



Horizontal transmission and recombination of *Wolbachia* in the butterfly tribe Aeromachini Tutt, 1906 (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae)

Zimiao Zhao,^{1,†} Jianqing Zhu,^{2,†} Ary A. Hoffmann,³ Lijun Cao,⁴ Li Shen,¹ Jie Fang,¹ Shuojia Ma,¹ Qunxiu Liu,² Weidong Yu,¹ Liying Tang,¹ Yongqiang Wang,¹ and Weibin Jiang ()^{1,*}

¹Laboratory of Environmental Entomology, College of Life Sciences, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, People's Republic of China ²Shanghai Zoological Park, Shanghai 200335, People's Republic of China

³School of BioSciences, Bio21 Institute, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3052, Australia

⁴Institute of Plant and Environmental Protection, Beijing Academy of Agriculture and Forestry Sciences, Beijing 100097, People's Republic of China [†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author: Email: jiangwb@shnu.edu.cn

Abstract

Wolbachia is arguably one of the most ubiquitous heritable symbionts among insects and understanding its transmission dynamics is crucial for understanding why it is so common. While previous research has studied the transmission pathways of *Wolbachia* in several insect lineages including Lepidoptera, this study takes advantage of data collected from the lepidopteran tribe Aeromachini in an effort to assess patterns of transmission. Twenty-one of the 46 species of Aeromachini species were infected with *Wolbachia*. Overall, 25% (31/125) of Aeromachini specimens tested were *Wolbachia* positive. All *Wolbachia* strains were species-specific except for the wJho strain which appeared to be shared by three host species with a sympatric distribution based on a cophylogenetic comparison between *Wolbachia* and the Aeromachini species. Two tests of phylogenetic congruence did not find any evidence for cospeciation between *Wolbachia* strains and their butterfly hosts. The cophylogenetic comparison, divergence time estimation, and *Wolbachia* recombination analysis revealed that *Wolbachia* acquisition in Aeromachini appears to have mainly occurred mainly through horizontal transmission rather than codivergence.

Keywords: Aeromachini; Wolbachia; divergence time; cophylogeny; recombination; horizontal transmission

Introduction

Wolbachia is the most widespread endosymbiotic bacterium that infects a large variety of arthropods and filarial nematodes (Bandi et al. 1998; Weinert et al. 2015). In butterflies, Wolbachia infections have been reported in five families (Papilionidae, Hesperiidae, Nymphalidae, Pieridae, and Lycaenidae) so far (Jiggins et al. 2000; Dyson et al. 2002; Hiroki et al. 2004; Tagami and Miura 2004; Russell et al. 2009; Bipinchandra et al. 2012; Jiang et al. 2018) . The transmission pattern of Wolbachia is predominantly vertical and secondarily horizontal (Raychoudhury et al. 2009). It induces various reproductive alterations to alter host biology, like cytoplasmic incompatibility (CI), male killing (MK), feminization induction (FI), and thelytokous parthenogenesis (Yen and Barr 1971; Rousset et al. 1992; Stouthamer et al. 1993; Hurst and Jiggins 2000). In butterflies, some of these effects are well established, especially MK in Hypolimnas bolina and Acraea encedon (Jiggins et al. 2001; Dyson and Hurst 2004), CI in H. bolina and Polygonia calbum (Hornett et al. 2008; Kodandaramaiah et al. 2011) and FI in Eurema hecabe (Kageyama et al. 2008).

Based on phylogenetic reconstructions with a set of loci (MLST) used to type Wolbachia strains, Wolbachia fall into 17

supergroups designated by the letters A–R, with supergroup G being controversial (Baldo and Werren 2007; Augustinos et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2016). Wolbachia in butterflies has been associated only with supergroups A and B. Wolbachia from supergroup B occurs in a wide range of butterfly hosts and an MLST allele (ST-41) is core in butterfly hosts worldwide (Bipinchandra et al. 2012; Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017). While Wolbachia has been investigated in detail in some infected butterfly species (Homett et al. 2006; Charlat et al. 2007; Narita et al. 2007; Gompert et al. 2008; Duplouy et al. 2010; Jiang et al. 2014, 2016), there are few systematic studies of Wolbachia at the molecular level across a group of related species even though such an analysis can be useful in assessing horizontal transmission patterns in other insects such as Drosophila (Turelli et al. 2018), Agelenopsis (Baldo et al. 2008), Trichogramma (Huigens et al. 2004), Rhagoletis (Schuler et al. 2013), and Altica (Jackel et al. 2013). In this study, we tackle this issue by evaluating the molecular phylogeny of the tribe Aeromachini and associating it with phylogenetic patterns for Wolbachia infections to assess patterns of transmission.

Aeromachini is a tribe of family Hesperiidae and currently comprises 136 described species in 11 genera (Warren et al. 2008;

Received: March 23, 2021. Accepted: June 28, 2021

[©] The Author(s) 2021. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Genetics Society of America.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

2009; Huang 2009; Li *et al.* 2019). Most species are restricted geographically to the Oriental Region, and a few species are found in Afrotropical Region and Palearctic Region (Eliot 1969). The common ancestor of this tribe was inferred to originate in Southeast Asia (Huang *et al.* 2019). We have reported the external features and the molecular phylogeny of the tribe in a preliminary study (Li *et al.* 2019). In prior screening, we found Wolbachia in Aeromachus inachus, A. virgata, and Halpe dizangpusa which prompted our further study of all Aeromachini species in China.

In this study, we characterized the Wolbachia in tribe Aeromachini by MLST genotyping. Furthermore, we conducted a cophylogenetic analysis between Wolbachia and their Aeromachini hosts, compared the age of Wolbachia divergence with that of host species, and analyzed the actual and potential recombination of Wolbachia in Aeromachini to provide information on the patterns of Wolbachia transmission across this tribe.

Materials and methods Samples collection, DNA extraction, and Wolbachia MLST typing

We collected a total of 125 Aeromachini butterflies representing 10 genera and 46 species from 42 local regions in China across the last 12 years (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table S1). All specimens were caught with sweep nets and saved in small envelopes. The species were identified with morphological characteristics and molecular techniques (Jiang *et al.* 2019; Li *et al.* 2019). The DNA was isolated from whole abdomens of specimens using a QIAamp DNA Mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany).

To screen for Wolbachia infection status, the wsp locus was amplified followed the published protocols described by Zhou et al. (1998; Supplementary Table S2). The characterization of Wolbachia strains was performed to sequence multiple loci suggested by Wolbachia MLST database (http://pubmlst.org/wolba chia) (Zhou et al. 1998; Supplementary Table S2). The MLST typing consisted of five Wolbachia gene fragments (gatB, coxA, hcpA, ftsZ, and *fbpA*). The PCR product was purified using the Wizard SV Gel and PCR Clean-up System (Promega, Madison, WI, USA). The purified product was ligated with the pGEM-T easy vector (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) using a ligation mix (TaKaRa). Competent cells (*Escherichia coli* JM109, TaKaRa) were then transformed with the plasmid. Plasmid DNA was extracted using the Pure Yield Plasmid Miniprep System (Promega, Madison, WI, USA). The sequencing was performed using an ABI 377 automated DNA sequencer.

A Mantel test was used to compare Wolbachia frequency (pooled across species) and geographical distribution of their corresponding Aeromachini hosts with the software Isolation by Distance (IBD; Bohonak 2002). It was performed on the pairwise node distance matrix of *Wolbachia* frequency and host Aeromachini species to test for an association between matrices (Maddison 2015).

Cophylogenetic analysis

The MLST sequences were aligned with outgroups retrieved from the MLST database (host: *Brugia malayi*, *Cordylochemes scorpioides*, and *Opistophthalmus capensis*; Supplementary Table S1) using Bioedit v. 7.0 (Hall 1999). The HKY + I model was selected as the best-fit substitution model with PartitionFinder v2.1.1 (Lanfear et al. 2012) using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). Maximum likelihood (ML) tree was constructed with the concatenated data using IQtree 1.4.2 (Nguyen et al. 2015). To assess nodal support, we performed 1000 ultrafast bootstrap replicates with UFBoot and an SH-aLRT test with 1000 replicates (Hoang et al. 2018).

For the molecular phylogenetic constructions of Aeromachini species (the concatenated mitochondrial and nuclear genes), we retrieved the mitochondrial genes COI, COII, and three variable domains of the nuclear DNA (D3 region of 28S rDNA, V4 and V7 regions of 18S rDNA) from GenBank (MK344780–MK345418). The method of ML tree construction follows that used for the hosts as



Figure 1 The distribution of specimens collected in China infected or uninfected with Wolbachia. The sizes of the circles are directly proportional to the number of individuals analyzed (black: infected with Wolbachia, white: uninfected). The triangles refer to the location of collection sites and the letters are the Abbreviation of place names. For full site names and other details, please see Supplementary Table S1.

described above. The GTR + G model was selected as the best-fit substitution model for this dataset.

A Mantel test was used to compare genetic and Wolbachia distance matrices with IBD (Bohonak 2002). It was performed on the pairwise node distance matrix of Wolbachia strains and host Aeromachini species to test for an association between matrices (Hall 1999). Another test of phylogenetic congruence between butterflies and endosymbiont partners was undertaken with the Procrustean Approach to Cophylogeny (PACo; Balbuena *et al.* 2013). The analysis was performed in R with 100,000 permutations using packages VEGAN v.2.4.6 (Oksanen *et al.* 2018) and APE v.4.1 (Paradis *et al.* 2004).

Estimation of divergence time

We referred to a molecular dating analysis of Wolbachia supergroups A and B to compare the divergence times of Wolbachia (Gerth and Bleidorn 2016) with the age of Aeromachini species divergence. The divergence times of all Wolbachia-infected Aeromachini species were inferred with the relaxed-clock molecular dating estimation by BEAST 1.5.2 (Excoffier et al. 2005). The HKY model of nucleotide substitution with gamma distributed rate variation among sites was used to analyze and the Yule speciation method was assumed. We used the age ranges estimated from Chazot et al. (2019) to calibrate the split between Hesperiidae and Hedylidae (81-114 Mya) and the age ranges between Hesperiinae and Heteropterinae (35-55 Mya). We also used a recently described fossil hesperiid, Pamphilites abdita Scudder, 1875 to constrain the minimum stem age of subfamily Hesperiinae to 25 Mya (de Jong 2016). Chains were run for 50 million generations, with the first 20% discarded as burn-in. The results were summarized with TRACER 1.5 (Fu and Li 1993).

Recombination analysis

Gene recombination can interfere with and mislead phylogenetic relationships of species. We detected recombination events with the MLST and *wsp* genes, to clarify whether horizontal transmission had occurred among these *Wolbachia* strains. To examine recombination among *Wolbachia* strains from Aeromachini species, each MLST gene and *wsp* gene were detected using RDP3 (Martin et al. 2010). Seven methods (RDP, GENECONV, BootScan, MaxChi, Chimaera, SiScan, and 3Seq) in program RDP3 were chose to identify the recombinant sequences and recombination breakpoints. The potential recombination events can be detected by any of the methods listed above. As recommended for this procedure, the breakpoint positions and recombinant sequences inferred from every potential recombination event were manually checked and adjusted following the phylogenetic and recombination signal analysis features available in RDP3.

To visualize potential recombination events, ML trees for each MLST gene and *wsp* were constructed with 10 reference STs and 3 outgroups retrieved from the MLST database (Supplementary Table S1) using IQtree 1.4.2 (Nguyen *et al.* 2015). They were checked for their supergroup clustering in ML trees. A potential recombination event could be found from inconsistencies between gene trees (Werren and Bartos 2001; Baldo *et al.* 2006).

Results

Infection rates and diversity of Wolbachia

In the examined butterflies, 25% (31/125) of samples were Wolbachia positive and 46% (21/46) of Aeromachini species in this study were considered infected with Wolbachia, with some of these shown to be polymorphic for the infection despite limited

sampling. The infection status and geographical distribution of each sample and species is shown in Figure 1, Supplementary Tables S1 and S3. The Mantel test analysis indicated a nonsignificant correlation between Wolbachia frequency and geographic location of their corresponding Aeromachini hosts when pooled across species and samples (r = 0.1714, P = 0.060), suggesting a weak spatial structure in the incidence of Wolbachia. However, there is no obvious association between Wolbachia frequency overall and latitude (Figure 1), a pattern previously noted for moths (Ahmed et al. 2015). We amplified five MLST loci to characterize Wolbachia strains. Each of the five MLST genes and the wsp gene detected from each Aeromachini species had the same sequence. The strains are denoted based on the MLST loci as wPic, wMag, wIna, wKyn, wJho, wYin, wLua, wDio, wHyr, wBai, wLin, wVir, wPes, wDol, wLat, wSub, wKua, wDiz, and wStr (GenBank accession numbers: MT935975-MT936085).

Comparison of Wolbachia and Lepidoptera phylogenies

All Wolbachia strains were species specific except for wJho shared by three host species (Aeromachus jhora, Aeromachus propinquus, and Pedesta bivitta) sympatric in Yunnan Province, southwest China (Figure 2). Although the concatenated sequences of hosts and Wolbachia strain types matched well, the topologies of Aeromachini hosts and corresponding Wolbachia strains (which fell into supergroups A and B) were not congruent (Figure 2). It is possible that coevolution could have occurred between hosts and their Wolbachia in the Aeromachus clade, although the Mantel test indicated no significant correlation between the genetic distances of the Wolbachia strains and their host Aeromachini species (r = -0.094, P = 0.719). This points to the horizontal transmission being an important mode of transmission. Similarly, PACo provided no evidence for congruence between the phylogeny of Aeromachini and that of their endosymbionts (PACo $m^2 = 0.033, P = 0.402).$

Divergence time estimation

Divergence time of the Aeromachini was estimated with the relaxed clock molecular dating implemented in BEAST. We compared the divergence between *Wolbachia* supergroups based on genomic data (Gerth and Bleidorn 2016) with divergence times of Aeromachini and found the youngest divergence between species at 6.69 Mya (8.82–4.03, 95% HPD) and the oldest gap between *Parasovia perbella* and the other species at 43.30 Mya (47.93–39.61, 95% HPD) (Figure 3).

Recombination of MLST and wsp genes

The recombination analysis within each MLST gene and wsp gene showed that the polymorphic sites of the alignment of the FtsZ alleles are not randomly distributed, but a mosaic pattern consistent with recombination in a coinfected host. To estimate the approximate recombination events, all events were confirmed with five of seven RDP3 algorithms (Table 1). The FtsZ sequence of four Wolbachia strains (wIna from A. inachus; wJho from A. jhora, A. propinquus, and P. bivitta; wYin from Pedesta yingqii; and wDol from Sebastonyma dolopia) are the same recombinant between Wolbachia strain wLat detected from Pedesta latris and Wolbachia strain wDio from Ampittia dioscorides (Supplementary Figure S1).

We also reconstructed ML trees for each MLST gene and the wsp gene separately (Figure 4). Eleven of the nineteen Wolbachia strains (wJho, wPic, wMag, wLin, wVir, wPes, wDol, wLat, wSub, wDiz, and wStr) were found to have inconsistent supergroup



Figure 2 Cophylogenetic analysis of Aeromachini based on mtDNA + nDNA (left) and corresponding *Wolbachia* strains based on MLST (right). Numbers beside nodes are IQTREE ultrafast bootstrap and SH-aLRT values. The *Wolbachia* strains of Supergroups A are in blue and those of Supergroups B are in red. Scale bars indicate the mean number of substitutions per site.

allocation among the five MLST gene trees. For example, the localization of *wJ*ho on the ML tree was with the B-supergroup (Figure 2). This was associated with a coxA allele that belonged to supergroup A, in contrast to alleles at other loci belonging to supergroup B (Figure 4). Therefore, there was substantial incongruence between the *Wolbachia* phylogenies based on the MLST genes and the *wsp* gene sequences (Figure 4) and highlights limitations of supergroup assignment.

Discussion

Two reports have predicted the incidence of Wolbachia in lepidopteran insects and arthropods more generally (Weinert et al. 2015; Ahmed et al. 2016). The estimated infection incidence in species was predicted to be 80% in Lepidoptera, which is much higher than the 52% incidence predicted in arthropods. However, the mean prevalence of Wolbachia in Lepidoptera (27%) is similar to that that in arthropods (24%). The high incidence and low prevalence of Wolbachia in Lepidoptera was interpreted as indicating substantial horizontal transmission of Wolbachia (Ahmed et al. 2016). For the Aeromachini butterflies considered in this study, the mean prevalence in samples (25%) was like the value in other Lepidoptera (27%) and arthropods more generally (24%). On the other hand, the presence of the infection at the species level (46%) was similar to that in arthropods (52%) but considerably lower than reported previously in Lepidoptera (80%). However, the 21 uninfected species in this study are often represented by only 1 or 2 individuals, such as Ampittia trimacula, A. jhora, Pedesta xiaoqingae, and Pedesta zinnia. The proportion of species infected should therefore be considered as an underestimate of the actual incidence of Wolbachia infection across Aeromachini species until larger sample sizes across the geographic range of species are considered.

Two cophylogenetic analyses revealed no correlation of genetic distances between Wolbachia strains and their butterfly hosts, which further supports horizontal transmission of Wolbachia in the tribe. The divergence time of Wolbachia supergroups was compared with that of Aeromachini species (Figure 3). Gerth and Bleidorn (2016) estimated the divergence time between Wolbachia supergroups A and B was 216.61 Mya. This implies that transfers of Wolbachia from different supergroups between Aeromachini species cannot due to divergence coinciding with speciation events which are dated between 6.69 and 43.30 Mya. Instead, these analyses point to clear cases of horizontal transmission. The Wolbachia strain wJho provides a particularly strong argument for horizontal transmission, given that it was present in three species in the tribe (Figure 2). The individuals of A. jhora, A. propinguus, and P. bivitta, infected with wJho, co-occur in Yunnan Province, southwest of China, presumably reflecting an opportunity for horizontal transmission.

Pathways of horizontal transmission for Wolbachia could occur through hybridization (e.g., Jiang et al. 2018), feeding on common plants (e.g., Sintupachee et al. 2006; Li et al. 2017), ectoparasitic mites (e.g., Jaenike et al. 2007; Gehrer and Vorburger 2012), or parasitoids (e.g., Vavre et al. 1999; Ahmed et al. 2015). To our knowledge, there is no report of hybridization in the tribe Aeromachini so far. Although sympatric species A. jhora and A. propinguus harbor the same Wolbachia strains based on MLST typing, we cannot confirm Wolbachia spread through introgressive hybridization based on the ML trees constructed with mt+nDNA, mtDNA, and nDNA using IQtree (Supplementary Figure S2). We also found the topological structure based on mtDNA sequence was consistent with mt+nDNA, but different from nDNA. The discordance between these patterns may have several reasons including inaccurate species taxonomy, paralogous pseudogenes, incomplete lineage sorting (ILS), and introgressive hybridization.



Figure 3 (A) Estimated divergence times of Wolbachia Supergroups A and B based on Gerth and Bleidom (2016), and (B) Bayesian Inference (BI) tree of mtDNA datasets for Aeromachini species using uncorrelated lognormal relaxed clock in BEAST v1.5.2. Posterior probabilities of nodes are shown to the right of the node branch when higher than 0.95. The violet bars (B) indicate 95% highest posterior density interval (HPD) of the node ages.

Table 1 Average P-values of recombinations estimated using the RDP3 pr	rogram
--	--------

Recombination strains	Average P-value							
	RDP	GENECONV	BootScan	MaxChi	Chimaera	SiScan	3Seq	
wIna	5.306×10^{-09}	2.475×10^{-08}	5.032×10^{-10}	8.266×10^{-11}	7.207×10^{-12}	_	1.395×10^{-18}	
wJho	_	1.585×10^{-06}	1.516×10^{-08}	5.784×10^{-11}	5.719×10^{-11}	_	8.139×10^{-18}	
wYin	_	1.308×10^{-10}	1.904×10^{-12}	2.522×10^{-11}	7.657×10^{-12}	_	1.177×10^{-18}	
wDol	—	1.585×10^{-16}	2.550×10^{-09}	5.784×10^{-11}	5.784×10^{-11}	_	5.360×10^{-18}	

We can exclude the possibility of inaccurate species taxonomy and paralogous pseudogenes in our case, as all specimens were identified carefully by experts and all sequences were checked for paralogous pseudogenes prior to analysis. However, we cannot really distinguish ILS from introgressive hybridization on the evidence we have so far. Also, the few substitutions detected in the nuclear markers tested here make it difficult to use these data to reconstruct fine-scale phylogenies. However, since most butterfly larvae feed on plant tissue, and adults obtain nectar from flowers or tree sap, the close relationship between



Figure 4 Maximum likelihood trees for each MLST gene and the wsp gene. Numbers beside nodes are IQTREE ultrafast bootstrap and SH-aLRT values. The Wolbachia strains of Supergroups A are in blue and those of Supergroups B are in red.

butterflies and host plants might lead to infection transmission through plant mediation (Sintupachee *et al.* 2006). There are many known hymenopteran parasitoids found on both lepidopteran and dipteran hosts, and generalist parasitoids may also have mediated horizontal transmission (Apiwathnasom 2012). This could be further tested by examining *Wolbachia* strains in parasitoids particularly in those from Yunnan province.

The recombination analysis of each MLST allele and *wsp* using RDP3 found intragenic recombination in the FtsZ gene in four *Wolbachia* strains. This result also argues for horizontal transmission between *Wolbachia* strains in the tribe Aeromachini; the very similar recombined FtsZ sequence in four species-specific *Wolbachia* strains may reflect a second horizontal transmission in these closely related species (Supplementary Figure S1). In our reconstructed ML trees for each MLST allele and *wsp* gene (Figure 4), we found potential recombination events by checking every

allele for supergroup localization among the gene trees. Eleven *Wolbachia* strains from Aeromachini species showed inconsistent supergroup localization for the five MLST allele trees. The substantial incongruence between the *Wolbachia* phylogenies based on the MLST concatenated sequences and the *wsp* gene (Figure 4) suggests that the different *Wolbachia* genes have undergone independent evolutionary trajectories. This has also been observed in rice planthoppers, butterflies, and moths (Zhang et al. 2013; Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017) and highlights the limitations of the MLST system for classifying *Wolbachia* strains, whereas full genome sequencing may be required to further establish relationships among *Wolbachia* strains (Conner et al. 2017; Cooper et al. 2019; Meany et al. 2019).

Taken together, this study provides a conservative estimate of *Wolbachia* prevalence (25%) of the butterfly tribe Aeromachini with a species incidence of >46%. The cophylogenetic

comparison, divergence time estimation, and Wolbachia recombination analysis revealed that Wolbachia acquisition in Aeromachini is often through horizontal transmission as also found for other groups such as fruit flies (Turelli *et al.* 2018), spiders (Baldo *et al.* 2008), wasps (Huigens *et al.* 2004), trypetids (Schuler *et al.* 2013), leaf beetles (Jackel *et al.* 2013), moths (Ahmed *et al.* 2016), rice planthoppers (Zhang *et al.* 2013), and mosquitoes (Shaikevich *et al.* 2019).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Zhibin Chen (Shanghai Zoological Park, Shanghai, China), Jialin Chen (Foshan, Guangdong, China), Siyao Huang (Zhuhai, Guangdong, China), Shusheng Zhang (Wuyanling National Nature Reserve, Zhejiang, China), Hao Huang (Qingdao, Shangdong, China), Liang Tang, Jiayao Hu, Ziwei Yin, Zhong Peng, and Lizhen Li (Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, China) for providing valuable comments and specimens throughout the project.

Funding

This study was financially supported by grants from Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (20ZR1440800), Shanghai Municipal Human Resources and Social Security Bureau (No.2019112) and Shanghai Normal University (SK202143).

Data availability

The authors state that all data necessary for confirming the conclusions presented in the article are represented fully within the article. All original raw sequence data files are available via the GenBank (accession number MT935975–MT936085 and MK344780–MK345418).

Supplementary material is available at G3 online.

Conflicts of interest

None declared.

Literature cited

- Ahmed MZ, Araujo-Jnr EV, Welch JJ, Kawahara AY. 2015. Wolbachia in butterflies and moths: geographic structure in infection frequency. Front Zool. 12:16.
- Ahmed MZ, Breinholt JW, Kawahara AY. 2016. Evidence for common horizontal transmission of *Wolbachia* among butterflies and moths. BMC Evol Biol. 16:118.
- Apiwathnasorn C. 2012. Literature review of parasitoids of filth flies in Thailand: a list of species with brief notes on bionomics of common species. Se Asian J Trop Med. 43:48–54.
- Augustinos AA, Santos-Garcia D, Dionyssopoulou E, Moreira M, Papapanagiotou A, et al. 2011. Detection and characterization of Wolbachia infections in natural populations of Aphids: is the hidden diversity fully unraveled? PLoS One. 6:e28695.
- Balbuena JA, Míguez-Lozano R, Blasco-Costa I. 2013. PACo: a novel Procrustes application to cophylogenetic analysis. PLoS One. 8: e61048.
- Baldo L, Ayoub NA, Hayashi CY, Russell JA, Stahlhut JK, et al. 2008. Insight into the routes of Wolbachia invasion: high levels of horizontal transfer in the spider genus Agelenopsis revealed by

Wolbachia strain and mitochondrial DNA diversity. Mol Ecol. 17: 557–569.

- Baldo L, Werren JH. 2007. Revisiting *Wolbachia* supergroup typing based on WSP: spurious lineages and discordance with MLST. Curr Microbiol. 55:81–87.
- Baldo L, Dunning HJC, Jolley KA, Bordenstein SR, Biber SA, et al. 2006. Multilocus sequence typing system for the endosymbiont Wolbachia pipientis. Appl Environ Microbiol. 72:7098–7110.
- Baldo L, Bordenstein S, Wernegreen JJ, Werren JH. 2006. Widespread recombination throughout Wolbachia genomes. Mol Biol Evol. 23: 437–449.
- Bandi C, Anderson TJC, Genchi C, Blaxter ML. 1998. Phylogeny of Wolbachia in filarial nematodes. Proc Biol Sci. 265:2407–2413.
- Bipinchandra KS, Rahul CS, Dhiraj PD, Sandeep AW, Avinash BK, et al. 2012. Determination of Wolbachia diversity in butterflies from Western Ghats, India, by a multigene approach. Appl Environ Microb. 78:4458–4467.
- Bohonak AJ. 2002. IBD (Isolation by Distance): a program for analyses of Isolation by Distance. J Hered. 93:153–154.
- Charlat S, Hornett EA, Fullard JH, Davies N, Roderick GK, et al. 2007. Extraordinary flux in sex ratio. Science. 317:214.
- Chazot N, Wahlberg N, Freitas AVL, Mitter C, Labandeira C, et al. 2019. The trials and tribulations of priors and posteriors in Bayesian timing of divergence analyses: the age of butterfles revisited. Syst Biol. 68:797–813.
- Conner WR, Blaxter ML, Anfora G, Ometto L, Rota-Stabelli O, et al. 2017. Genome comparisons indicate recent transfer of wRi-like Wolbachia between sister species Drosophila suzukii and D. subpulchrella. Ecol Evol. 7:9391–9404.
- Cooper BS, Vanderpool D, Conner WR, Matute DR, Turelli M. 2019. Wolbachia acquisition by Drosophila yakuba-clade hosts and transfer of incompatibility loci between distantly related Wolbachia. Genetics. 212:1399–1419.
- de Jong R. 2016. Reconstructing a 55-million-year-old butterfly (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae). Eur J Entomol. 113:423–428.
- Duplouy A, Hurst GDD, O'Neill SL, Charlat S. 2010. Rapid spread of male-killing Wolbachia in the butterfly Hypolimnas bolina. J Evol Biol. 23:231–235.
- Dyson EA, Hurst GD. 2004. Persistence of an extreme sex-ratio bias in a natural population. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 101:6520–6523.
- Dyson EA, Kamath MK, Hurst GD. 2002. Wolbachia infection associated with all-female broods in *Hypolimnas bolina* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae): evidence for horizontal transmission of a butterfly male-killer. Heredity (Edinb). 88:166–171.
- Eliot JN. 1969. An analysis of the Eurasian and Australian Neptini. Bull Br Mus Nat Hist. 15:1–155.
- Excoffier L, Laval G, Schneider S. 2005. Arlequin ver. 3.0: an integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. Evol Bioinform. 1:47–50.
- Fu YX, Li WH. 1993. Statistical tests of neutrality of mutations. Genetics. 133:693–709.
- Gehrer L, Vorburger C. 2012. Parasitoids as vectors of facultative bacterial endosymbionts in aphids. Biol Lett. 8:613–615.
- Gerth M, Bleidorn C. 2016. Comparative genomics provides a timeframe for Wolbachia evolution and exposes a recent biotin synthesis operon transfer. Nat Microb. 2:16241.
- Gompert Z, Forister ML, Fordyce JA, Nice CC. 2008. Widespread mito-nuclear discordance with evidence for introgressive hybridization and selective sweeps in Lycaeides. Mol Ecol. 17:5231–5244.
- Hall TA. 1999. BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor an analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. Nucleic Acids Symp. 41:95–98.

- Hiroki M, Tagami Y, Miura K, Kato Y. 2004. Multiple infection with Wolbachia inducing different reproductive manipulations in the butterfly *Eurema hecabe*. Proc Biol Sci. 271:1751–1755.
- Hoang DT, Chernomor O, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ, Vinh LS. 2018. UFBoot2: improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. Mol Biol Evol. 35:518–522.
- Hornett EA, Charlat S, Duplouy AMR, Davies N, Roderick GK, et al. 2006. Evolution of male-killer suppression in a natural population. PLoS Biol. 4:e283.
- Hornett EA, Duplouy AMR, Davies N, Roderick GK, Wedell N, *et al.* 2008. You can't keep a good parasite down: evolution of a male-killer suppressor uncovers cytoplasmic incompatibility. Evolution. 62:1258–1263.
- Huang ZF, Chiba H, Jin J, Kizhakke AG, Wang M, et al. 2019. A multilocus phylogenetic framework of the tribe Aeromachini (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae: Hesperiinae), with implications for taxonomy and biogeography. Syst Entomol. 44:163–178.
- Huang H. 2009. Systematic and Taxonomic Study on the Tribe Aeromachini Tutt (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae) from China. Dissertation. Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai.
- Huigens ME, Almeida RP, de Boons PAH, Luck RF, Stouthamer R. 2004. Natural interspecific and intraspecific horizontal transfer of parthenogenesis-inducing Wolbachia in Trichogramma wasps. Proc Biol Sci. 271:509–515.
- Hurst GDD, Jiggins FM. 2000. Male-killing bacteria in insects: mechanisms, incidence, and implications. Emerg Infect Dis. 6:329–336.
- Ilinsky Y, Kosterin OE. 2017. Molecular diversity of Wolbachia in Lepidoptera: prevalent allelic content and high recombination of MLST genes. Mol Phylogenet Evol. 109:164–179.
- Jackel R, Mora D, Dobler S. 2013. Evidence for selective sweeps by Wolbachia infections: phylogeny of Altica leaf beetles and their reproductive parasites. Mol Ecol. 22:4241–4255.
- Jaenike J, Polak M, Fiskin A, Helou M, Minhas M. 2007. Interspecific transmission of endosymbiotic Spiroplasma by mites. Biol Lett. 3: 23–25.
- Jiang WB, Wu YJ, He HY, Zhu JQ, Yu WD. 2016. A prevalence survey of Wolbachia in Polytremis fukia (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae). J. Asia-Pac. Entomol. 19:399–404.
- Jiang WB, Zhu JQ, Wu YJ, Li LZ, Li YY, et al. 2018. Influence of Wolbachia infection on mitochondrial DNA variation in the genus Polytremis (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae). Mol Phylogenet Evol. 129: 158–170.
- Jiang WB, Zhu JQ, Chen MH, Yang QC, Du X, et al. 2014. Wolbachia infection status and genetic structure in natural populations of Polytremis nascens (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae). Infect Genet Evol. 27:202–211.
- Jiang WB, He HY, Li YY, Wang Y, Ge C, *et al.* 2019. Molecular phylogeny of the tutterfly tribe Baorini Doherty, 1886 (Hesperiidae, Hesperiinae) in China. Zootaxa. 4565:zootaxa.4565.1.8.
- Jiggins FM, Hurst GD, Dolman CE, Majerus ME. 2000. High prevalence male-killing Wolbachia in the butterfly Acraea encedana. J Evol Biol. 13:495–501.
- Jiggins FM, Hurst GD, Schulenburg JH, Majerus ME. 2001. Two male-killing Wolbachia strains coexist within a population of the butterfly *Acraea encedon*. Heredity (Edinb). 86:161–166.
- Kageyama D, Narita S, Noda H. 2008. Transfection of feminizing Wolbachia endosymbionts of the butterfly, *Eurema hecabe*, into the cell culture and various immature stages of the silkmoth, *Bombyx* mori. Microb Ecol. 56:733–741.
- Kodandaramaiah U, Weingartner E, Janz N, Dalen L, Nylin S. 2011. Population structure in relation to host-plant ecology and *Wolbachia* infestation in the comma butterfly. J Evol Biol. 24: 2173–2185.

- Lanfear R, Calcott B, Ho SYW, Guindon S. 2012. PartitionFinder: combined selection of partitioning schemes and substitution models for phylogenetic analyses. Mol Biol Evol. 29:1695–1701.
- Li SJ, Ahmed MZ, Lv N, Shi PQ, Wang XM, et al. 2017. Plant mediated horizontal transmission of Wolbachia between whiteflies. ISME J. 11:1019–1028.
- Li YY, Zhu JQ, Ge C, Wang Y, Zhao ZM, et al. 2019. Molecular phylogeny and historical biogeography of the butterfly tribe Aeromachini Tutt (Lepidoptera: Hesperiidae) from China. Cells. 8:294.
- Maddison WP. 2015. Mesquite: A modular system for evolutionary analysis. Version 3.04. Available from http://mesquiteproject.org.
- Martin DP, Lemey P, Lott M, Moulton V, Posada D, et al. 2010. RDP3: a flexible and fast computer program for analyzing recombination. Bioinformatics. 26:2462–2463.
- Meany M, Conner W, Richter S, Bailey J, Cooper B, et al. 2019. Loss of cytoplasmic incompatibility and minimal fecundity effects explain relatively low Wolbachia frequencies in Drosophila mauritiana. Evolution. 73:1278–1295
- Narita S, Nomura M, Kato Y, Yata O, Kageyama D. 2007. Molecular phylogeography of two sibling species of *Eurema butterflies*. Genetica. 131:241–253.
- Nguyen LT, Schmidt HAA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: a fast and effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. Mol Biol Evol. 32:268–274.
- Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, et al. 2018. Vegan: community ecology package. R Package Version. 2:4–6.
- Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K. 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R language. Bioinformatics. 20:289–290.
- Raychoudhury R, Baldo L, Oliveira DC, Werren JH. 2009. Modes of acquisition of Wolbachia: horizontal transfer, hybrid introgression, and codivergence in the Nasonia species complex. Evolution. 63: 165–183.
- Rousset F, Bouchon D, Pintureau B, Juchault P, Solignac M. 1992. Wolbachia endosymbionts responsible for various alterations of sexuality in arthropods. Proc Biol Sci. 250:91–98.
- Russell JA, Goldman-Huertas B, Moreau CS, Baldo L, Stahlhut JK, *et al.* 2009. Specialization and geographic isolation among *Wolbachia* symbionts from ants and lycaenid butterflies. Evolution. 63: 624–640.
- Schuler H, Bertheau C, Egan SP, Feder JL, Riegler M, et al. 2013. Evidence for a recent horizontal transmission and spatial spread of Wolbachia from endemic Rhagoletis cerasi (Diptera: Tephritidae) to invasive Rhagoletis cingulata in Europe. Mol Ecol. 22:4101–4111.
- Shaikevich E, Bogacheva A, Rakova V, Ganushkina L, Ilinsky Y. 2019. Wolbachia symbionts in mosquitoes: intra- and intersupergroup recombinations, horizontal transmission and evolution. Mol Phylogenet Evol. 134:24–34.
- Sintupachee S, Milne JR, Poonchaisri S, Baimai V, Kittayapong P. 2006. Closely related *Wolbachia* strains within the pumpkin arthropod community and the potential for horizontal transmission via the plant. Microb Ecol. 51:294–301.
- Stouthamer R, Breeuwert JA, Luck RF, Werren JH. 1993. Molecular identification of microorganisms associated with parthenogenesis. Nature. 361:66–68.
- Tagami Y, Miura K. 2004. Distribution and prevalence of Wolbachia in Japanese populations of Lepidoptera. Insect Mol Biol. 13:359–364.
- Turelli M, Cooper BS, Richardson KM, Ginsberg PS, Peckenpaugh B, et al. 2018. Rapid global spread of wRi-like Wolbachia across multiple Drosophila. Curr Biol. 28:963–971.
- Vavre F, Fleury F, Lepetit D, Fouillet P, Bouletreau M. 1999. Phylogenetic evidence for horizontal transmission of Wolbachia in host-parasitoid associations. Mol Biol Evol. 16:1711–1723.

- Wang GH, Jia LY, Xiao JH, Huang DW. 2016. Discovery of a new Wolbachia supergroup in cave spider species and the lateral transfer of phage WO among distant hosts. Infect Genet Evol. 41:1–7.
- Warren AD, Ogawa JR, Brower AVZ. 2008. Phylogenetic relationships of subfamilies and circumscription of tribes in the family Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera: Hesperioidea). Cladistics. 24:642–676.
- Warren AD, Ogawa JR, Brower AVZ. 2009. Revised classifiation of the family Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera: Hesperioidea) based on combined molecular and morphological data. Syst. Entomol. 34: 467–523.
- Weinert LA, Araujo-Jnr EV, Ahmed MZ, Welch JJ. 2015. The incidence of bacterial endosymbionts in terrestrial arthropods. Proc Biol Sci. 282:20150249.

- Werren JH, Bartos JD. 2001. Recombination in Wolbachia. Curr Biol. 11:431–435.
- Yen JH, Barr AR. 1971. New hypothesis of the cause of cytoplasmic incompatibility in *Culex pipiens* L. Nature. 232:657–658.
- Zhang KJ, Han X, Hong XY. 2013. Various infection status and molecular evidence for horizontal transmission and recombination of *Wolbachia* and *Cardinium* among rice planthoppers and related species. Insect Sci. 20:329–344.
- Zhou W, Rousset F, O'Neil S. 1998. Phylogeny and PCR-based classification of Wolbachia strains using *wsp* gene sequences. Proc Biol Sci. 265:509–515.

Communicating editor: J. Ross-Ibarra