# A major gene controls mimicry and crypsis in butterflies and moths 
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#### Abstract

The wing patterns of butterflies and moths (Lepidoptera) are diverse and striking examples of evolutionary diversification by natural selection1,2. Lepidopteran wing colour patterns are a key innovation, consisting of arrays of coloured scales. We still lack a general understanding of how these patterns are controlled and if there is any commonality across the 160,000 moth and 17,000 butterfly species. Here, we identify a gene, cortex, through fine-scale mapping using population genomics and gene expression analyses, which regulates pattern switches in multiple species across the mimetic radiation in Heliconius butterflies. cortex belongs to a fast evolving subfamily of the otherwise highly conserved fizzy family of cell cycle regulators3, suggesting that it most likely regulates pigmentation patterning through regulation of scale cell development. In parallel with findings in the peppered moth (Biston betularia) 4 , our results suggest that this mechanism is common within Lepidoptera and that cortex has become a major target for natural selection acting on colour and pattern variation in this group of insects.


In Heliconius, there is a major effect locus, $Y b$, that controls a diversity of colour pattern elements across the genus. It is the only locus in Heliconius that regulates all scale types and colours, including the diversity of white and yellow pattern elements in the two co-mimics H. melpomene $(\mathrm{Hm})$ and $H$. erato $(\mathrm{He})$, but also whole wing variation in black, yellow, white, and orange/red elements in H. numata (Hn)5-7. In addition, genetic variation underlying the Bigeye wing pattern mutation in Bicyclus anynana, melanism in the peppered moth, Biston betularia, and melanism and patterning differences in the silkmoth, Bombyx mori, have all been localised to homologous genomic regions8-10 (Fig 1). Therefore, this genomic region appears to contain one or more genes that act as major regulators of wing pigmentation and patterning across the Lepidoptera.

Previous mapping of this locus in $\mathrm{He}, \mathrm{Hm}$ and Hn identified a genomic interval of $\sim 1 \mathrm{Mb} 11-$ 13 (Extended Data Table 1), which also overlaps with the 1.4 Mb region containing the carbonaria locus in B. betularia9 and a 100bp non-coding region containing the Ws mutation in B. mori10 (Fig 1). We took a population genomics approach to identify single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) most strongly associated with phenotypic variation within the $\sim 1 \mathrm{Mb}$ Heliconius interval. The diversity of wing patterning in Heliconius arises from divergence at wing pattern loci7, while convergent patterns generally involve the same loci and sometimes even the same alleles $14-16$. We used this pattern of divergence and sharing to identify SNPs associated with colour pattern elements across many individuals from a wide diversity of colour pattern phenotypes (Fig 2).

In three separate Heliconius species, our analysis consistently implicated the gene cortex as being involved in adaptive differences in wing colour pattern. In He the strongest associations with the presence of a yellow hindwing bar were centred around the genomic region containing cortex ( Fig 2 A ). We identified 108 SNPs that were fixed for one allele in He favorinus, and fixed for the alternative allele in all individuals lacking the yellow bar, the majority of which were in introns of cortex (Extended Data Table 2). 15 SNPs showed a similar fixed pattern for He demophoon, which also has a yellow bar. These were nonoverlapping with those in He favorinus, consistent with the hypothesis that this phenotype evolved independently in the two disjunct populations17.

Previous work has suggested that alleles at the $Y b$ locus are shared between $H m$ and the closely related species $H$. timareta, and also the more distantly related species H. elevatus, resulting in mimicry between these species18. Across these species, the strongest associations with the yellow hindwing bar phenotype were again found at cortex (Fig 2D, Extended Data Fig 1A and Table 3). Similarly, the strongest associations with the yellow forewing band were found around the 5 ' UTRs of cortex and gene HMOOO36, an orthologue of D. melanogaster washout gene. A single SNP $\sim 17 \mathrm{~kb}$ upstream of cortex (the closest gene) was perfectly associated with the yellow forewing band across all $H m, H$. timareta and $H$. elevatus individuals (Extended Data Fig 1A, Fig 2 and Table 3). We found no fixed coding sequence variants at cortex in a larger sample (43-61 individuals) of Hm aglaope and Hm amaryllis (Extended Data Figure 3, Supplementary Information), which differ in Yb controlled phenotypes 19, suggesting that functional variants are likely to be regulatory rather than coding. We found extensive transposable element variation around cortex but it is unclear if any of these associate with phenotype (Extended Data Figure 3 and Table 4; Supplementary Information).

Finally, in $H n$ large inversions at the $P$ supergene locus (Fig 1) are associated with different morphs13. There is a steep increase in genotype-by-phenotype association at the breakpoint of inversion 1, consistent with the role of these inversions in reducing recombination (Fig 2E). However, the bicoloratus morph can recombine with all other morphs across one or the other inversion, permitting finer-scale association mapping of this region. As in He and Hm , this analysis showed a narrow region of associated SNPs corresponding exactly to the cortex gene (Fig 2E), again with the majority of SNPs in introns (Extended Data Table 2). This associated region does not correspond to any other known genomic feature, such as an inversion or inversion breakpoint.

To determine whether sequence variants around cortex were regulating its expression we investigated gene expression across the $Y b$ locus. We used a custom designed microarray including probes from all predicted genes in the $H$. melpomene genome 18, as well as probes tiled across the central portion of the $Y b$ locus, focussing on two naturally hybridising Hm races (plesseni and malleti) that differ in $Y b$ controlled phenotypes7. cortex was the only gene across the entire interval to show significant expression differences both between races with different wing patterns and between wing sections with different pattern elements (Fig 3). This finding was reinforced in the tiled probe set, where we observed strong differences in expression of cortex exons and introns but few differences outside this region (Extended Data Table 2). cortex expression was higher in Hm malleti than Hm plesseni in all three wing sections used (but not eyes) (Fig 3C; Extended Data Fig 4C). When different wing sections were compared within each race, cortex expression in Hm malleti was higher in the distal section that contains the $Y b$ controlled yellow forewing band, consistent with cortex producing this band. In contrast, Hm plesseni, which lacks the yellow band, had higher cortex expression in the proximal forewing section (Fig 3F; Extended Data Fig 4J). Expression differences were found only in day 1 and day 3 pupal wings rather than day 5 or day 7 (Extended Data Fig 4), similar to the pattern observed previously for the transcription factor optix20.

Differential expression was not confined to the exons of cortex; the majority of differentially expressed probes in the tiling array corresponded to cortex introns (Fig 3). This does not appear to be due to transposable element variation (Extended Data Table 2), but may be due to elevated background transcription and unidentified splice variants. RT-PCR revealed a diversity of splice variants (Extended Data Fig 5), and sequenced products revealed 8 nonconstitutive exons and 6 variable donor/acceptor sites, but this was not exhaustive (Supplementary Information). We cannot rule out the possibility that some of the differentially expressed intronic regions could be distinct non-coding RNAs. However, qRTPCR in other hybridising races with divergent $Y b$ alleles (aglaope/amaryllis and rosina/ melpomene) also identified expression differences at cortex and allele-specific splicing differences between both pairs of races (Extended Data Figs 1 and 5, Supplementary Information).

Finally, in situ hybridisation of cortex in final instar larval hindwing discs showed expression in wing regions fated to become black in the adult wing, most strikingly in their correspondence to the black patterns on adult Hn wings (Fig 4). In contrast, the array results from pupal wings were suggestive of higher expression in non-melanic regions. This may suggest that cortex is upregulated at different time-points in wing regions fated to become different colours.

Overall, cortex shows significant differential expression and is the only gene in the candidate region to be consistently differentially expressed in multiple race comparisons and between differently patterned wing regions. Coupled with the strong genotype-by-phenotype associations across multiple independent lineages (Extended Data Table 1), this strongly implicates cortex as a major regulator of colour and pattern. However, we have not excluded the possibility that other genes in this region also influence pigmentation patterning. A prominent role for cortex is also supported by studies in other taxa; our identification of distant 5' untranslated exons of cortex (Supplementary Information) suggests that the 100bp interval containing the $W s$ mutation in $B$. mori is likely to be within an intron of cortex and not in intergenic space as previously thought10. In addition, fine-mapping and gene expression also implicate cortex as controlling melanism in the peppered moth4.

It seems likely that cortex controls pigmentation patterning through control of scale cell development. The cortex gene falls in an insect specific lineage within the fizzy/CDC20 family of cell cycle regulators (Extended Data Fig 6A). The phylogenetic tree of the gene family highlighted three major orthologous groups, two of which have highly conserved functions in cell cycle regulation mediated through interaction with the anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C)3,21. The third group, cortex, is evolving rapidly, with low amino acid identity between $D$. melanogaster and $H m$ cortex ( $14.1 \%$ ), contrasting with much higher identities for orthologues between these species in the other two groups (fzy, $47.8 \%$ and rap/fzr, $47.2 \%$, Extended Data Fig 6A). Drosophila melanogaster cortex acts through a similar mechanism to fzy in order to control meiosis in the female germ line2224. Hm cortex also has some conservation of the fizzy family C-box and IR elements (Supplementary Information) that mediate binding to the APC/C23, suggesting that it may have retained a cell cycle function, although we found that expressing Hm cortex in $D$.
melanogaster wings produced no detectable effect (Extended Data Fig 6, Supplementary Information).

Previously identified butterfly wing patterning genes have been transcription factors or signalling molecules20,25. Developmental rate has long been thought to play a role in lepidopteran patterning26,27, but cortex was not a likely a priori candidate, because its Drosophila orthologue has a highly specific function in meiosis 23 . The recruitment of cortex to wing patterning appears to have occurred before the major diversification of the Lepidoptera and this gene has repeatedly been targeted by natural selection1,7,9,28 to generate both cryptic4 and aposematic patterns.

## Methods

## He Cr reference

$C r$ is the homologue of $Y b$ in He (Fig 1). An existing reference for this region was available in 3 pieces $(467,734 b p, 114,741 \mathrm{bp}$ and $161,149 \mathrm{bp}$, GenBank: KC469893.1)31. We screened the same BAC library used previously11,31 using described procedures 11 with probes designed to the ends of the existing BAC sequences and the $H m Y b$ BAC reference sequence. Two BACs (04B01 and 10B14) were identified as spanning one of the gaps and sequenced using Illumina $2 \times 250 \mathrm{bp}$ paired-end reads collected on the Illumina MiSeq. The raw reads were screened to remove vector and $E$. coli bases. The first 50 k read pairs were taken for each BAC and assembled individually with the Phrap32 software and manually edited with consed33. Contigs with discordant read pairs were manually broken and properly merged using concordant read data. Gaps between contig ends were filled using an in-house finishing technique where the terminal 200bp of the contig ends were extracted and queried against the unused read data for spanning pairs, which were added using the addSolexaReads.perl script in the consed package. Finally, a single reference contig was generated by identifying and merging overlapping regions of the two consensus BAC sequences.

In order to fill the remaining gap (between positions 800,387 and 848,446 ) we used the overhanging ends to search the scaffolds from a preliminary He genome assembly of five Illumina paired end libraries with different insert sizes (250, 500, 800, 4300 and 6500bp) from two related He demophoon individuals. We identified two scaffolds (scf1869 and scf1510) that overlapped and spanned the gap (using 12,257bp of the first scaffold and $35,803 \mathrm{bp}$ of the second).

The final contig was $1,009,595 \mathrm{bp}$ in length of which $2,281 \mathrm{bp}$ were unknown ( N 's). The HeCr assembly was verified by aligning to the HmYb genome scaffold (HE667780) with mummer and blast. The HeCr contig was annotated as described previously32, with some minor modifications. Briefly this involved first generating a reference based transcriptome assembly with existing H. erato RNA-seq wing tissue (GenBank accession SRA060220). We used Trimmomatic34 (v0.22), and FLASh35 (v1.2.2) to prepare the raw sequencing reads, checking the quality with FastQC36 (v0.10.0). We then used the Bowtie/TopHat/ Cufflinks37-39 pipeline to generate transcripts for the unmasked reference sequence. We generated gene predictions with the MAKER pipeline40 (v2.31). Homology and synteny in
gene content with the Hm Yb reference were identified by aligning the Hm coding sequences to the He reference with BLAST. Homologous genes were present in the same order and orientation in He and Hm (Fig 2B,C). Annotations were manually adjusted if genes had clearly been merged or split in comparison to H. melpomene (which has been extensively manually curated12). In addition He cortex was manually curated from the RNA-seq data and using Exonerate41 alignments of the $H$. melpomene protein and mRNA transcripts, including the $5^{\prime}$ UTRs.

## Genotype-by-phenotype association analyses

Information on the individuals used and ENA accessions for sequence data are given in Supplementary Table 1 . We used shotgun Illumina sequence reads from 45 He individuals from 7 races that were generated as part of a previous study31 (Supplementary Information). Reads were aligned to an He reference containing the Cr contig and other sequenced He BACs11,31 with BWA42, which has previously been found to work better than Stampy 43 (which was used for the alignments in the other species) with an incomplete reference sequence31. The parameters used were as follows: Maximum edit distance (n), 8 ; maximum number of gap opens (o), 2; maximum number of gap extensions (e), 3; seed (1), 35; maximum edit distance in seed (k), 2. We then used Picard tools to remove PCR and optical duplicate sequence reads and GATK44 to re-align indels and call SNPs using all individuals as a single population. Expected heterozygosity was set to 0.2 in GATK. 132,397 SNPs were present across $C r$. A further 52,698 SNPs not linked to colour pattern loci were used to establish background association levels.

For the $\mathrm{Hm} / \mathrm{Hn}$ clade we used previously published sequence data from 19 individuals from enrichment sequencing targeting of the $Y b$ region, the unlinked $H m B / D$ region that controls the presence/absence of red colour pattern elements, and $\sim 1.8 \mathrm{Mb}$ of non-colour pattern genomic regions 45 , as well as 9 whole genome shotgun sequenced individuals 18,46 . We added targeted sequencing and shotgun whole genome sequencing of an additional 47 individuals (Supplementary Information). Alignments were performed using Stampy 43 with default parameters except for substitution rate which was set to 0.01 . We again removed duplicates and used GATK to re-align indels and call SNPs with expected heterozygosity set to 0.1 .

The analysis of the $\mathrm{Hm} /$ timareta/silvaniform included 49 individuals, which were aligned to v1.1 of the $H m$ reference genome with the scaffolds containing $Y b$ and $H m B / D$ swapped with reference BAC sequences 18 , which contained fewer gaps of unknown sequence than the genome scaffolds. 232,631 SNPs were present in the $Y b$ region and a further 370,079 SNPs were used to establish background association levels.

The Hn analysis included 26 individuals aligned to unaltered v1.1 of the Hm reference genome, because the genome scaffold containing $Y b$ is longer than the BAC reference making it easier to compare the inverted and non-inverted regions present in this species. We tested for associations at 262,137 SNPs on the $Y b$ scaffold with the Hn bicoloratus morph, which had a sample of 5 individuals.

We measured associations between genotype and phenotype using a score test (qtscore) in the GenABEL package in R47. This was corrected for background population structure using a test specific inflation factor, $\lambda$, calculated from the SNPs unlinked to the major colour pattern controlling loci (described above), as the colour pattern loci are known to have different population structure to the rest of the genome $14,15,18$. We used a custom perl script to convert GATK vcf files to Illumina SNP format for input to genABEL47. genABEL does not accept multiallelic sites, so the script also converted the genotype of any individuals for which a third (or fourth) allele was present to a missing genotype (with these defined as the lowest frequency alleles). Custom R scripts were used to identify sites showing perfect associations with calls for $>75 \%$ of individuals.

## Microarray Gene Expression Analyses

We designed a Roche NimbleGen microarray (12x135K format) with probes for all annotated $H m$ genes 18 and tiling the central portion of the $Y b$ BAC sequence contig that was previously identified as showing the strongest differentiation between $H m$ races 45 . In addition to the HmYb tilling array probes there were 6,560 probes tiling HmAc (a third unlinked colour pattern locus) and 10,716 probes tiling $H m B / D$, again distanced on average at 10 bp intervals. The whole-genome gene expression array contained 107,898 probes in total.

This was interrogated with Cy3 labelled double stranded cDNA generated from total RNA (with a SuperScript double-stranded cDNA synthesis kit, Invitrogen, and a one-colour DNA labelling kit, Niblegen) from four pupal developmental stages of Hm plesseni and malleti. Pupae were from captive stocks maintained in insectary facilities in Gamboa, Panama. Tissue was stored in RNA later at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ prior to RNA extraction. RNA was extracted using TRIzol (Invitrogen) followed by purification with RNeasy (Qiagen) and DNase treated with DNA-free (Ambion). Quantification was performed using a Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen) and purity and integrity assessed using a Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent). Samples were randomised and each hybridised to a separate array. The $H m Y b$ probe array contained 9,979 probes distanced on average at 10 bp . The whole-genome expression array contained on average 9 probes per annotated gene in the genome (v1.118) as well as any transcripts not annotated but predicted from RNA-seq evidence.

Background corrected expression values for each probe were extracted using NimbleScan software (version 2.3). Analyses were performed with the LIMMA package implemented in R/Bioconductor 48 . The tiling array and whole-genome data sets were analysed separately. Expression values were extracted and quantile-normalised, $\log _{2}$-transformed, quality controlled and analysed for differences in expression between individuals and wing regions. P-values were adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing using the False Discovery Rate (FDR) method 49.

We detected isoform-specific expression differences between Hm aglaopelamaryllis and Hm rosina/melpomene using RT-PCR and qRT-PCR on RNA extracted from developing hindwing tissue (further details in Supplementary Information). Previously published RNAseq data was also used to assess gene expression differences between Hm aglaope and amaryllis18 (further details in Supplementary Information).

## In situ hybridisations

$H n$ and Hm larvae were reared in a greenhouse at $25-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and sampled at the last instar. In situ hybridizations were performed according to previously described methods 25 with a cortex riboprobe synthesized from a 831-bp cDNA amplicon from Hn. Wing discs were incubated in a standard hybridization buffer containing the probe for $20-24 \mathrm{~h}$ at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. For secondary detection of the probe, wing discs were incubated in a 1:3000 dilution of antidigoxigenin alkaline phosphatase Fab fragments and stained with BM Purple for 3-6 h at room temperature. Stained wing discs were photographed with a Leica DFC420 digital camera mounted on a Leica Z6 APO stereomicroscope.

## De novo assembly of short read data in Hm and related taxa

In order to better characterise indel variation from the short-read sequence data used for the genotype-by-phenotype association analysis, we performed de novo assemblies of a subset of Hm individuals and related taxa with a diversity of phenotypes (Extended Data Figure 2). Assemblies were performed using the de novo assembly function of CLCGenomics Workbench v.6.0 under default parameters. The assembled contigs were then BLASTed against the $Y b$ region of the $H m$ melpomene genome18, using Geneious v.8.0. The contigs identified by BLAST were then concatenated to generate an allele sequence for each individual. Occasionally two unphased alleles were generated when two contigs were matched to a given region. If more than two contigs of equal length matched then this was considered an unresolvable repeat region and replaced with Ns. The assembled alleles were then aligned using the MAFFT alignment plugin in Geneious v.8.0.

## Long-range PCR targeted sequencing of cortex in Hm aglaope and Hm amaryllis

We generated two long-range PCR products covering $88.8 \%$ of the $1,344 \mathrm{bp}$ coding region of cortex (excluding 67bp at the 5' end and 83bp at the 3' end, further details in Supplementary Information). A product spanning coding exons 5 to 9 (the final exon) was obtained from 29 Hm amaryllis individuals and 29 Hm aglaope individuals; a product spanning coding exons 2 to 5 was obtained from 32 Hm amaryllis individuals and 14 Hm aglaope. In addition, a product spanning exons 4 to 6 was obtained from 6 Hm amaryllis and 5 Hm aglaope that failed to amplify one or both of the larger products. Long-range PCR was performed using Extensor long-range PCR mastermix (Thermo Scientific) following manufacturers guidelines with a $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ annealing temperature in a $10-20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ volume. The product spanning coding exons 5 to 9 was obtained with primers HM25_long_F1 and HM25_long_R4 (see Supplementary Table 2 for primer sequences); the product spanning coding exons 2 to 5 was obtained with primers HM25_long_F4 and HM25_long_R2; the product spanning exons 4 to 6 was obtained with primers 25_ex5-ex7_r1 and 25_ex5-ex7_f1. Products were pooled for each individual, including 5 additional products from the $Y b$ locus and 7 products in the region of the $H m B / D$ locus. They were then cleaned using QIAquick PCR purification kit (QIAgen) before being quantified with a Qubit Fluorometer (Life Technologies) and pooled in equimolar amounts for each individual, taking into account variation in the length and number of PCR products included for each individual (because of some PCR failures, ie. proportionally less DNA was included if some PCR products were absent for a given individual).

Products were pooled within individuals (including additional products for other genes not analysed here) and then quantified and pooled in equimolar amounts for each individual within each race. The pooled products for each race (Hm aglaope and amaryllis) were then prepared as two separate libraries with molecular identifiers and sequenced on a single lane of an Illumina GAIIx. Analysis was performed using Galaxy and the history is available at https://usegalaxy.org/u/njnadeau/h/long-pcr-final. Reads were quality filtered with a minimum quality of 20 required over $90 \%$ of the read, which resulted in $5 \%$ of reads being discarded. Reads were then quality trimmed to remove bases with quality less than 20 from the ends. They were then aligned to the target regions using the fosmid sequences from known races 45 with sequence from the $Y b$ BAC walk 12 used to fill any gaps. Alignments were performed with BWA v0.5.642 and converted to pileup format using Samtools v0.1.12 before being filtered based on quality ( $\geq 20$ ) and coverage ( $\geq 10$ ). BWA alignment parameters were as follows: fraction of missing alignments given $2 \%$ uniform base error rate (aln -n) 0.01 ; maximum number of gap opens (aln -o) 2; maximum number of gap extensions (aln e) 12; disallow long deletion within 12 bp towards the $3^{\prime}$-end (aln -d); number of first subsequences to take as seed (aln -1 ) 100 . We then calculated coverage and minor allele frequencies for each race and the difference between these using custom scripts in R50.

## Sequencing and analysis of $\mathbf{H m}$ fosmid clones

Fosmid libraries had previously been made from single individuals of 3 Hm races (rosina, amaryllis and aglaope) and several clones overlapping the $Y b$ interval had been sequenced45. We extended the sequencing of this region, particularly the region overlapping cortex by sequencing an additional 4 clones from Hm rosina (1051_83D21, accession KU514430; 1051_97A3, accession KU514431; 1051_65N6, accession KU514432; 1051_93D23, accession KU514433) 2 clones from Hm amaryllis (1051_13K4, accession KU514434; 1049_8P23, accession KU514435) and 3 clones from Hm aglaope (1048_80B22, accession KU514437; 1049_19P15, accession KU514436; 1048_96A7, accession KU514438). These were sequenced on a MiSeq 2000, and assembled using the de novo assembly function of CLCGenomcs Workbench v.6.0. The individual clones (including existing clones 1051-143B3, accession FP578990; 1049-27G11, accession FP700055; 1048-62H20, accession FP565804) were then aligned to the BAC and genome scaffold18 references using the MAFFT alignment plugin of Geneious v.8.0. Regions of general sequence similarity were identified and visualised using MAUVE51. We merged overlapping clones from the same individual if they showed no sequence differences, indicating that they came from the same allele. We identified transposable elements (TEs) using nBLAST with an insect TE list downloaded from Repbase Update52 including known Heliconius specific TEs53.

## 5' RACE, RT-PCR and qRT-PCR

All tissues used for gene expression analyses were dissected from individuals from captive stocks derived from wild caught individuals of various races of Hm (aglaope, amaryllis, melpomene, rosina, plesseni, malleti) and F2 individuals from a Hm rosina (female) x Hm melpomene (male) cross. Experimental individuals were reared at $28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-31^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Developing wings were dissected and stored in RNAlater (Ambion Life Technologies). RNA was extracted using a QIAgen RNeasy Mini kit following the manufacturer's guidelines and
treated with TURBO DNA-free DNase kit (Ambion Life Technologies) to remove remaining genomic DNA. RNA quantification was performed with a Nanodrop spectrophotometer, and the RNA integrity was assessed using the Bioanalyzer 2100 system (Agilent).

Total RNA was thoroughly checked for DNA contamination by performing PCR for EF1a (using primers ef1-a_RT_for and ef1-a_RT_rev, Table S2) with $0.5 \mu$ of RNA extract ( $50 \mathrm{ng}-1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of RNA) in a $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ reaction using a polymerase enzyme that is not functional with RNA template (BioScript, Bioline Reagents Ltd.). If a product amplified within 45 cycles then the RNA sample was re-treated with DNase.

Single stranded cDNA was synthesised using BioScript MMLV Reverse Transcriptase (Bioline Reagents Ltd.) with random hexamer (N6) primers and $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of template RNA from each sample in a $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ reaction volume following the manufacturer's protocol. The resulting cDNA samples were then diluted $1: 1$ with nuclease free water and stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

5' RACE was performed using RNA from hind-wing discs from one Hm aglaope and one Hm amaryllis final instar larvae with a SMARTer RACE kit from Clonetech (California, USA). The gene specific primer used for the first round of amplification was anchored in exon 4 (fzl_raceex5_R1, Supplementary Table 2). Secondary PCR of these products was then performed using a primer in exon 2 (HM25_long_F2, Supplementary Table 2) and the nested universal primer A. Other isoforms were detected by RT-PCR using primers within exons 2 and 9 (gene25_for_full1 and gene25_rev_ex3). We identified isoforms from 5' RACE and RT-PCR products by cutting individual bands from agarose gels and if necessary by cloning products before Sanger sequencing. Cloning of products was performed using TOPO TA (Invitrogen) or pGEM-T (Promega) cloning kits. Sanger sequencing was performed using BigDye terminator v3.1 (Applied Biosystems) run on an ABI13730 capillary sequencer. Primers fzl_ex1a_F1 and fzl_ex4_R1 were used to confirm expression of the furthest 5' UTR. For isoforms that appeared to show some degree of race specificity we designed isoform specific PCR primers spanning specific exon junctions (Extended Data Fig 2, 4, Supplementary Table 2) and used these to either qualitatively (RT-PCR) or quantitatively (qRT-PCR) assess differences in expression between races.

We performed qRT-PCR using SensiMix SYBR green (Bioline Reagents Ltd.) with $0.2-0.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of each primer and $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of the diluted product from the cDNA reactions. Reactions were performed in an Opticon 2 DNA engine (MJ Research), with the following cycling parameters: $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $10 \mathrm{~min}, 35-50 \mathrm{x}$ : $\left(95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$ for $15 \mathrm{sec}, 55-60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{sec}, 72^{\circ}$ for $30 \mathrm{sec}), 72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min . Melting curves were generated between $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with readings taken every $0.2^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for each of the products to check that a single product was generated. At least one product from each set of primers was also run on a $1 \%$ agarose gel to check that a single product of the expected size was produced and the identity of the product confirmed by direct sequencing (See Supplementary Table 2 for details of primers for each gene). We used two housekeeping genes (EF1a and Ribosomal Protein S3A) for normalisation and all results were taken as averages of triplicate PCR reactions for each sample.
$C_{t}$ values were defined as the point at which fluorescence crossed a threshold ( $R_{C t}$ ) adjusted manually to be the point at which fluorescence rose above the background level. Amplification efficiencies $(E)$ were calculated using a dilution series of clean PCR product. Starting fluorescence, which is proportional to the starting template quantity, was calculated as $R_{O}=R_{C t}(1+E)^{-C t}$. Normalized values were then obtained by dividing $R_{O}$ values for the target loci by $R_{O}$ values for EF1a and RPS3A. Results from both of these controls were always very similar, therefore the results presented are normalized to the mean of EF1a and RPS3A. All results were taken as averages of triplicate PCR reactions. If one of the triplicate values was more than one cycle away from the mean then this replicate was excluded. Similarly any individuals that were more than two standard deviations away from the mean of all individuals for the target or normalization genes were excluded (these are not included in the numbers of individuals reported). Statistical significance was assessed by Wilcoxon rank sum tests performed in R50.

## RNAseq analysis of Hm amaryllis/aglaope

RNA-seq data for hind-wings from three developmental stages had previously been obtained for two individuals of each race at each stage ( 12 individuals in total) and used in the annotation of the Hm genome18 (deposited in ENA under study accessions ERP000993 and PRJEB7951). Four samples were multiplexed on each sequencing lane with the fifth instar larval and day 2 pupal samples sequenced on a GAIIx sequencer and the day 3 pupal wings sequenced on a Hiseq 2000 sequencer.

Two methods were used for alignment of reads to the reference genome and inferring read counts, Stampy43 and RSEM (RNAseq by Expectation Maximisation)54. In addition we used two different R/Bioconductor packages for estimation of differential gene expression, DESeq55 and BaySeq 56. Read bases with quality scores < 20 were trimmed with FASTXToolkit (http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/index.html). Stampy was run with default parameters except for mean insert size, which was set to 500, SD 100 and substitution rate, which was set to 0.01 . Alignments were filtered to exclude reads with mapping quality <30 and sorted using Samtools57. We used the HT seq-count script in with HTseq58 to infer counts per gene from the BAM files.

RSEM54 was run with default parameters to infer a transcriptome and then map RNAseq reads against this using Bowtie37 as an aligner. This was run with default parameters except maximum number of mismatches, which was set to 3 .

## Annotation and alignment of fizzy family proteins

In the arthropod genomes, some fizzy family proteins were found to be poorly annotated based on alignments to other family members. In these cases annotations were improved using well annotated proteins from other species as references in the program Exonerate41 and the outputs were manually curated. Specifically, the annotation of B. mori fzr was extended based on alignment of D. plexippus fzr, the annotation of B. mori fzy was altered based on alignment of Drosophila melanogaster and D. plexippus fzy, H. melpomene fzy was identified as part of the annotated gene HMEL017486 on scaffold HE671623 (Hmel v1.1) based on alignment of D. plexippus fzy; the Apis mellifera fzr annotation was altered
based on alignment of D. melanogaster fzr, the annotation of Acyrthosiphon pisum fzr was altered based on alignment of $D$. melanogaster fzr. No one-to-one orthologues of $D$. melanogaster fzr2 were found in any of the other arthropod genera, suggesting that this gene is Drosophila specific. Multiple sequence alignment of all the fizzy family proteins was then performed using the Expresso server59 within T-coffee60, and this alignment was used to generate a neighbour joining tree in Geneious v8.1.7.

## Expression of $H$. melpomene cortex in D. melanogaster wings

D. melanogaster Cortex is known to generate an irregular microchaete phenotype when ectopically expressed in the posterior compartment of the adult fly wing24. We performed the same assay using $H$. melpomene cortex in order to test if this functionality was conserved. Following the methods of Swan and Schüpbach24 a UAS-GAL4 construct was created using the coding region for the long isoform of Hm cortex, plus a Drosophila cortex version to act as positive control. The HA-tagged H. melpomene UAS-cortex expression construct was generated using cDNA reverse transcribed (Revert-Aid, Thermo-Scientific) from RNA extracted (Qiagen RNeasy) from pre-ommochrome pupal wing material. An HAtagged D.melanogaster UAS-cortex version was also constructed, following the methods of Swan and Schüpbach, (2007). Expression was driven by hsp70 promoter. Constructs were injected into $\phi$ C31-attP40 flies (\#25709, Bloomington stock centre, Indiana; Cambridge University Genetics Department, UK, fly injection service) by site directed insertion into CII via an attB site in the construct. Homozygous transgenic flies were crossed with w, y ; ;en-GAL4;UAS-GFP (gift of M. Landgraf lab, Cambridge University Zoology Department) to drive expression in the engrailed posterior domain of the wing, and adult offspring wings photographed (Extended Data Fig 6B-D). Expression of the construct was confirmed by IHC (standard Drosophila protocol) of final instar larval wing discs using mouse anti-HA and goat anti-mouse alexa-fluor 568 secondary antibodies (Abcam), imaged by Leica SP5 confocal. Successful expression of Hm_Cortex was confirmed by IHC against an HA tag inserted at the N terminal of either protein (Extended Data Fig 6E).

## Extended Data
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## Extended Data Figure 1.

A) Exons and splice variants of cortex in $H m$. Orientation is reversed with respect to figures 2 and 4, with transcription going from left to right. SNPs showing the strongest associations with phenotype are shown with stars. B) Differential expression of two regions of cortex between Hm amaryllis and Hm aglaope whole hindwings ( $\mathrm{N}=11$ and $\mathrm{N}=10$ respectively). Boxplots are standard (median; $75^{\text {th }}$ and $25^{\text {th }}$ percentiles; maximum and minimum excluding outliers - shown as discrete points) C) Expression of a cortex isoform lacking exon 3 is found in Hm aglaope but not Hm amaryllis hindwings. D) Expression of an isoform lacking exon 5 is found in Hm rosina but not Hm melpomene hindwings. Green triangles indicate predicted start codons and red triangles predicted stop codons, with usage dependent on which exons are present in the isoform. Schematics of the targeted exons are shown for each (q)RT-PCR product, black triangles indicate the position of the primers used in the assay.
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## Extended Data Figure 2.

Alignments of de novo assembled fragments containing the top associated SNPs from Hm and related taxa short-read data. Identified indels do not show stronger associations with phenotype that those seen at SNPs (as shown in Extended Data Table 2), although some near-perfect associations are seen in fragment C. Black regions = missing data; yellow box $=$ individuals with a hindwing yellow bar; blue box = individuals with a yellow forewing band.




## Extended Data Figure 3.

Sequencing of long-range PCR products and fosmids spanning cortex. A) Sequence read coverage from long-range PCR products across the cortex coding region from 2 Hm races. B) Minor allele frequency difference from these reads between Hm aglaope and Hm amaryllis. Exons of cortex are indicated by boxes, numbered as in Extended Data Figure 2. C) Alignments of sequenced fosmids overlapping cortex from 3 Hm individuals of difference races. No major rearrangements are observed, nor any major differences in transposable element (TE) content between closely related races with different colour patterns (melpomene/rosina or amaryllis/aglaope). Hm amaryllis and rosina have the same phenotype, but do not share any TEs that are not present in the other races. Hm_BAC = BAC reference sequence, Hm _mel = melpomene from new unpublished assembly of Hm
genome51, Hm_ros = rosina ( 2 different alleles were sequenced from this individual), Hm_ama = amaryllis ( 2 non-overlapping clones were sequenced in this individual), Hm_agla = aglaope ( 4 clones were sequenced in this individual 2 of which represent alternative alleles). Alignments were performed with Mauve: coloured bars represent homologous genomic regions. cortex is annotated in black above each clone. Variable TEs are shown as coloured bars below each clone: red = Metulj-like non-LTR, yellow $=$ Helitronlike DNA, grey $=$ other.


## Extended Data Figure 4.

Expression array results for additional stages, related to Figure 4. A-G: comparisons between races (H. m. plesseni and H. m. malleti) for 3 wing regions. H-N: comparisons between proximal and distal forewing regions for each race. Significance values (-log10(pvalue)) are shown separately for genes in the $H m Y b$ region from the gene array (A,D,F,H,K,M) and for the $H m Y b$ tiling array (B,E,G,I,L,N) for day 1 (A,B,H,I), day 5 ( $\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{L}$ ) and day $7(\mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N})$ after pupation. The level of expression difference (log fold change) for tiling probes showing significant differences (p $₫ 0.05$ ) is shown for day 1 ( C and J ) with probes in known cortex exons shown in dark colours and probes elsewhere shown as pale colours.


Extended Data Figure 5.
Alternative splicing of cortex. A) Amplification of the whole cortex coding region, showing the diversity of isoforms and variation between individuals. B) Differences in splicing of exon 3 between H. m. aglaope and H. m. amaryllis. Products amplified with a primer spanning the exon $2 / 4$ junction at 3 developmental stages. The lower panel shows verification of this assay by amplification between exons 2 and 4 for the same final instar larval samples (replicated in Extended Data Figure 2C) C) Lack of consistent differences between H. m. melpomene and H. m. rosina in splicing of exon 3. Top panel shows products
amplified with a primer spanning the exon $2 / 4$ junction, lower panel is the same samples amplified between exons 2 and 4. D) Differences in splicing of exon 5 between $H$. m. melpomene and $H$. m. rosina. Products amplified with a primer spanning the exon $4 / 6$ junction at 3 developmental stages. E) Subset of samples from $D$ amplified with primers between exons 4 and 6 for verification (middle, 24hr pupae samples are replicated in Extended Data Figure 2D). F) Lack of consistent differences between $H$. m. aglaope and $H$. m. amaryllis in splicing of exon 5. Products amplified with a primer spanning the exon $4 / 6$ junction. G) H. m. cythera also expresses the isoform lacking exon 5, while a pool of $6 \mathrm{H} . \mathrm{m}$. malleti individuals do not. H) Expression of the isoform lacking exon 5 from an $\mathrm{F} 2 \mathrm{H} . \mathrm{m}$. melpomene x $H$. m. rosina cross. Individuals homozygous or heterozygous for the $H$. m. rosina $\mathrm{Hm} Y b$ allele express the isoform while those homozygous for the $H$. m. melpomene $H m Y b$ allele do not. I) Allele specific expression of isoforms with and without exon 5. Heterozygous individuals (indicated with blue and red stars) express only the H. m. rosina allele in the isoform lacking exon 5 ( G at highlighted position), while they express both alleles in the isoform containing exon 5 (G/A at this position).


Extended Data Figure 6.
Phylogeny of fizzy family proteins and effects of expressing cortex in the Drosophila wing.
A) Neighbour joining phylogeny of Fizzy family proteins including functionally characterised proteins (in bold) from Saccharomyces cerevisiae, Homo sapiens and Drosophila melanogaster as well as copies from the basal metazoan Trichoplax adhaerens
and a range of annotated arthropod genomes (Daphnia pulex, Acyrthosiphon pisum, Pediculus humanus, Apis mellifica, Nasonia vitripennis, Anopheles gambiae, Tribolium castaneum) including the lepidoptera H. melpomene (in blue), Danaus plexippus and Bombyx mori. Branch colours: dark blue, CDC20/fzy; light blue, CDH1/fzr/rap; red, lepidoptran cortex. B-E) Ectopic expression of cortex in Drosophila melanogaster. Drosophila cortex produces an irregular microchaete phenotype when expressed in the posterior compartment of the fly wing (C) whereas Heliconius cortex does not (D), when compared to no expression (B). A, anterior; P, posterior. Successful Heliconius cortex expression was confirmed by anti-HA IHC in the last instar Drosophila larva wing imaginal disc ( D, red), with DAPI staining in blue.
Extended Data Table 1
Genes in the $Y b$ region and evidence for wing patterning control in Heliconius $\mathrm{Yb}^{\mathrm{I}}$, within the previously mapped $Y b$ interval12. $\mathrm{Sb}^{\mathrm{I}}$, within the previously mapped $S b$ interval $12 . S b$ controls a white/yellow hindwing margin and is not investigated in this study. The $N$ locus has not been fine-mapped previously. $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{Yb}}$, number of above background SNPs associated with the hindwing yellow bar in this study. $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{N}}$, number of above background SNPs associated with the forewing yellow band in this study. $\mathrm{E}^{1}$, detected as differentially expressed between Hm aglaope and amaryllis from RNAseq data in this study (Supplementary Information). $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{gw}}$, detected as differentially expressed between forewing regions in the gene array in this study. $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{gr}}$, detected as differentially expressed between Hm plesseni and malleti in in the gene array in this study. $\mathrm{E}^{\text {tw }}$, numbers of probes showing differential expression between forewing regions in the tilling array in this study. $\mathrm{E}^{\text {tr }}$, numbers of probes showing differential expression between $H m$ plesseni and malleti in in the tiling array in this study. $\mathrm{Cr}^{\mathrm{I}}$, within the previously mapped HeCrinterval11. $A^{\text {pet }}$, number of SNPs fixed for the alternative allele in He demophoon. $\mathrm{A}^{\text {fav }}$, number of SNPs fixed for the alternative allele in He favorinus. $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}$, within the previously mapped P interval13. A ${ }^{\text {bic }}$, number of above background SNPs associated with the Hn bicoloratus phenotype in this study.

| Hmane ID | He gene ID | Putative gene name | Heliconius melpomene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H. erato |  |  | $H n$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{Y b}{ }^{\text {I }}$ | Sb ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\mathbf{V b}}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {N }}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{gw}}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\text {gr }}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\text {tw }}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\text {tr }}$ | Cr ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {pet }}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {fav }}$ | ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {bic }}$ |
| HM00002 | HERA000036 | Acylpeptide hydrolase |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00003 | HERA000037 | HM00003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00004 | HERA000038 | Trehalase-1B | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00006 | HERA000038.1 | Trehalase-1A | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00007 | HERA000039 | B9 protein | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00008 | HERA000040 | HM00008 | x |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00010 | HERA000041 | WD40 repeat domain 85 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00012 | HERA000042 | CG2519 | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00013 | HERA000045 | Unkempt | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00014 | HERA000046 | Histone H3 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00015 | HERA000047 | HM00015 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00016 | HERA000048 | HM00016 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00017 | HERA000049 | RecQ Helicase | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00018 | HERA000051 | HM00018 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00019 | HERA000052 | BmSuc2 | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00020 | HERA000053 | CG5796 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00021 | HERA000054 | HM00021 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00022 | HERA000055 | Enoyl-CoA hydratase | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |

Nadeau et al.

| Hm gene ID | He gene ID | Putative gene name | Heliconius melpomene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H. erato |  |  | Hn |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{Y b}{ }^{\text {I }}$ | Sb ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | $\mathbf{A}^{\mathbf{Y b}}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {N }}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\text {gw }}$ | $\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{gr}}$ | $E^{\text {tw }}$ | $\mathbf{E}^{\text {tr }}$ | Cr ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | $\mathbf{A}^{\text {pet }}$ | $\mathbf{A}^{f a v}$ | $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{I}}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {bic }}$ |
| HM00023 | HERA000056 | ATP binding protein | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| HM00024 | HERA000057 | HM00024 | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| HM00025 | HERA000059 | cortex | x | x | 56 | 74 | x | x | x | 603 | 1796 | x | 2 | 99 | x | 51 |
| HM00026 | HERA000077 | Poly(A)-specific ribonuclease (parn) |  | x | 10 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 34 | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00027 | HERA000079 | CG31320 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00028 | HERA000080 | ARP-like |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| HM00029 | HERA000081 | CG4692 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00030 | HERA000082 | Proteasome 26S non ATPase subunit 4 |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00031 | HERA000083 | HM00031 |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00032 | HERA000084 | Zinc phosphodiesterase |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00033 | HERA000085 | Serine/threonine-protein kinase (LMTK1) |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00034 | HERA000086 | WD repeat domain 13 (Wdr13) |  |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 5 | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00035 | HERA000087 | Domeless |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00036 | HERA000061 | WAS protein family homologue 1 |  |  | 5 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 37 | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00038 | HERA000062 | Lethal (2) k05819 CG3054 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | 2 |  | x |  |
| HM00039 | HERA000064 | Mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPKK) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00040 | HERA000064.1 | DNA excision repair protein ERCC-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00041 | HERA000065 | Penguin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00042 | HERA000066 | Thymidylate kinase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00043 | HERA000067 | Caspase-activated DNase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | x |  |
| HM00044 | HERA000068 | Regulator of ribosome biosynthesis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00045 | HERA000069 | CG12659 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | x |  |
| HM00046 | HERA000070 | CG33505 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00047 | HERA000071 | Sr protein |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | x |  |
| HM00048 | HERA000073 | HM00048 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00049 | HERA000073.1 | HM00049 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | X |  |
| HM00050 | HERA000074 | Shuttle craft |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
| HM00051 | HERA000075 | HM00051 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| HM00052 | HERA000076 | HM00052 |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |


|  | Positions of SNPs in the He and Hn cortex Other association analyses |  | cortex coding exons | cortex UTR exons | cortex introns (nonTE) | cortex flanking intergenic (nonTE) | TEs | Other genes (exons or introns) | Other intergenic | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| erato favorinus fixed erato demophoon fixed numata bicoloratus above background |  |  | 2 | 0 | 96 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 |
|  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 47 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 69 |
| Positions of DE tiling array probes |  |  | Known cortex coding exons | cortex UTR exons | cortex introns (nonTE) | miRNAs | TEs | Other gene exons | Other introns/intergenic | Total |
| Day3 | malleti vs plesseni | Forewing proximal Forewing distal Hindwing | 8 | 7 | 323 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 359 |
|  |  |  | 12 | 2 | 327 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 357 |
|  |  |  | 5 | 14 | 378 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 413 |
|  | $\underset{\text { distal }}{\text { Proximal vs }}$ |  | 0 | 1 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 81 |
|  |  | plesseni | 2 | 4 | 222 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 242 |
| Day 1 | malleti vs plesseni | Forewing proximal | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 33 |
|  |  | Forewing distal | 2 | 3 | 116 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 112 | 248 |
|  |  | Hindwing | 9 | 10 | 500 | 1 | 20 | 2 | 80 | 622 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proximal vs } \\ & \text { distal } \end{aligned}$ | malleti | 0 | 12 | 95 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
|  |  | plesseni | 3 | 3 | 81 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 186 |

Extended Data Table 3
SNPs showing the strongest phenotypic associations in the H. melpomene/timareta/silvaniform comparison.
*downstream of cortex, †between exons 3 and 4 of cortex, $\ddagger$ upstream of cortex, §between exons U4 and U3 of cortex. None of these SNPs are within known TEs. Colours show phenotypic associations: yellow = yellow hindwing bar; pink = no yellow hindwing bar; green = yellow forewing band; blue = no yellow forewing band; grey $=$ allele does not match expected pattern.

| Species | Race | Sample code | HW bar | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & 457083 \dagger \\ & (p=6.07 \mathrm{E}-10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & 439063^{*} \\ & (\mathrm{p}=1.72 \mathrm{E}-09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & 602131 \ddagger \\ & (p=2.42 \mathrm{E}-09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & 457056 \dagger \\ & (p=2.42 \mathrm{E}-09) \end{aligned}$ | FW band | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & \mathbf{5 8 4 4 6 5 \S} \\ & (\mathrm{p}=1.37 \mathrm{E}-07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & \mathbf{5 8 4 4 1 8 \S} \\ & (p=1.41 \mathrm{E}-07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & \mathbf{5 8 4 6 3 3 8} \\ & (\mathrm{p}=2.10 \mathrm{E}-07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SNP pos } \\ & \mathbf{6 0 3 3 4 4} \\ & (\mathrm{p}=2.19 \mathrm{E}-07) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H. melpomene | aglaope | 09-246 | 0 | A/A | A/G | A/A | C/C | 1 | T/T | A/A | NA | T/T |
| H. melpomene | aglaope | 09-267 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 1 | T/T | A/A | C/C | T/T |
| H. melpomene | aglaope | 09-268 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 1 | T/T | A/A | C/C | T/T |
| H. melpomene | aglaope | 09-357 | 0 | A/A | G/G | G/A | C/C | 1 | T/T | NA | C/C | T/T |
| H. melpomene | aglaope | aglaope. 1 | 0 | A/A | G/G | N/A | C/C | 1 | C/T | T/A | T/C | T/T |
| H. melpomene | amandus | 2221 | 1 | A/A | NA | G/G | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amandus | 2228 | 1 | A/A | NA | G/G | C/C | 0 | C/T | T/A | T/C | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amarylis | 09-332 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amaryllis | 09-333 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amarylis | 09-075 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amarylis | 09-079 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | amarylis | amaryllis. 1 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | bellula | 228 | 1 | T/T | NA | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | NA |
| H. melpomene | bellula | 231 | 1 | T/T | NA | G/A | T/T | 0 | C/T | T/A | T/C | NA |
| H. melpomene | cythera | 2856 | 1 | T/T | A/A | G/G | T/T | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | cythera | 2857 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| H. melpomene | malleti | 17162 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 1 | T/T | A/A | C/C | T/T |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | 18038 | 0 | A/A | G/G | G/G | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | 18097 | 0 | NA | G/G | NA | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | NA |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | m0.06 | 0 | A/A | G/G | G/G | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | gen_ref | 0 | A/A | G/G | NA | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | 13435 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | 9315 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
| H. melpomene | melpomene | 9316 | 0 | A/A | G/G | A/A | C/C | 0 | C/C | T/T | T/T | A/A |
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Transposable Elements (TEs) found within the $Y b$ region.

| Unique Occurrences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BAC | mel | ros | ama | agl | No. | TE name | Superfamily |


|  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Helitron-like-14 | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 4 | Helitron-like-12 | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
| 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 5 | Helitron-like-12b | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
|  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | Helitron-like-4a | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Helitron-like-4b | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Helitron-N2 | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | Helitron-like-7 | Helitron_A |  | DNA transposon |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 16 | Helitron-like-6a | Helitron_B |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Helitron-like-6b | Helitron_B |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Helitron-like-11 | Helitron_B |  | DNA transposon |
| 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 11 | Helitron-like-15 | Helitron_B |  | DNA transposon |
| 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 |  | 18 | Helitron-like-5 | Helitron_B |  | DNA transposon |
|  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | Hmel_Unknown_50 |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | Hmel_Unknown_174a/b |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | Hmel_Unknown_187b |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | Hmel_Unknown_230 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Hmel_Unknown_234a |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Hmel_Unknown_236a |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | Jockey-4 | Jockey | LINE | Non-LTR retrotransposon |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | LTR-3_gypsy | Gypsy |  | LTR retrotransposon |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | Mariner-4 | Mariner/Tc1 |  | DNA transposon |
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Figure 1.
A homologous genomic region controls a diversity of phenotypes across the Lepidoptera. Left: phylogenetic relationships29. Right: chromosome maps with colour pattern intervals in grey, coloured bars represent markers used to assign homology5,8-10, the first and last genes from Fig 2 shown in red. In He the HeCr locus controls the yellow hind-wing bar phenotype (grey boxed races). In Hm it controls both the yellow hind-wing bar ( HmYb , pink box) and the yellow forewing band ( $H m N$, blue box). In $H n$ it modulates black, yellow and orange elements on both wings ( $H n P$ ), producing phenotypes that mimic butterflies in the
genus Melinaea. Morphs/races of Heliconius species included in this study are shown with names.


Figure 2.
Association analyses across the genomic region known to contain major colour pattern loci in Heliconius. A) Association in He with the yellow hind-wing bar ( $\mathrm{n}=45$ ). Coloured SNPs are fixed for a unique state in He demophoon (orange) or He favorinus (purple). B) Genes in $H e$ with direct homologs in Hm. Genes are in different colours with exons (coding and UTRs) connected by a line. Grey bars are transposable elements. C) $H m$ genes and transposable elements: colours correspond to homologous He genes; MicroRNAs30 in black. D) Association in the $\mathrm{Hm} /$ timareta/silvaniform group with the yellow hind-wing bar (red) and yellow forewing band (blue) ( $\mathrm{n}=49$ ). E) Association in $H n$ with the bicoloratus
morph ( $\mathrm{n}=26$ ); inversion positions 13 shown below. In all cases black/dark coloured points are above the strongest associations found outside the colour pattern scaffolds (He $\mathrm{p}=1.63 \mathrm{e}-05 ; H m \mathrm{p}=2.03 \mathrm{e}-05$ and $\mathrm{p}=2.58 \mathrm{e}-05$; Hn $\mathrm{p}=6.81 \mathrm{e}-06$ ).


Figure 3.
Differential gene expression across the genomic region known to contain major colour pattern loci in Heliconius melpomene. Expression differences in day 3 pupae, for all genes in the $Y b$ interval $(\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{D})$ and tiling probes spanning the central portion of the interval (B,C,E,F). Expression is compared between races for each wing region ( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ ) and between proximal and distal forewing sections for each race ( $\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{F}$ ). C and F : magnitude and direction of expression difference ( $\log _{2}$ fold-change) for tiling probes showing significant differences ( $\mathrm{p} \leq 0.05$ ); probes in known cortex exons shown in dark colours. Gene HM00052
was differentially expressed between other races in RNA sequence data (Supplementary Information) but is not differentially expressed here.


Figure 4.
In situ hybridisations of cortex in hind-wings of final instar larvae. B) Hn tarapotensis, adult wing shown in A, coloured points indicate landmarks, yellow arrows highlight adult pattern elements corresponding to the cortex staining. D) Hm rosina; adult wing shown in C, staining patterns in other Hm races (meriana and aglaope) appeared similar. The probe used was complementary to the cortex isoform with the longest open reading frame (also the most common, Supplementary Information).
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