

Sexual selection against natural hybrids may contribute to reinforcement in a house mouse hybrid zone

Yasmin Latour, Marco Perriat-Sanguinet, Pierre Caminade, Pierre Boursot, Carole Smadja, Guila Ganem

► To cite this version:

Yasmin Latour, Marco Perriat-Sanguinet, Pierre Caminade, Pierre Boursot, Carole Smadja, et al.. Sexual selection against natural hybrids may contribute to reinforcement in a house mouse hybrid zone. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2014, 281 (1776), pp.20132733. 10.1098/rspb.2013.2733. hal-02347496

HAL Id: hal-02347496 https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-02347496

Submitted on 14 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Last version

- 2 FULL TITLE: Sexual selection against natural hybrids may contribute to reinforcement in a
- 3 house mouse hybrid zone
- 4 Author list:
- 5 Yasmin LATOUR,
- 6 Marco PERRIAT-SANGUINET,
- 7 Pierre CAMINADE,
- 8 Pierre BOURSOT,
- 9 Carole M. SMADJA,
- 10 Guila GANEM
- 11 Authors' affiliation:
- 12 CNRS, Université Montpellier 2, Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier -
- 13 UMR5554
- 14 Address:
- 15 Université Montpellier 2 Place E. Bataillon
- 16 CC065, ISE-M
- 17 34095 Montpellier CEDEX 05 France
- 18 Authors for correspondence:
- 19 Yasmin Latour & Guila Ganem
- 20 e-mail: <u>yasmin.latour@gmail.com</u>
- 21 e-mail: guila.ganem@univ-montp2.fr

ABSTRACT: Sexual selection may hinder gene flow across contact zones when hybrid 23 recognition signals are discriminated against. We tested this hypothesis in a unimodal hybrid 24 zone between Mus musculus musculus and M. m. domesticus where a pattern of reinforcement 25 was described and lower hybrid fitness documented. We presented mice from the border of 26 the hybrid zone with a choice between opposite sex urine from same subspecies versus 27 hybrids sampled in different locations across the zone. While no preference was evidenced in 28 domesticus mice, musculus males discriminated in favour of musculus signals and against 29 hybrid signals. Remarkably, the pattern of hybrid unattractiveness did not vary across the 30 hybrid zone. Moreover, allopatric populations tested in the same conditions did not 31 discriminate against hybrid signals, indicating character displacement for signal perception or 32 preference. Finally, habituation-discrimination tests assessing similarities between signals 33 pointed out that hybrid signals differed from the parental ones. Overall, our results suggest 34 35 that perception of hybrids as unattractive has evolved in border populations of musculus after the secondary contact with *domesticus*. We discuss the mechanisms involved in hybrid 36 37 unattractiveness, and the potential impact of asymmetric sexual selection on gene flow and 38 isolation between the two subspecies.

39

40 KEY WORDS: hybrid signal, mate recognition, urinary cues, reproductive character
41 displacement, speciation.

43 INTRODUCTION

Hybridisation in nature is mostly observed at the limits of species or population range. Its 44 presence in the wild can either facilitate or impede speciation [1-3]. If hybridisation is 45 maladaptive, selection is expected to favour the evolution of assortative mate preference in 46 the two hybridising populations, a process called reinforcement [4-7]. This adaptation can be 47 driven by the cost of hybridisation between parental populations [8-10], but not only. 48 Interactions with the hybrids could also be selected against. In particular, if hybrid signals are 49 less attractive, sexual selection could reduce gene flow across the hybrid zone [11, 12]. 50 Mating signals evolve under sexual and ecological selection [13]. Their complexity depends 51 52 on the number and characteristics of the genes involved in their determinism [14-16] as well as on environmental factors influencing their expression and their perception [13, 17]. Hybrid 53 genotypes could produce unrecognised or unattractive signals when new associations of 54 55 alleles are brought together by hybridisation [18], and sexual selection can occur against such signals (review in Electronic Supplementary Materials ESM1). Sexual selection is considered 56 57 a powerful potential driver of speciation [19]. Nevertheless, it was recently argued that empirical demonstration of its importance is still insufficient, notably because most studies do 58 not "relate variation and divergence in mating traits and preferences to gene flow and genetic 59 population differentiation" [20]. Here we investigate mating traits divergence between hybrid 60 populations with different level of genetic divergence from their parental populations. The 61 rationale behind our study is that if individuals of parental populations seldom mate with 62 hybrids, gene flow across the hybrid zone can be hindered and the established zone could act 63 as a barrier between incipient species. In contrast, hybrids could form a bridge between 64 parental genomes if fitness of crosses between neighbouring, genetically less divergent, 65 populations allows step-by-step gene flow across the zone [21], but only if they are not 66 discriminated against [22]. 67

68 Our study model is a unimodal hybrid zone formed during a secondary contact between two

69 subspecies of the house mouse *Mus musculus musculus* and *M. m. domesticus* (thereafter

70 *musculus* and *domesticus*). The history of divergence between these subspecies is

characterised by a long initial period in allopatry (a few hundred thousand years ago [23, 24]),

72 which could account for the accumulation of numerous genetic incompatibilities resulting in

relation against hybridisation and underlying the formation of a tension zone crossing

74 Europe [25-29].

Olfactory signals present in mice urine were shown to play a central role in social and sexual communication and to be shaped both by sexual and natural selection [30-32], and a mouse nose can detect odour differences in less than a second [33].

78 Populations of both subspecies at the border of the hybrid zone display assortative mate

79 preference for signals present in the urine, and reproductive character displacement (for both

80 preference and signals) was documented between border and allopatric populations of the two

subspecies in male and female mice [16, 34, 35]. Wild hybrids show preference for

82 *domesticus* odour with a steep shift from *domesticus* to *musculus* odour preference roughly

83 10 km north of the genetic centre of the Danish hybrid zone [16], while in other parts of the

zone this shift coincides with the genetic centre of the zone [35].

85 The present study addresses the signal component of potential hybrid mates, by assessing how

such signals are perceived, mainly by the choosiest subspecies (*musculus*) [16, 34, 36].

87 The specific questions addressed here are:

1) Are signals of hybrid mice discriminated against by the two parental subspecies?
What is the generality of this pattern? Does it vary with the genetic characteristics (hybrid
index) across the hybrid zone? To address this series of questions we assessed: a) preference
of male and female mice of parental populations from the border of the hybrid zone during
two-way choice tests involving hybrid versus parental opposite sex urine as the stimuli; b) we

replicated this test changing the origin of parental urine; c) we replicated the test, presenting
against the parental urine hybrid urine from different locations across the hybrid zone. We
predicted that if discrimination occurred and preference was linked to genetic similarities
between the chooser and the stimuli, assortative preference would be more marked in
presence of distant as compared to neighbour hybrids.

98 2) Did sexual selection against hybrids evolve in the hybrid zone? We compared
99 patterns of preference in populations of mice distant versus at the borders of the hybrid zone
100 (map in ESM2).

3) What may be the causation of hybrid unattractiveness, i.e. how different are hybrid
and parental odours? We investigated odour similarities between hybrids and the two parental
subspecies and addressed whether they were distinctively different (i.e. transgressive), using
habituation-discrimination/generalisation tests [37].

105

106 MATERIAL & METHODS

107 Biological material

108 *Mice*

All mice involved in this study were either wild trapped in Jutland, Denmark, in commensal indoor habitats, in October 2010 and June 2011, or descendants of these, bred in the lab (see details in ESM3). We sampled mice in several farms at the northern and southern edges of the hybrid zone ("border mice"), across the hybrid zone ("hybrid mice") and approximately 40 km north of *musculus* border of the zone where "pure" *musculus* individuals putatively occur ("close allopatric mice", see ESM2). Hybrid mice used in this study were wild, and after stalling in laboratory conditions for several months, were used as urine donors for subsequent

- 116 behavioural experiments (see below). Border and close allopatric mice were first and second
- 117 generation progeny of wild trapped mice, and provided test mice and urine stimuli.

118 *Genetic markers and hybrid index estimation*

119 We genotyped wild mice using loci with insertion/deletion polymorphisms of transposable elements, determined to have contrasted allele frequencies (alternatively fixed or nearly so) 120 between the two subspecies in allopatry (markers design in ESM3). Eighteen of them are 121 autosomal, two are X-linked and one Y-linked (methods as in ref. [38], described in ESM4). 122 On this basis, population samples of the present study could be characterised by a multilocus 123 hybrid index (HI, defined throughout as the proportion of *musculus* ancestry) estimated by 124 maximum likelihood [e.g. 39] given the parental allele frequencies estimated in samples from 125 populations more than 200 km away from the hybrid zone. 126

127 The genetic cline of the mouse hybrid zone is geographically well structured [25]. Hence,

128 geographic location of a sample is considered a good predictor of its average genetic

129 composition. Genetic typing involved a relatively limited number of markers as it served to

130 check that none of the studied populations or individuals was an outlier as compared to its

131 geographic origin, which could happen as a result of accidental, recent long distance

migration. The HI estimates of wild samples and their support limits are reported in figure 1

and ESM5.

134 Urinary stimuli

Urine donors were either first-generation-laboratory born (border or close allopatric
populations) or wild hybrid mice maintained in same standardised conditions for at least 2
months after trapping. Urine was collected at different times of the day and over several days
to capture intra- and inter-day variations in urine composition, both upon handling of mice
and pipetted from a cleaned surface, and stored at -20°C. All stimuli were pools of urine from
to 4 mice of the same sex and of different populations or farms to account for genetic and

environmental individual variance within a given category. In the specific case of hybrids,
categories were defined with regard to their geographical positions on the hybrid zone (figure
1), going from sites neighbouring *musculus* border (H1) to those closer to *domesticus* border
(H7). We only trapped one male in the H5 category, so we combined its urine with those of
males of the H6 category to match the minimum of 3 different urine donors in a pool. The
hybrid categories were intended to capture potential variations with reference to the shift of
the preference cline (see figure 1).

148 **Behavioural tests**

149 Mate preference was assessed from relative time spent by a mouse investigating two urinary stimuli deposited in two peripheral boxes connected to a Y maze during 5 minutes trials (two-150 way choice tests). Odour discrimination and ability to perceive differences between two 151 odorant stimuli was addressed via habituation-discrimination (or generalisation) tests. The 152 latter experiment is based on observations that mice investigate more novel stimuli than 153 familiar ones. Practically, a mouse is first presented with a single odour long enough to induce 154 familiarity (habituation), immediately after the same mouse is presented with two new 155 stimuli, which will be investigated differently if one is more similar to the habituation 156 157 stimulus than the other [review in 37, details in ESM3]. Preference tests involved one sex presented with urine pools of the opposite sex, and habituation tests involved males presented 158 with female urine. We used protocols described by Smadja and Ganem [40, 41], with minor 159 160 changes (see ESM3).

A total of 232 wild derived mice (*musculus* :122 males, 81 female; *domesticus* 20 males, 9 females) were involved in two-way choice experiments, and 39 male *musculus* in the habituation/discrimination or habituation/generalisation experiments ("the noses"). Female mice were tested when sexually receptive. All tested mice were unrelated to urine donors, and

pregnant females were excluded. Each different choice or discrimination test was conductedwith 8 to 17 unrelated mice.

167 Experimental designs

168 *1. Are signals of hybrid mice discriminated against by parental subspecies?*

169 1*a*. Discrimination against hybrids.

170 We first determined if males and females of border populations displayed homogamous

171 choice when presented with "musculus border" versus "domesticus border" stimuli. Mice

discriminating against heterosubspecific stimuli, i.e. male and female *musculus* mice and male

173 *domesticus* (see results), were involved in choice tests between a border conspecific stimulus

and a stimulus from the geographically closest hybrid category (H1 for *musculus* or H7 for

175 *domesticus*, see figure 1). We expected assortative preference if the stimuli differed and the

176 hybrid signal was discriminated against.

177 1*b*. Generality.

178 To test the generality of the assortative mate preference assessed in 1a, we performed a

179 control test presenting *musculus* border mice with a hybrid (H1) and a conspecific stimulus.

180 from close allopatry rather than from border (1a) populations. We predicted preference for the

allopatric signal if discrimination against the hybrid stimulus was independent of the

182 conspecific stimulus geographic origin..

183 1*c*. Variation.

184 We determined whether hybrid stimuli perception varied with their genetic or geographic

185 characteristics during choice tests where we diversified the origin of the hybrid stimulus

186 presented against the parental stimulus (hybrid categories described in figure 1). Only the

187 most discriminating subspecies, *musculus*, participated to these tests. If hybrid attractiveness

varied with geographical proximity or genetic similarity we expected higher discrimination
against hybrids more distant from the noses, Alternatively, all hybrids were perceived as
equally unattractive (or attractive).

191 2. Did discrimination against hybrid signals evolve in the hybrid zone?

192 To determine the origin of discrimination against hybrid signals (evolution in contact zone or

early divergence in allopatry), we assessed preference of close allopatric *musculus* mice

during choice tests between conspecific (*musculus* border) and H1 hybrid stimuli. We

195 expected mice from close allopatry to discriminate less between the stimuli than border mice

196 (test 1a) if discrimination against hybrid signals evolved in the contact zone.

197 *3. How similar are hybrid and parental odours?*

198 The two extreme hybrid categories (H1 and H7) odours were each compared to the

199 domesticus parent, via habituation-discrimination tests to ascertain that they differed from this

subspecies. A second test assessed whether H7 was more similar to *domesticus* than H1,

201 which is expected if odour determinism is additive and odour similarity parallels genetic

similarity. In line with what precedes, we tested whether similarity between H1 and

203 *domesticus* was higher than similarity between the two parental subspecies (ESM3). If the

204 hybrid stimulus shared similarities with *domesticus* we expected it to be less investigated than

the *musculus* stimulus, and if odour similarities with *domesticus* varied with genetic

similarities we expected H7 to be less investigated than H1.

207

208 Statistical analysis

209 Preference and discrimination were assessed by pair comparisons of time spent sniffing or210 touching the proposed stimuli. Random choice or absence of discrimination was concluded

when there was no significant difference between the times spent in contact with eitherstimulus.

213 To compare preference across tests, we used an index (R): time spent in contact with

homosubspecific stimulus divided by total time in contact with both stimuli. We performed a

215 mixed ANCOVA on this transformed variable (expR) with sex and hybrid category as fixed

factors, population as a random factor and motivation (i.e. the sum of time spent in the right

and left sides of the Y maze) as a covariable.

All statistical analyses were performed with R 2.15.0 software [42-44].

219

220 Results

221 1. Are signals of hybrid mice discriminated against by parental subspecies?

222 1a. Discrimination against hybrids.

Male and female *musculus* mice from populations at the border of the hybrid zone showed 223 assortative preference when presented with musculus versus their most neighbour hybrid 224 stimuli (H1, figure 2A&B; males: n=17, median=5.91s, V=130, p=0.009; females: n=10, 225 226 median=0.81s, V=49, p=0.027). In contrast, although border domesticus males discriminated in favour of their own subspecies during choice between musculus and domesticus stimuli 227 228 (figure 2B; n=10, median=2.65s, V=8, p=0.049), they did not show any directional choice when the alternative to their own subspecies signal was their most neighbour hybrid category 229 (H7, figure 2B; n=10, median=2.07s, V=18, p=0.375). Female *domesticus* didn't show any 230 directional choice when presented with *musculus versus domesticus* stimuli (figure 2A; n=9, 231 median=-0.92, V=20, p=0.8203). 232

233 1b. Generality

When border *musculus* mice were presented with a choice between a *musculus* stimulus from close allopatry (instead of border population in 1a) versus a hybrid stimulus, the allopatric signal was investigated significantly more than the hybrid one (paired Wilcoxon test: n=10, median=10.54, V=54, p=0.004).

238 1c. Variation.

Remarkably, preference did not vary with the hybrid category presented as an alternative to 239 the *musculus* stimulus (table 1; maximal model: df=138, F=1.18, p=0.319) nor interactively 240 with the sexes (table 1). However, male *musculus* was more choosy than the females (table 1; 241 minimal model: df=166, F=9.85, p=0.002), a pattern which did not vary with motivation 242 (table 1; maximal model: df=138, F=0.62, p=0.434), Considering direction of preference for 243 hybrid across the zone, a consistent trend was for hybrid stimuli to be less investigated than 244 245 *musculus* ones (figure 3; males: n=84, median=6.19s, V=3335, p=4.832e-12; females: n=61, median=0.91s, V=1406, p=9.529e-4). 246

247 2. Did discrimination against hybrid signals evolve in the hybrid zone?

Allopatric *musculus* mice did not show a directional preference when presented with a choice
between *musculus* versus hybrid stimuli (table 2; males: n=17, median=0.74, V=94, p=0.431;
females: n=10, median=0.70, V=40, p=0.232), while border mice presented with the same
stimuli discriminated against the hybrid one (table 2; males: n=17, median=5.91s, V=130,
p=0.009; females: n=10, median=0.81s, V=49, p=0.027).

253 3. How similar are hybrid and parental odours?

Assortative preference displayed by border *musculus* mice (results above) indicated that

255 hybrids and *musculus* signals differed. We hence compared hybrid and *domesticus* signals.

- 256 The results of the habituation-discrimination experiment indicated that signals of hybrid
- 257 categories neighbouring (H7) and most distant from *domesticus* (H1) were perceived as

different from *domesticus* (respectively figure 4a & 4b: n=8, V=35, p=0.016, and n=8, V=36, p=0.008). Moreover, despite its geographical proximity and genetic similarity, H7 was not perceived as more similar to *domesticus* than H1 (figure 4c: n=13, V=62, p=0.273). Finally, unlike predicted if hybrid signals shared similarities with the two parental subspecies, when *musculus* and H1 stimuli were presented simultaneously after habituation to *domesticus*, H1 signals did not show more similarities with *domesticus* than did *musculus* signals (figure 4d: n=10, V=28, p=1).

265

266 DISCUSSION

Selection against hybrids that carry less attractive signals could be an important mechanism 267 hindering gene flow between parapatric or sympatric populations [12, 19, 45, 46]. However, 268 this process remains scarcely demonstrated in nature. We investigated this process in a house 269 270 mouse hybrid zone where hybrid populations with highly recombined genomes are 271 established between the parental ones. We made the hypothesis that sexual selection could facilitate the reinforcement process described between musculus and domesticus [40, 41] by 272 273 decreasing hybrid mating success and hence impeding step by step gene flow through the zone. Our results indicate that hybrids are perceived as less attractive than own subspecies 274 275 stimuli only in *musculus* populations from the border of the hybrid zone, pointing out character displacement of preference between allopatric and border populations of this 276 277 subspecies, and a potential for sexual selection against hybrids in the *musculus* side of the 278 zone. Studies involving other models e.g. flycatchers [47] and chorus frog [48], evaluated that sexual selection could account, respectively, for 3/4 and 4/5 of reduction in hybrid male 279 fitness, suggesting that sexual selection could be an important force in evolution of 280 281 reproductive isolation in contact zones. Here, asymmetric sexual selection against hybrids

could act simultaneously to the reinforcement process.

Our results also indicate that unattractiveness of hybrid did not vary with genetic similarities between hybrid and parental populations, suggesting that the hybrid signal may not significantly vary across the zone and/or that it could share an unattractive component sufficient to trigger a negative response (see below). This study also points out that asymmetry exists between the sexes, as choosiness was higher in males as compared to females

289

290 Lower choosiness of females

The extent to which males and females contribute to behavioural isolation varies between taxa [e.g. 49, 50] and findings, like our study, that male mate choice plays an important role are not an exception [51-55]. In the house mouse, both males and females may be involved in mate choice [56-58].

Cost of heterospecific mating is expected to be similar in the two subspecies [59] but higher 295 296 in females. First, because female physiological investment in each reproduction event is 297 supposed to be higher than male investment [60] but see [52]. Second, in our biological system sterility affects hybrid males more than hybrid females [26, 28, 61, 62]. This should 298 result in higher selection on females than males to discriminate against hybrid mates, which 299 our results partially contradict. The patterns of lower female choosiness pointed out in our 300 study could be explained if postmating-prezygotic mechanisms preventing the production of 301 costly hybrid zygotes occur [63]. Indeed, in vitro laboratory investigations involving the two 302 303 house mice subspecies [64] suggest that sperm competition may favour homogamous fecundation; such a mechanism could possibly put less pressure on the evolution of female 304 305 premating choosiness, explaining the patterns evidenced in our study. Notwithstanding, we cannot completely exclude that lower preference of females in our study 306

could be caused by the experimental design being less appropriate to assess female than male
mate choice. Indeed, it may be that simultaneous presentation of two male stimuli to a female
induces anxiety, while for males simultaneous presentation of two female stimuli may induce
higher pressure to properly allocate their energy [52, 65].

311 Gaining insight into hybrid signal unattractiveness

Hybrid unattractiveness for border population mice did not vary significantly with the origin
of hybrid stimuli, suggesting that different categories of hybrids were perceived as equally
unattractive.

The theory of odour-genes covariance proposes that odour similarity may parallel genetic similarity [37]. If this was true we would have expected odour similarity between parental and hybrid stimuli to vary with the hybrid index HI, which did not seem to be the case since stimuli of the most different hybrids were discriminated against to the same extent and perceived as equally different from *domesticus*.

A study assessing preference of wild hybrids when presented with a choice between stimuli of 320 321 musculus versus domesticus [16] revealed dominance of preference for domesticus and a shift 322 in favour of higher choosiness and preference for *musculus* 10 km north of the genetic centre of the Danish hybrid zone (figure 1), in a location where hybrid genomes were very similar to 323 musculus. Our study concerns the same hybrid zone, hence our expectation that, if hybrid 324 preference followed a self-matching scheme, hybrid odours would be dominantly domesticus 325 with a shift in the hybrid signal nature roughly at the same location as the preference shift. 326 Precisely, we expected H7, neighbouring the *domesticus* border of the hybrid zone, to be more 327 328 similar to domesticus than H1, which does not seem to be the case. Further, if the hybrid signals were intermediate (i.e. carry similarities with both parents), we would have expected 329 H1 to be perceived as more similar to *domesticus* than *musculus*. Our study indicates that all 330 hybrid signals tested were rejected by *musculus* noses (during choice tests), but not because 331

they had similarities with the *domesticus* signal, leading us to propose that hybrid signals may
share an unattractive transgressive component, i.e. out of the range of variation of the two
subspecies [see also 66].

335

336 Evolution of sexual selection against hybrids

The fact that, unlike border populations, mice from neighbour allopatry did not discriminate 337 against hybrid stimuli suggests that hybridisation may not produce signals that are not 338 recognised by *musculus* or unattractive *per se*, and that perception of hybrid signals as 339 unattractive has evolved in the border of the hybrid zone. Discrimination against hybrid 340 signals could be the consequence of changes in the olfactory receptors leading to non-341 recognition of hybrid signals in the contact zone, or, possibly, changes in the neuronal 342 integration of the message transmitted by the receptor (discrimination leading to negative 343 344 behavioural response). Evolution of hybrid perception by musculus receiver could be a pleiotropic consequence of narrowing the range of acceptable signals during evolution of 345 346 assortative mating (i.e. preference for alike) in response to selection against maladaptive 347 hybridisation with domesticus. Alternatively, natural selection against possibly maladaptive backcross hybridisation [26, 59, 61] could have directly influenced the pattern evidenced in 348 this study. In both cases, if after selection in secondary contact *musculus* receiver is finely 349 350 tuned to the extent that it is able to reject any signal different to its "own" (i.e. self-matching), one may consider that strong signal divergence is not necessary to induce premating isolation 351 in a hybrid zone, which might be sometimes the case [e.g. 67]. As far as the mouse hybrid 352 zone is concerned our results suggest that both musculus receiver component has diverged and 353 the hybrid signals are different from the parental ones. 354

355

356 Sexual selection against hybrids and the hybrid zone dynamics

Sexual selection against hybrids, as our study suggests, can contribute to strengthen 357 reproductive isolation between diverging taxa [11, 19, 45]. Further, asymmetry in premating 358 divergence between parental populations has been reported in many taxa [68-72] and can 359 impact the dynamics of hybrid zones [73]. Here, asymmetric sexual selection against hybrids 360 could have similar consequences. Particularly, given that *domesticus*, unlike *musculus*, tends 361 not to discriminate against hybrids (this study) and that hybrids tend not to reject domesticus 362 [16], we could expect back-crossing to occur more frequently on *domesticus* side of the 363 hybrid zone, facilitating some *domesticus* genes flow into the zone. Further, several studies 364 suggest that *domesticus* is dominant over *musculus* and more aggressive [review in 74], a 365 behavioural trait that might be an advantage when dispersing [75]. In the absence of 366 geographical or ecological constraints (e.g. absence of favourable habitats), aggressiveness 367 might facilitate *domesticus* progression across the zone. Nevertheless, about 10 km north of 368 369 the genetic centre of the zone, this progression could be hindered by lower attractiveness of domesticus mice to hybrids in this region [16], and strong assortative mating of musculus 370 371 border population mice would further slow down domesticus advance. Still, whether 372 behavioural evolution in the hybrid zone actually drive a movement of the hybrid zone is difficult to assess on the sole basis of behavioural data, and our scenario could be further 373 tested with both genomics and theoretical approaches. We also need a better knowledge of 374 375 demographic parameters, dispersal characteristics, population growth rate etc., which are scarce for both subspecies in the context of the hybrid zone. 376

377

378 Conclusion

This study provides arguments in favour of a role for sexual selection against hybrids in
shaping mate recognition patterns and limiting gene flow in this house mouse hybrid zone.
Together with natural selection against hybrids, it could significantly contribute to

reproductive isolation between the two European subspecies of the house mouse. New
insights into the neurophysiology, chemistry and genetic bases of discrimination and
signalling components will further extend our understanding of the evolutionary forces in
action in this study model for speciation with gene flow.

386

387 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the 2010 field trapping team, to support from Givskud Zoo (particularly R.

389 Osterbald and K. Rasmussen) and to the hospitality of Jutland farmers. T. Lenormand

390 contributed with helpful discussions while designing the experiments. The transposon

insertion markers were developed by PB, B. Dod, P. Munclinger and V. Janoušek (Charles

392 University, Prague). T. Audoux and M. Boyaval helped with the behavioural study performed

under the permission of the French authorities to GG (authorization $n^{\circ}C34-265$). This work

394 was funded by the French national research agency (ANR, N°2010BLAN171401-

395 AssortMate). ISEM/xxxx.

396

397 DATA ACCESSIBILITY

398 Final DNA sequence assembly uploaded as online supplemental material

399 Raw Behavioural data will be archived on the Dryad Data Repository website.

401 REFERENCES

- 402 1. Mallet J. 2007 Hybrid speciation. *Nature* 446(7133), 279-283.
- Schulte U., Veith M., Hochkirch A. 2012 Rapid genetic assimilation of native wall lizard
 populations (podarcis muralis) through extensive hybridization with introduced lineages. *Mol Ecol*21(17), 4313-4326.
- Bank C., Hermisson J., Kirkpatrick M. 2011 Can reinforcement complete speciation? *Evolution* 66(1), 229-239.
- 408 4. McKinnon J.S., Rundle H.D. 2002 Speciation in nature: The threespine stickleback model
 409 systems. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17(10), 480-488.
- 410 5. Hoskin C.J., Higgie M., McDonald K.R., Moritz C. 2005 Reinforcement drives rapid
 411 allopatric speciation. *Nature* 437, 1353-1356.
- 412 6. Jaenike J., Dyer K.A., Cornish C., Minhas M.S. 2006 Asymmetrical reinforcement and
 413 wolbachia infection in drosopila. *PLOS Biol* 4(10), 1852-1862.
- 7. Nosil P., Crespi B.J., Gries R., Gries G. 2007 Natural selection and divergence in mate
 preference during speciation. *Genetica* 129(3), 309-327.
- 416 8. Hoskin C.J., Higgie M. 2010 Speciation via species interactions: The divergence of mating
 417 traits within species. *Ecol Lett* 13(4), 409-420.
- 418 9. Cutter A.D. 2011 The polymorphic prelude to bateson-dobzhansky-muller incompatibilities.
 419 *Trends Ecol Evol* 27(4), 209-218.
- 420 10. Johnson N.A. 2000 Speciation:Dobzhansky-muller incompatibilities,dominance and gene
 421 interactions. *Trends Ecol Evol* 15, 480-482.
- 422 11. Kuijper B., Pen I., Weissing F.J. 2012 A guide to sexual selection theory. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*423 43(1), 287-311.
- 424 12. Weissing F.J., Edelaar P., van Doorn G.S. 2011 Adaptive speciation theory: A conceptual
 425 review. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 65(3), 461-480.
- 426 13. Maan M.E., Seehausen O. 2010 Mechanisms of species divergence through visual adaptation
- 427 and sexual selection: Perspectives from a cichlid model system. *Curr Zool* **56**(3), 285-299.
- 428 14. Svensson O., Egger B., Gricar B., Woodhouse K., van Oosterhout C., Salzburger W.,
- 429 Seehausen O., Turner G.F. 2011 Segregation of species-specific male attractiveness in f2 hybrid lake
- 430 malawi cichlid fish. *Int J Evol Biol* **2011**.
- 431 15. Ptacek M.B. 2002 Patterns of inheritance of mating signals in interspecific hybrids between
- 432 sailfin and shortfin mollies (poeciliidae: Poecilia: Mollienesia). *Genetica* **116**(2), 329-342.
- 433 16. Ganem G., Litel C., Lenormand T. 2008 Variation in mate preference across a house mouse
- 434 hybrid zone. *Heredity* **100**, 594-601.
- 435 17. Delcourt M., Rasanen K., Hendry A.P. 2008 Genetic and plastic components of divergent
- 436 male intersexual behavior in misty lake/stream stickleback. *Behav Ecol* **19**(6), 1217-1224.

- Rieseberg L.H., Archer M.A., Wayne R.K. 1999 Transgressive segregation, adaptation and
 speciation. *Heredity* 83, 363-372.
- 439 19. Ritchie M.G. 2007 Sexual selection and speciation. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 38, 79-102.
- 440 20. Maan M.E., Seehausen O. 2011 Ecology, sexual selection and speciation. *Ecol Lett* 14(6),
 441 591-602.
- 442 21. Vedenina V.Y., Kulygina N.K., Panyutin A.K. 2007 Isolation mechanisms in the closely
- related grasshopper species, chorthippus albomarginatus and ch. Oschei (orthoptera, acrididae).
- 444 *Zoologichesky Zhurnal* **86**(5), 537-546.
- 445 22. Rosenfield J.A., Kodric-Brown A. 2003 Sexual selection promotes hybridization between
- pecos pupfish, cyprinodon pecosensis and sheepshead minnow, c-variegatus. *J Evol Biol* 16(4), 595606.
- 23. Duvaux L., Belkhir K., Boulesteix M., Boursot P. 2011 Isolation and gene flow: Inferring the
 speciation history of european house mice. *Mol Ecol* 20(24), 5248-5264.
- 450 24. Boursot P., Din W., Anand R., Darviche D., Dod B., Von Deimling F., Talwar G.P.,
- Bonhomme F. 1996 Origin and radiation of the house mouse: Mitochondrial DNA phylogeny. *J Evol Biol* 9, 391-415.
- 453 25. Raufaste N., Orth A., Belkhir K., Senet D., Smadja C., Baird S.J.E., Bonhomme F., Dod B.,
- Boursot P. 2005 Inference of selection and migration in the danish house mouse hybrid zone. *Biol J Linn Soc* 84, 593-616.
- 456 26. Britton-Davidian J., Fel-Clair F., Lopez J., Alibert P., Boursot P. 2005 Postzygotic isolation
- between the two european subspecies of the house mouse: Estimates from fertility patterns in wild and
- 458 laboratory-bred hybrids. *Biol J Linn Soc* 84, 379-393.
- 459 27. Janousek V., Wang L.Y., Luzynski K., Dufkova P., Vyskocilova M.M., Nachman M.W.,
- 460 Munclinger P., Macholan M., Pialek J., Tucker P.K. 2012 Genome-wide architecture of reproductive
- 461 isolation in a naturally occurring hybrid zone between mus musculus musculus and m. M. Domesticus.
- 462 *Mol Ecol* **21**(12), 3032-3047.
- 463 28. Turner L.M., Schwahn D.J., Harr B. 2011 Reduced male fertility is common but highly
- 464 variable in form and severity in a natural house mouse hybrid zone. *Evolution* **66**(2), 443-458.
- 465 29. Macholán M., Baird S., Munclinger P., Dufková P., Bímová B., Piálek J. 2008 Genetic
- 466 conflict outweighs heterogametic incompatibility in the mouse hybrid zone? *BMC Evol Biol* **8**(1), 271.
- 467 30. Roberts S.C., Gosling L.M. 2003 Genetic similarity and quality interact in mate choice
- decisions by female mice. *Nature gen* **35**(1), 103-106.
- 469 31. Gosling L.M., Roberts S.C., Thornton E.A., Andrew M.J. 2000 Life history costs of olfactory
 470 status signalling in mice. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 48, 328-332.
- 471 32. Hurst J.L., Beynon R.J. 2004 Scent wars: The chemobiology of competitive signalling in
 472 mice. *BioEssays* 26(12), 1288-1298.

- 473 33. Abraham N.M., Spors H., Carleton A., Margrie T.W., Kuner T., Schaefer A.T. 2004
- 474 Maintaining accuracy at the expense of speed: Stimulus similarity defines odor discrimination time in
 475 mice. *Neuron* 44(5), 865-876.
- 34. Smadja C., Catalan J., Ganem G. 2004 Strong premating divergence in a unimodal hybrid
 zone between two subspecies of the house mouse. *J Evol Biol* 17(1), 165-176.
- 478 35. Bímová B.V., Macholan M., Baird S.J.E., Munclinger P., Dufkova P., Laukaitis C.M., Karn
- 479 R.C., Luzynski K., Tucker P.K., Pialek J. 2011 Reinforcement selection acting on the european house
- 480 mouse hybrid zone. *Mol Ecol* **20**(11), 2403-2424.
- 481 36. Bímová B., Albrecht T., Macholán M., Piálek J. 2009 Signalling components of the house
 482 mouse mate recognition system. *Behav Processes* 80(1), 20-27.
- 483 37. Todrank J., Heth G. 2003 Odor-genes covariance and genetic relatedness assessments:
- 484 Rethinking odor-based "Recognition" Mechanisms in rodents. *Adv stud behav* **32**, 77-130.
- 485 38. Boissinot S., Boursot P. 1997 Discordant phylogeographic patterns between the y
- chromosome and mitochondrial DNA in the house mouse: Selection on the y chromosome. *Genetics*146, 1019-1034.
- Buerkle C.A. 2005 Maximum-likelihood estimation of a hybrid index based on molecular
 markers. *Mol Ecol Notes* 5(3), 684-687.
- 490 40. Smadja C., Ganem G. 2008 Divergence of odorant signals within and between the two
- 491 european subspecies of the house mouse. *Behav Ecol* **19**(1), 223-230.
- 492 41. Smadja C., Ganem G. 2002 Subspecies recognition in the house mouse: A study of two
- 493 populations from the border of a hybrid zone. *Behav Ecol* **13**(3), 312-320.
- 494 42. R Development Core Team. 2012 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R*495 *Foundation for Statistical Computing*.
- 43. Pinheiro J., Bates D., DebRoy S., Deepayan S., R Development Core Team. 2012 Nlme:
 497 Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models.
- 498 44. Warnes G.R., Team R.D.C. 2011 Gplots: Various r programming tools for plotting data.
- 499 45. Servedio M.R. 2004 The evolution of premating isolation: Local adaptation and natural and
- sexual selection against hybrids. . *Evolution* **58**, 913-924.
- Kawata M., Yoshimura J. 2000 Speciation by sexual selection in hybridizing populations
 without viability selection. *Evol Ecol Res* 2, 897-909.
- 503 47. Svedin N., Wiley C., Veen T., Gustafsson L., Qvarnstrom A. 2008 Natural and sexual
- selection against hybrid flycatchers. *Proc R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* 275(1635), 735-744.
- 505 48. Lemmon E.M., Lemmon A.R. 2010 Reinforcement in chorus frogs: Lifetime fitness estimates
- 506 including intrinsic natural selection and sexual selection against hybrids. *Evolution* **64**(6), 1748-1761.
- 507 49. Espinedo C.M., Gabor C.R., Aspbury A.S. 2010 Males, but not females, contribute to sexual
- isolation between two sympatric species of gambusia. *Evol Ecol* **24**(4), 865-878.

- 509 50. Kozak G.M., Reisland M., Boughman J.W. 2009 Sex differences in mate recognition and 510 conspecific preference in species with mutual mate choice. *Evolution* **63**(2), 353-365.
- 511 51. Gregorio O., Berdan E.L., Kozak G.M., Fuller R.C. 2012 Reinforcement of male mate
- 512 preferences in sympatric killifish species lucania goodei and lucania parva. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*

513 66(10), 1429-1436.

- 514 52. Edward D.A., Chapman T. 2011 The evolution and significance of male mate choice. *Trends*515 *Ecol Evol* 26(12), 647-654.
- 516 53. Svensson E.I., Karlsson K., Friberg M., Eroukhmanoff F. 2007 Gender differences in species
 517 recognition and the evolution of asymmetric sexual isolation. *Curr Biol* 17(22), 1943-1947.
- 54. Swenton D.M. 2011 Sex differences in mate preference between two hybridizing species of
 poeciliid fish. *Ethology* 117(3), 208-216.
- 520 55. O'Rourke C.F., Mendelson T.C. 2010 Male and female preference for conspecifics in a fish

521 with male parental care (percidae: Catonotus). *Behav Processes* **85**(2), 157-162.

- 522 56. Drickamer L.C., Gowaty P.A., Wagner D.M. 2003 Free mutual mate preferences in house
 523 mice affect reproductive success and offspring performance. *Anim Behav* 65, 105-114.
- 57. Drickamer L.C., Gowaty P.A., Holmes C.M. 2000 Free female mate choice in house mice
 affects reproductive success and offspring viability and performance. *Anim Behav* 59, 371-378.
- 526 58. Gowaty P.A., Drickamer L.C., Schmid-Holmes S. 2003 Male house mice produce fewer
- offspring with lower viability and poorer performance when mated with females they do not prefer. *Anim Behav* 65, 95-103.
- 59. Good J.M., Handel M.A., Nachman M.W. 2008 Asymmetry and polymorphism of hybrid
 male sterility during the early stages of speciation in house mice. *Evolution* 62(1), 50-65.
- 531 60. Groning J., Hochkirch A. 2008 Reproductive interference between animal species. *Q Rev Biol*532 83(3), 257-282.
- 533 61. Dzur-Gejdosova M., Simecek P., Gregorova S., Bhattacharyya T., Forejt J. 2012 Dissecting
 534 the genetic architecture of f1 hybrid sterility in house mice. *Evolution* 66(11), 3321-3335.
- 535 62. Albrechtova J., Albrecht T., Baird S.J.E., Macholan M., Rudolfsen G., Munclinger P., Tucker
- 536 P.K., Pialek J. 2012 Sperm-related phenotypes implicated in both maintenance and breakdown of a
- 537 natural species barrier in the house mouse. *Proc R Soc Lond, Ser B: Biol Sci* **279**(1748), 4803-4810.
- 538 63. Veen T., Borge T., Griffith S.C., Saetre G.-P., Bures S., Gustafsson L., Sheldon B.C. 2001
- Hybridization and adaptive mate choice in flycatchers. *Nature* **411**(6833), 45-50.
- 540 64. Dean M.D., Nachman M.W. 2009 Faster fertilization rate in conspecific versus heterospecific
 541 matings in house mice. *Evolution* 63(1), 20-28.
- 542 65. Barry K.L., Kokko H. 2010 Male mate choice: Why sequential choice can make its evolution
 543 difficult. *Anim Behav* 80(1), 163-169.
- 544 66. Ganem G., Rueff C., Perriat-Sanguinet M. in press The genetic architecture of chemosensory
- 545 cues involved in species recognition: A behavioral approach in the house mouse. *Behav Genet*.

- 546 67. Hobel G., Gerhardt H.C. 2003 Reproductive character displacement in the acoustic
- 547 communication system of green tree frogs (hyla cinerea). *Evolution* **57**(4), 894-904.
- 548 68. Sugano Y.C., Akimoto S. 2007 Asymmetric mating in the brachypterous grasshopper podisma
 549 sapporensis. *Ethology* 113(3), 301-311.
- 69. Polačik M., Reichard M. 2011 Asymmetric reproductive isolation between two sympatric
 annual killifish with extremely short lifespans. *PLoS ONE* 6(8).
- 552 70. Shine R., Reed R.N., Shetty S., Lemaster M., Mason R.T. 2002 Reproductive isolating
- mechanisms between two sympatric sibling species of sea snakes. *Evolution* **56**(8), 1655-1662.
- 554 71. Hardwick K.M., Robertson J.M., Rosenblum E.B. 2013 Asymmetrical mate preference in
- recently adapted white sands and black lava populations of sceloporus undulatus. *Curr Zool* 59(1), 2030.
- Arnold S.J., Verrell P.A., Tilley S.G. 1996 The evolution of asymmetry in sexual isolation: A
 model and a test case. *Evolution* 50(3), 1024-1033.
- 559 73. Bella J.L., Butlin R.K., Ferris C., Hewitt G.M. 1992 Asymmetrical homogamy and unequal
- sex ratio from reciprocal mating-order crosses between *chorthippus parallelus* subspecies. *Heredity*68, 345-352.
- 562 74. Ganem G. 2012 Behaviour, ecology, and speciation in the house mouse. In *Evolution of the*
- 563 house mouse (eds. Macholan M., baird S.J.E., Munclinger P., P. J.), pp. 373-406, Cambridge
- 564 University Press.
- 565 75. Pocock M.J.O., Hauffe H.C., Searle J.B. 2005 Dispersal in house mice. *Biol J Linn Soc* 84(3),
 565-583.
- 567

model		explanatory variable	fixed / random	n.d.f	d.d.f.	F	P-value
maximal model:	ExpR ~	Sex	F	1	138	9.23	0.003
AIC: 64.1		Motivation	F	1	138	0.62	0.434
		stimulus category ¹	F	6	138	1.18	0.319
		sex x motivation	F	1	138	0.13	0.724
		sex x stimulus category1	F	6	138	0.9	0.499
		motivation \mathbf{x} stimulus category ¹	F	6	138	1.26	0.279
		sex x motivation x stimulus category ¹	F	6	138	1.05	0.395
		Population	R			0.823	0.365
minimal model:	$ExpR \sim$	Sex	F	1	166	9.85	0.002

Table 1: A summary of the results of a mixed ANCOVA testing the influence of sex, stimulus category, the nose population, and motivation*, on variation of preference (expR) displayed by border *musculus* mice, during choice tests between *musculus* versus a hybrid or a *domesticus* stimulus.

AIC: 39.5

*Motivation is the total time spent in either the right or left part of the maze (by opposition to the neutral central part), a measure of the mice willingness to participate to the test; ¹hybrids plus *domesticus*; ²H5 and H6 were grouped for this analysis, see text; ³Likelihood Ratio

569

Table 2: Results of preference tests assessing whether *musculus* discrimination against hybrids evolved in allopatry or in the contact zone. Preference is time spent in contact with *musculus* border stimulus minus with H1 neighbour hybrid stimulus(positive values means homogamous preferences). Sample sizes (n) are given alongside statistics of paired Wilcoxon tests. Bold p-values highlight significant deviance from the null hypothesis (H0: noses spent the same time in contact with the two stimuli).

		Border of hybrid zone					allopatry				
		median	1st / 3rd quartiles	п	V	р	median	1st / 3rd quartiles	n	V	р
	females	0.805	-0.0300 / 2.66	10	49	0.027	0.695	-0.220 / 1.32	10	40	0.232
	males	5.910	-0.320 / 9.33	17	130	0.009	0.740	-3.89 / 5.10	17	94	0.431
70											

572 FIGURE CAPTIONS

573

574 Figure 1: Trapping sites and their genetic characteristics plotted on a transect orthogonal to the genetic centre (bold line) of 575 the Danish hybrid zone defined in [25]. The thick light grey line describes the general shape of the cline from [25]. Trapping 576 sites are represented by white circles with reference to their HI estimated in this study (detailed in table ESM5). Rectangles 577 show grouping of hybrid sites into categories; from left (light) to right (dark) across the hybrid zone respectively: border 578 domesticus, hybrids H7, H6, H5, H4, H3, H2, H1 and border musculus. Circles' size is proportional to the sample size used to 579 estimate the site HI. Dashed lines refer to an earlier study [16] testing wild hybrids preference for parental stimuli and 580 showing an abrupt transition (behavioural centre) from preference for *domesticus*, left of the dashed lines, to preference for 581 musculus right of these lines.

582

583 Figure 2: Results of two-ways choice tests assessing preference of musculus and domesticus mice from the border of the 584 hybrid zone when one of the stimuli represents their geographically closest hybrid neighbours. The figure shows preferences 585 of A) females and B) males (left: musculus, right domesticus mice) when the homosubspecific stimulus is presented against a 586 heterosubspecific (white) or a hybrid (grey) stimulus. Identity of stimuli is indicated above (homosubspecific) and below 587 (heterosubspecific or hybrid) each plot. Preference is calculated as the difference in time spent with one or the other stimulus 588 (positive when assortative). The horizontal dotted line represents random choice (preference = 0). Box-plots show preference 589 median (bold line), 1st and 3rd quartiles, and whiskers represent the entire data range. Sample sizes (n) and p-values of paired 590 Wilcoxon rank tests (p) are given below each plot. Preference values were tested against random choice ("*" p < 0.05, "**" p 591 < 0.01).

591 < 592

593 Figure 3: Results of preference assessing attractiveness of urinary hybrid stimuli categories sampled across the hybrid zone. 594 Preferences of musculus individuals from the border of the hybrid zone (A: female noses; B: male noses) are shown as the 595 difference in time spent in contact with the homosubspecific stimulus (musculus border, indicated as "mus" above the plot) 596 versus a more distant hybrid stimulus ("H1", "H2"... specified below the plot). Preference data is as in Figure 2. The plot 597 colour code follows that described in Figure 1 (from light to dark grey: from South to North of the hybrid zone). The 598 estimated hybrid indexes (HI) of the hybrid stimuli presented against musculus stimulus, and sample sizes (n: number of 599 noses involved in each test) are given below each plot. The plots on the right indicate preference results when data for all 600 hybrid categories were considered as a block after mixed ANCOVA analysis revealed no significant difference between the 601 stimulus categories; preference values were tested against random choice (Wilcoxon tests "***" p < 0.001)... 602

Figure 4: Results of the discrimination (a and b) and generalisation (c and d) tests assessing similarities between hybrid
 signals and parental odours. The noses were *musculus* border males for all experiments. The stimulus used for the habituation
 step was *domesticus* and the stimuli used during the discrimination (or generalisation) step are indicated below each plot.
 Results are presented as the average ± standard error of time spent in contact with each of the test stimuli after habituation to

607 *domesticus*. The plot colour code refers to the geographical origins of the stimuli as in figure 1 and 3 (light for the *domesticus*

608 side and dark for the *musculus* side of the zone). Results of paired comparisons: "NS" p > 0.05, "*" p < 0.05, "*" p < 0.01.