, A. S. Tupper, B. L. S. Furman, M. Knytl, *et al.*, 2020 Developmental systems drift and the drivers of sex chromosome evolution. Molecular Biology and Evolution 37: 799–810. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msz268>

Cerny A. C., D. Grossmann, G. Bucher, and M. Klingler, 2008 The *Tribolium* ortholog of *knirps* and *knirps*-related is crucial for head segmentation but plays a minor role during abdominal patterning. Developmental Biology 321: 284–294.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.05.527>

- Chang W., D. R. Matute, and M. Kreitman, 2021 Rapid evolution of the functionally conserved gap gene *giant* in *Drosophila*. bioRxiv 2021.07.08.451553. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.08.451553>
- Clark A. G., M. B. Eisen, D. R. Smith, C. M. Bergman, and the *Drosophila* 12 Genomes Consortium, 2007 Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny. *Nature* 450: 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06341>
- Cook R. K., M. E. Deal, J. A. Deal, R. D. Garton, C. A. Brown, *et al.*, 2010 A new resource for characterizing *X*-linked genes in *Drosophila melanogaster*: Systematic coverage and subdivision of the *X* chromosome with nested, *Y*-linked duplications. *Genetics* 186: 1095–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.110.123265>
- Cooper B. S., P. S. Ginsberg, M. Turelli, and D. R. Matute, 2017 *Wolbachia* in the *Drosophila yakuba* complex: Pervasive frequency variation and weak cytoplasmic incompatibility, but no apparent effect on reproductive isolation. *Genetics* 205: 333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.116.196238>
- Coughlan J. M., and D. R. Matute, 2020 The importance of intrinsic postzygotic barriers throughout the speciation process. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 375: 20190533. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0533>

Coyne J. A., 1985 Genetic studies of three sibling species of *Drosophila* with relationship to theories of speciation. Genetical Research. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672300022643>

Coyne J. A., S. Simeonidis, and P. Rooney, 1998 Relative paucity of genes causing inviability in hybrids between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. Genetics 150: 1091–1103.

Coyne J. A., S. Elwyn, S. Y. Kim, and A. Llopart, 2004 Genetic studies of two sister species in the *Drosophila melanogaster* subgroup, *D. yakuba* and *D. santomea*. Genetics Research 84: 11–26.

Coyne J. A., and H. A. Orr, 2004 *Speciation*. Sinauer Associates.

Crombach A., M. A. García-Solache, and J. Jaeger, 2014 Evolution of early development in dipterans: Reverse-engineering the gap gene network in the moth midge *Clogmia albipunctata* (Psychodidae). BioSystems 123: 74–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystems.2014.06.003>

Crombach A., K. R. Wotton, E. Jiménez-Guri, and J. Jaeger, 2016 Gap gene regulatory dynamics evolve along a genotype network. Molecular Biology and Evolution 33: 1293–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw013>

Cutter A. D., and J. D. Bundus, 2020 Speciation and the developmental alarm clock. eLife 9: e56276.

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.56276>

Darwin C., 1859 *The origin of species by means of natural selection*.

DePristo M. A., E. Banks, R. Poplin, K. V. Garimella, J. R. Maguire, *et al.*, 2011 A framework for variation discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data. Nature genetics 43: 491–498.

Dobzhansky T., 1937 Genetic nature of species differences. The American Naturalist 71: 404–420. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2457293>

Dos Santos G., A. J. Schroeder, J. L. Goodman, V. B. Strelets, M. A. Crosby, *et al.*, 2015a FlyBase: Introduction of the *Drosophila melanogaster* Release 6 reference genome assembly and large-scale migration of genome annotations. Nucleic Acids Research 43: D690–D697. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku1099>

Eldon E. D., and V. Pirrotta, 1991 Interactions of the *Drosophila* gap gene *giant* with maternal and zygotic pattern-forming genes. Development (Cambridge, England) 111: 367–378.

Ferree P. M., and D. A. Barbash, 2009 Species-specific heterochromatin prevents mitotic chromosome segregation to cause hybrid lethality in *Drosophila*. PLOS Biology 7: e1000234. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000234>

García-Solache M., J. Jaeger, and M. Akam, 2010 A systematic analysis of the gap gene system in the moth midge *Clogmia albipunctata*. *Developmental Biology* 344: 306–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2010.04.019>

Garrigan D., S. B. Kingan, A. J. Geneva, P. Andolfatto, A. G. Clark, *et al.*, 2012 Genome sequencing reveals complex speciation in the *Drosophila simulans* clade. *Genome Research* 22: 1499–1511. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.130922.111>

Gaunt S. J., 2002 Conservation in the *Hox* code during morphological evolution. *International Journal of Developmental Biology* 38: 549–552.

Gavin-Smyth J., and D. R. Matute, 2013 Embryonic lethality leads to hybrid male inviability in hybrids between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. santomea*. *Ecology and Evolution* 3: 1580–1589. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.573>

Gibson D. G., L. Young, R.-Y. Chuang, J. C. Venter, C. A. Hutchison, *et al.*, 2009 Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. *Nature methods* 6: 343–345.

Goltsev Y., W. Hsiong, G. Lanzaro, and M. Levine, 2004 Different combinations of gap repressors for common stripes in *Anopheles* and *Drosophila* embryos. *Developmental Biology* 275: 435–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2004.08.021>

Gordon K. L., and I. Ruvinsky, 2012 Tempo and mode in evolution of transcriptional regulation. PLOS Genetics 8: e1002432.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002432>

Groth A. C., M. Fish, R. Nusse, and M. P. Calos, 2004 Construction of transgenic *Drosophila* by using the site-specific integrase from phage ϕ C31. Genetics 166: 1775–1782.

Hare E. E., B. K. Peterson, and M. B. Eisen, 2008a A careful look at binding site reorganization in the even-skipped enhancers of *Drosophila* and sepsids. PLoS genetics, 4(11), p.e1000268.

Hare E. E., B. K. Peterson, V. N. Iyer, R. Meier, and M. B. Eisen, 2008b Sepsid *even-skipped* enhancers are functionally conserved in *Drosophila* despite lack of sequence conservation. PLoS Genetics 4. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000106>

Hartman T. R., D. Zinshteyn, H. K. Schofield, E. Nicolas, A. Okada, *et al.*, 2010 *Drosophila* *Boi* limits hedgehog levels to suppress follicle stem cell proliferation. Journal of Cell Biology 191: 943–952. <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.201007142>

He B. Z., A. K. Holloway, S. J. Maerkl, and M. Kreitman, 2011 Does positive selection drive transcription factor binding site turnover? a test with *Drosophila* *cis*-regulatory modules. PLoS Genetics 7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002053>

Hu T. T., M. B. Eisen, K. R. Thornton, and P. Andolfatto, 2013 A second-generation assembly of the *Drosophila simulans* genome provides new insights into patterns of lineage-specific divergence. *Genome Research* 23: 89–98.
<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.141689.112>

Huang W., A. Massouras, Y. Inoue, J. Peiffer, M. Ràmia, *et al.*, 2014 Natural variation in genome architecture among 205 *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic Reference Panel lines. *Genome Research* 24: 1193–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.171546.113>

Jaeger J., 2011 *The gap gene network*.

Janssens H., K. Siggins, D. Cicin-Sain, E. Jiménez-Guri, M. Musy, *et al.*, 2014 A quantitative atlas of *even-skipped* and *Hunchback* expression in *Clogmia albipunctata* (Diptera: Psychodidae) blastoderm embryos. *EvoDevo* 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2041-9139-5-1>

Johnson N. A., and A. H. Porter, 2007 Evolution of branched regulatory genetic pathways: Directional selection on pleiotropic loci accelerates developmental system drift. *Genetica* 129: 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10709-006-0033-2>

Johnson N. A., 2010 Hybrid incompatibility genes: Remnants of a genomic battlefield? *Trends in Genetics*, 26: 317-325.

- Johnson R. C., G. W. Nelson, J. L. Troyer, J. A. Lautenberger, B. D. Kessing, *et al.*, 2010 Accounting for multiple comparisons in a genome-wide association study (GWAS). *BMC genomics* 11: 1–6.
- Kaminker J., C. Bergman, B. Kronmiller, J. Carlson, R. Svirskas, *et al.*, 2002 The transposable elements of the *Drosophila melanogaster* euchromatin: a genomics perspective. *Genome Biology* 3: 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2002-3-12-research0084>
- Kinsey J. D., 1967 Studies on an embryonic lethal hybrid in *Drosophila*. *Development* 17: 405–423.
- Kondrashov A. S., S. Sunyaev, and F. A. Kondrashov, 2002 Dobzhansky–Muller incompatibilities in protein evolution. *PNAS* 99: 14878–14883. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.232565499>
- Kraut R., and M. Levine, 1991 Mutually repressive interactions between the gap genes *giant* and *Krüppel* define middle body regions of the *Drosophila* embryo. *Development* 111: 611–621.
- Lack J. B., J. D. Lange, A. D. Tang, R. B. Corbett-Detig, and J. E. Pool, 2016 A thousand fly genomes: An expanded *Drosophila* genome Nexus. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 33: 3308–3313. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw195>

- Lee A. P., E. G. Koh, A. Tay, S. Brenner, and B. Venkatesh, 2006 Highly conserved syntenic blocks at the vertebrate Hox loci and conserved regulatory elements within and outside Hox gene clusters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103: 6994–6999.
- Lee H. Y., J. Y. Chou, L. Cheong, N. H. Chang, S. Y. Yang, *et al.*, 2008 Incompatibility of nuclear and mitochondrial genomes causes hybrid sterility between two yeast species. *Cell* 135: 1065–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.10.047>
- Li H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan, *et al.*, 2009 The sequence alignment/map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* 25: 2078–2079.
- Li H., and R. Durbin, 2009 Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* 25: 1754–1760. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp324>
- Li H., 2013 Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. *arXiv preprint arXiv 00: 3*. <https://doi.org/arXiv:1303.3997> [q-bio.GN]
- Lindsley D. L., and G. G. Zimm, 1992 The genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*.

Llopart A., E. Brud, N. Pettie, and J. M. Comeron, 2018 Support for the dominance theory in *Drosophila* transcriptomes. *Genetics* 210: 703–718. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.118.301229>

Ludwig M. Z., A. Palsson, E. Alekseeva, C. M. Bergman, J. Nathan, *et al.*, 2005 Functional evolution of a *cis*-regulatory module. *PLoS Biology* 3: 0588–0598. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0030093>

Lynch V. J., 2009 Use with caution: Developmental systems divergence and potential pitfalls of animal models. *Yale J Biol Med* 82: 53–66.

Mack K. L., and M. W. Nachman, 2017 Gene regulation and speciation. *Trends in Genetics* 33: 68–80.

MacKay T. F. C., S. Richards, E. A. Stone, A. Barbadilla, J. F. Ayroles, *et al.*, 2012 The *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic Reference Panel. *Nature* 482: 173–178. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10811>

Maddison W., and D. Maddison, 2010 Mesquite 2. Manual 1–258.

Maheshwari S., and D. A. Barbash, 2011 The genetics of hybrid incompatibilities. *Annual Review of Genetics* 45: 331–355. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-genet-110410-132514>

Manu, M. Z. Ludwig, and M. Kreitman, 2013 Sex-specific pattern formation during early *Drosophila* development. *Genetics* 194: 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.112.148205>

Manzanares M., H. Wada, N. Itasaki, P. A. Trainor, R. Krumlauf, *et al.*, 2000 Conservation and elaboration of Hox gene regulation during evolution of the vertebrate head. *Nature* 408: 854–857.

Matute D. R., I. A. Butler, D. A. Turissini, and J. A. Coyne, 2010 A test of the snowball theory for the rate of evolution of hybrid incompatibilities. *Science* 329: 1518–1521. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193440>

Matute D. R., and J. Gavin-Smyth, 2014 fine mapping of dominant *X*-linked incompatibility alleles in *Drosophila* hybrids. *PLoS Genetics* 10. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004270>

Matute D. R., J. Gavin-Smyth, and G. Liu, 2014 Variable post-zygotic isolation in *Drosophila melanogaster*/*D. simulans* hybrids. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12422>

McKenna A., M. Hanna, E. Banks, A. Sivachenko, K. Cibulskis, *et al.*, 2010 The Genome Analysis Toolkit: A MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res.* 20: 1297–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.107524.110>

- Miller C. J. J., and D. R. Matute, 2017 The effect of temperature on *Drosophila* hybrid fitness. G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics 7: 377–385. <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.116.034926>
- Mohler J., E. D. Eldon, and V. Pirrotta, 1989 A novel spatial transcription pattern associated with the segmentation gene, *giant*, of *Drosophila*. The EMBO journal 8: 1539–1548.
- Moran B. M., C. Y. Payne, D. L. Powell, E. N. K. Iverson, S. M. Banerjee, *et al.*, 2021 A lethal genetic incompatibility between naturally hybridizing species in Mitochondrial Complex I. BioRxiv. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.13.452279>
- Moyle L. C., and T. Nakazato, 2010 Hybrid incompatibility “snowballs” between *Solanum* species. Science 329: 1521–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193063>
- Muller H. J., 1942 Isolating mechanisms, evolution and temperature. Biology Symposium, 6, 71-125.
- Nagy O., I. Nuez, R. Savisaar, A. E. Peluffo, A. Yassin, *et al.*, 2018 Correlated evolution of two copulatory organs via a single *cis*-regulatory nucleotide change. Current Biology 28: 3450–3457.
- Ni X., Y. E. Zhang, N. Nègre, S. Chen, M. Long, *et al.*, 2012 Adaptive evolution and the birth of ctcf binding sites in the *Drosophila* genome. PLoS Biology 10. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001420>

- Nitta K. R., A. Jolma, Y. Yin, E. Morgunova, T. Kivioja, *et al.*, 2015 Conservation of transcription factor binding specificities across 600 million years of bilateria evolution, (B. Ren, Ed.). eLife 4: e04837. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.04837>
- Nosil P., and D. Schluter, 2011 The genes underlying the process of speciation. Trends in ecology & evolution, 26(4), pp.160-167.
- Orr H. a, 1993 Haldane's rule has multiple genetic causes. Nature 361: 532–533. <https://doi.org/10.1038/361532a0>
- Palmer M. E., and M. W. Feldman, 2009 Dynamics of hybrid incompatibility in gene networks in a constant environment. Evolution 63: 418–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00577.x>
- Pavlicev M., and G. P. Wagner, 2012 A model of developmental evolution: Selection, pleiotropy and compensation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 27(6), pp.316-322.
- Perrimon N., L. Engstrom, and A. P. Mahowald, 1984 Developmental genetics of the 2e-F region of the *Drosophila* X chromosome: A region rich in “developmentally important” genes. Genetics 108: 559–572.
- Petschek J. P., N. Perrimon, and A. P. Mahowald, 1987 Region-specific defects in *l(1)giant* embryos of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Developmental Biology 119: 175–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-1606\(87\)90219-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-1606(87)90219-3)

Phadnis N., and H. A. Orr, 2009 A single gene causes both male sterility and segregation distortion in *Drosophila* hybrids. Science.

<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1163934>

Phadnis N., E. P. Baker, J. C. Cooper, K. A. Frizzell, E. Hsieh, *et al.*, 2015 An essential cell cycle regulation gene causes hybrid inviability in *Drosophila*. Science (New York, N.Y.) 350: 1552–5. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7504>

Pool J. E., 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.

Powell D. L., M. García-Olazábal, M. Keegan, P. Reilly, K. Du, *et al.*, 2020 Natural hybridization reveals incompatible alleles that cause melanoma in swordtail fish. Science 368: 731–736.

Presgraves D. C., 2003 A fine-scale genetic analysis of hybrid incompatibilities in *Drosophila*. Genetics 163: 955–972.

Presgraves D. C., and C. D. Meiklejohn, 2021 Hybrid sterility, genetic conflict and complex speciation: lessons from the *Drosophila simulans* clade species. Front. Genet. 0. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2021.669045>

R Core Team, 2016 R Development Core Team.

- Rebeiz M., M. Ramos-Womack, S. Jeong, P. Andolfatto, T. Werner, *et al.*, 2009 Evolution of the *tan* Locus contributed to pigment loss in *Drosophila santomea*: A Response to Matute et al. Cell 139: 1189–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2009.11.004>
- Reinitz J., and M. Levine, 1990 Control of the initiation of homeotic gene expression by the gap genes *giant* and *tailless* in *Drosophila*. Developmental Biology 140: 57–72. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-1606\(90\)90053-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-1606(90)90053-L)
- Rivera-Pomar R., X. Lu, N. Perrimon, H. Taubert, and H. Jäckle, 1995 Activation of posterior gap gene expression in the *Drosophila* blastoderm. Nature, 376: 253-256
- Rogers R. L., J. M. Cridland, L. Shao, T. T. Hu, P. Andolfatto, *et al.*, 2014 Landscape of standing variation for tandem duplications in *Drosophila yakuba* and *Drosophila simulans*. Molecular Biology and Evolution 31: 1750–1766. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu124>
- Rogers R. L., L. Shao, and K. R. Thornton, 2017 Tandem duplications lead to novel expression patterns through exon shuffling in *Drosophila yakuba*. PLoS Genetics 13. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1006795>
- Santini S., J. L. Boore, and A. Meyer, 2003 Evolutionary conservation of regulatory elements in vertebrate Hox gene clusters. Genome research 13: 1111–1122.

- Santos G. Dos, A. J. Schroeder, J. L. Goodman, V. B. Strelets, M. A. Crosby, *et al.*, 2015b FlyBase: Introduction of the *Drosophila melanogaster* Release 6 reference genome assembly and large-scale migration of genome annotations. Nucleic Acids Research 43: D690–D697. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku1099>
- Sawamura K., T. Taira, and T. K. Watanabe, 1993a Hybrid lethal systems in the *Drosophila melanogaster* species complex. I. The maternal hybrid rescue (*mhr*) gene of *Drosophila simulans*. Genetics 133: 299–305.
- Sawamura K., and M. T. Yamamoto, 1993 Cytogenetical localization of Zygotic hybrid rescue (*Zhr*), a *Drosophila melanogaster* gene that rescues interspecific hybrids from embryonic lethality. MGG Molecular & General Genetics. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00276943>
- Sawamura K., M. T. Yamamoto, and T. K. Watanabe, 1993b Hybrid lethal systems in the *Drosophila melanogaster* species complex. II. The Zygotic hybrid rescue (*Zhr*) gene of *D. melanogaster*. Genetics 133: 307–313.
- Schiffman J. S., and P. L. Ralph, 2021 System drift and speciation. Evolution. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14356>
- Schrider D. R., J. Ayroles, D. R. Matute, and A. D. Kern, 2018 Supervised machine learning reveals introgressed loci in the genomes of *Drosophila simulans* and *D. sechellia*. PLoS genetics. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007341>

Schulz C., and D. Tautz, 1995 Zygotic caudal regulation by *hunchback* and its role in abdominal segment formation of the *Drosophila* embryo. *Development* (Cambridge, England) 121: 1023–1028.

Serrato-Capuchina A., J. Wang, E. Earley, D. Peede, K. Isbell, *et al.*, 2020a Paternally inherited p-element copy number affects the magnitude of hybrid dysgenesis in *Drosophila simulans* and *D. melanogaster*. *Genome Biol Evol* 12: 808–826.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evaa084>

Serrato-Capuchina A., E. R. R. D’Agostino, D. Peede, B. Roy, K. Isbell, *et al.*, 2021 P-elements strengthen reproductive isolation within the *Drosophila simulans* species complex. *Evolution* 75: 2425-2440

Shull G. H., 1923 The species concept from the point of view of a geneticist. *American Journal of Botany* 10: 221–228.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2435375>

Skeath J. B., B. A. Wilson, S. E. Romero, M. J. Snee, Y. Zhu, *et al.*, 2017 The extracellular metalloprotease AdamTS-A anchors neural lineages in place within and preserves the architecture of the central nervous system. *Development*, 144: 3102-3113.
<https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.145854>

- Sommer R. J., 2012 Evolution of regulatory networks: Nematode vulva induction as an example of developmental systems drift, pp. 79–91 in *Evolutionary Systems Biology*, Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology. edited by Soyer O. S. Springer, New York, NY.
- Struhl G., P. Johnston, and P. A. Lawrence, 1992 Control of *Drosophila* body pattern by the hunchback morphogen gradient. *Cell* 69: 237–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674\(92\)90405-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(92)90405-2)
- Sturtevant A. H., 1920 Genetic Studies on *Drosophila Simulans*. I. Introduction. Hybrids with *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 5: 488–500. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.b.21128>
- Suvorov A., B. Y. Kim, J. Wang, E. E. Armstrong, D. Peede, *et al.*, 2021 Widespread introgression across a phylogeny of 155 *Drosophila* genomes. *Current Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.10.052>
- Tamura K., S. Subramanian, and S. Kumar, 2004 Temporal patterns of fruit fly (*Drosophila*) evolution revealed by mutation clocks. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 21: 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msg236>
- Tang S., and D. C. Presgraves, 2009 Evolution of the *Drosophila* nuclear pore complex results in multiple hybrid incompatibilities. *Science* 323: 779–782. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1169123>

Thibault S. T., M. A. Singer, W. Y. Miyazaki, B. Milash, N. A. Dompe, *et al.*, 2004 A complementary transposon tool kit for *Drosophila melanogaster* using *P* and *piggyBac*. *Nature genetics* 36: 283–287.

Toivonen J. M., K. M. C. O'Dell, N. Petit, S. C. Irvine, G. K. Knight, *et al.*, 2001 *Technical knockout*, a *Drosophila* model of mitochondrial deafness. *Genetics*. *Genetics*, 159: 241-254.

True J. R., and E. S. Haag, 2001 Developmental system drift and flexibility in evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution & development*, 3: 109-119.

Tulchinsky A. Y., N. A. Johnson, and A. H. Porter, 2014 Hybrid incompatibility despite pleiotropic constraint in a sequence-based bioenergetic model of transcription factor binding. *Genetics* 198: 1645–1654. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.114.171397>

Turissini D. A., G. Liu, J. R. David, and D. R. Matute, 2015 The evolution of reproductive isolation in the *Drosophila yakuba* complex of species. *J. Evol. Biol.* 28: 557–575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12588>

Turissini D. A., and D. R. Matute, 2017 Fine scale mapping of genomic introgressions within the *Drosophila yakuba* clade. *PLOS Genetics* 13: e1006971. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1006971>

- Turissini D. A., J. A. McGirr, S. S. Patel, J. R. David, and D. R. Matute, 2018 The rate of evolution of postmating-prezygotic reproductive isolation in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 35: 312–334. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msx271>
- Venkat A., M. W. Hahn, and J. W. Thornton, 2018 Multinucleotide mutations cause false inferences of lineage-specific positive selection. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*. 2: 1280-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0584-5>
- Venken K. J. T., E. Popodi, S. L. Holtzman, K. L. Schulze, S. Park, *et al.*, 2010 A molecularly defined duplication set for the *X* chromosome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 186: 1111–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.110.121285>
- Wang X., and R. J. Sommer, 2011 Antagonism of LIN-17/Frizzled and LIN-18/Ryk in Nematode vulva induction reveals evolutionary alterations in core developmental pathways. *PLOS Biology* 9: e1001110. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001110>
- Wang R. J., M. A. White, and B. A. Payseur, 2015 The pace of hybrid incompatibility evolution in house mice. *Genetics* 201: 229–242. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.115.179499>
- Weir J. J., 1985 An unnoticed factor in evolution. *Nature* 31: 194–194. <https://doi.org/10.1038/031194b0>
- Weiss K. M., and S. M. Fullerton, 2000 Phenogenetic drift and the evolution of genotype-phenotype relationships. *Theoretical population biology*, 57: 187-195.

Wellbrock C., E. Geissinger, A. Gómez, P. Fischer, K. Friedrich, *et al.*, 1998 Signalling by the oncogenic receptor tyrosine kinase Xmrk leads to activation of STAT5 in *Xiphophorus* melanoma. *Oncogene* 16: 3047–3056.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.onc.1201844>

Wilson M. J., M. Havler, and P. K. Dearden, 2010 Giant, Krüppel, and caudal act as gap genes with extensive roles in patterning the honeybee embryo. *Developmental Biology* 339: 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2009.12.015>

Wotton K. R., E. Jimenez-Guri, A. Crombach, H. Janssens, A. Alcaine-Colet, *et al.*, 2015a Quantitative system drift compensates for altered maternal inputs to the gap gene network of the scuttle fly *Megaselia abdita*. *eLife* 2015.
<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.04785>

Wu X., R. Vakani, and S. Small, 1998 Two distinct mechanisms for differential positioning of gene expression borders involving the *Drosophila* gap protein *giant*. *Development* 125: 3765–3774.

Yang Z., 1997 PAML: a program package for phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Computer applications in the biosciences*, 13: 555-556.

Yang Z., 2007 PAML 4: Phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 24: 1586-1591. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msm088>

Zuellig M. P., and A. L. Sweigart, 2018 Gene duplicates cause hybrid lethality between sympatric species of *Mimulus*. *PLOS Genetics* 14: e1007130. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007130>