

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Keaney, TA;Wong, HWS;Dowling, DK;Jones, TM;Holman, L

Title:

Mother's curse and indirect genetic effects: Do males matter to mitochondrial genome evolution?

Date:

2020-02-01

Citation:

Keaney, T. A., Wong, H. W. S., Dowling, D. K., Jones, T. M. & Holman, L. (2020). Mother's curse and indirect genetic effects: Do males matter to mitochondrial genome evolution?. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 33 (2), pp.189-201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13561>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/286622>

Mother's curse and interacting phenotypes: do males matter to mitochondrial genome evolution?

Running header: Adaption and male mitochondria

Thomas A. Keaney¹, Heidi W.S. Wong¹, Damian K. Dowling², Therésa M. Jones¹, Luke Holman¹

¹School of Biosciences, The University of Melbourne, Vic. 3010

²School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Vic. 3800

Email: tom.keaney@unimelb.edu.au

Contributions: TAK and HWSW performed experiments; all authors contributed to the design, analysis, and writing.

Acknowledgements: We thank Winston Yee for maintaining and providing the fly stocks and Michael Murray for generously sharing facilities and lab space.

Data accessibility: A website presenting all of the R code used to analyse and plot the data, along with the raw data files, can be found at <https://tomkeaney.github.io/maleMitochondria/>. Raw data can also be found at https://datadryad.org/stash/share/jqP1xs6r_A-qJ7FxjjvJo3p8w_vyqraaY375GAMi8w.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/JEB.13561](https://doi.org/10.1111/JEB.13561)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

MR. THOMAS ANTHONY KEANEY (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-7692-6190)

DR LUKE HOLMAN (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-7268-2173)

Article type : Research Papers

Mother's curse and indirect genetic effects: do males matter to mitochondrial genome evolution?

Abstract

Maternal inheritance of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) was originally thought to prevent any response to selection on male phenotypic variation attributable to mtDNA, resulting in a male-biased mtDNA mutation load ('mother's curse'). However, the theory underpinning this claim implicitly assumes that a male's mtDNA has no effect on the fitness of females he comes into contact with. If such 'mitochondrially-encoded indirect genetics effects' (mtIGEs) do in fact exist, and there is relatedness between the mitochondrial genomes of interacting males and females, male mtDNA-encoded traits can undergo adaptation after all. We tested this possibility using strains of *Drosophila melanogaster* that differ in their mtDNA. Our experiments indicate that female fitness is influenced by the mtDNA carried by males that the females encounter, which could plausibly allow the mitochondrial genome to evolve via kin selection. We argue that mtIGEs are probably common, and that this might ameliorate or exacerbate mother's curse.

Keywords: mtDNA, indirect genetic effects, interacting phenotypes, mutation load, kin selection, sexual conflict

Word count: 5375 in main text

Introduction

In most animals and plants, cytoplasmic genetic elements such as those carried inside mitochondria, chloroplasts, and endosymbiotic bacteria are, with rare exceptions, inherited only from the mother (Birky 1995). This uniparental inheritance has been proposed to make the effects of cytoplasmic mutations on males ‘invisible to selection’, particularly in the case of mitochondrial DNA (Frank and Hurst 1996; Hoekstra 2000; Gemmell et al. 2004; Beekman et al. 2014). The argument runs as follows: imagine a mutation in the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) that has no effect on female fitness, but which reduces the fitness of males that carry it. Even though males with the mutation leave fewer descendants (that is, the mutation is under selection), there will be no evolutionary response since males do not transmit the mtDNA to their offspring. This hypothesis predicts that male-harming mutations will accumulate in the mitochondrial genome, either because of genetic drift coupled with ineffective selection on males (Frank and Hurst 1996), or because some male-harming mutations have beneficial pleiotropic effects on females that cause them to be positively selected (Cosmides and Tooby 1981; Smith and Connallon 2017; Dowling and Adrian 2019). The male-biased mutation load that results from uniparental inheritance is often termed ‘mother’s curse’ (Gemmell et al. 2004). Consistent with the mother’s curse prediction, there is evidence that male traits have more mitochondrial genetic variance than female traits (Camus et al. 2012; Camus et al. 2015; Dowling et al. 2015; Wolff et al. 2016b; Camus and Dowling 2018), that human mitochondrial disease is more prevalent in males than females (e.g. Wallace et al. 1988; Martikainen et al. 2017; Milot et al. 2017), and that many male-harming mtDNA mutations are not harmful when expressed in females (reviewed in Beekman et al. 2014; Vaught and Dowling 2018).

However, some theoretical papers (Cosmides and Tooby 1981; Unckless and Herren 2009; Wade and Brandvain 2009; Hedrick 2012; Zhang et al. 2012) have identified specific scenarios where an evolutionary response to selection on male mtDNA is likely to occur. All of these scenarios involve kin selection (Hamilton 1964) and ‘mitochondrial indirect genetic effects’ (hereafter mtIGEs; Wolf et al. 1998), whereby the mtDNA carried by a male affects the fitness of females with which the male interacts. For example, Cosmides and Tooby (1981) and Wade and Brandvain (2009) suggested that selection might purge male-killing mtDNA mutations in species where males improve the fitness of their female relatives, e.g. through kin-directed altruistic behaviours or benefits from group living. A second group of models (Unckless and Herren 2009; Wade and Brandvain 2009; Hedrick 2012) showed that selection will disfavour mtDNA mutations that cause males to become sterile, provided that males preferentially mate with their ‘mitochondrial relatives’ (e.g. full sisters or maternal half-sisters). These models are all conceptually similar: their salient assumptions are that A) some male traits (e.g. behaviour or fertility) benefit the fitness of female ‘social partners’ (e.g. group members or mates) with which the males interact, and B) male and female social partners show positive

assortment with respect to their mtDNA haplotype. There is a third group of models that is also conceptually similar, except that the focus is on males harming instead of helping females. Cosmides and Tooby (1981) proposed that male-killing mtDNA mutations might be selectively favoured, provided that such mutations lessen competition on females carrying related mtDNA (e.g. the dead males' sisters). Further insightful models (Engelstädter and Charlat 2006; Hedrick 2012) demonstrated that selection can favour male-sterilising cytoplasmic DNA if males mate with their relatives *less* often than expected (e.g. due to inbreeding avoidance), because this impairs the fertility of females that do not carry the male-sterilising mutation. As before, these hypotheses can be understood in terms of kin selection (specifically "spite"; Gardner and West 2006): the key assumptions are that males affect female fitness, and there is *negative* assortment with respect to mtDNA.

To organise and unify these hypotheses, we propose a heuristic based on Hamilton's rule ($rB - C > 0$; Hamilton 1964), a famous inequality that describes when a social trait will be selectively favoured. If r_{mt} is the correlation in mitochondrial genotypes between interacting males and females, and B is the effect of a mitochondrially-encoded male trait on female fitness, we posit that a novel mitochondrial mutation that only affects the phenotype of males will be selectively favoured when $r_{mt}B > 0$, disfavoured when $r_{mt}B < 0$, and neutral when $r_{mt}B = 0$. We can omit the cost term C because mitochondrial mutations carried by males always have a direct fitness of zero under uniparental inheritance, and so $C = 0$. The simple expression $r_{mt}B > 0$ unifies the models above: when r_{mt} is positive (negative), meaning that interacting males and females are more (less) likely to carry the same mitochondrial mutation as two randomly-chosen individuals, selection favours mitochondrial mutations that increase (decrease) the fitness of female social partners, all else equal. If the mitochondrial mutation has no indirect genetic effect on female fitness ($B = 0$), or if interacting males and females assort at random with respect to their mtDNA ($r_{mt} = 0$), then the mutation will be selectively neutral; this recapitulates the findings of models such as Frank and Hurst (1996), which implicitly assumed that interactions are random and/or that mtIGEs do not exist.

To our knowledge, no empirical study has tested whether kin selection of this kind actually occurs. Immonen *et al.* (2016) conducted what appears to be the first and only measurement of mitochondrial indirect genetic effects, and found that male mtDNA affected the fecundity, egg size, and egg hatching rate of the male's mates in *Callosobruchus maculatus* beetles (though the paper did not mention the implications of this result for mother's curse). Additionally, studies of *Drosophila melanogaster* fruit flies have found that mitochondrial genetic variance affects several male phenotypes, many of which seem likely to affect the fitness of the male's female social partners. These traits include metabolic rate (Arnqvist et al. 2010; Đorđević et al. 2017) and body size (Dobler

et al. 2014), which potentially influence how males influence female fitness during behavioural interactions (e.g. large, highly active males might be more harmful to females; Pitnick and García-González 2002). Additionally, variance in mtDNA strongly affects male sperm function (Dowling et al. 2007; Patel et al. 2016), and multiple mtDNA mutations can cause total male sterility when paired with particular nuclear genotypes (Xu et al. 2008; Clancy et al. 2011; Dowling et al. 2015).

Here, we experimentally test one of the two essential conditions required for male mtDNA evolution: that the mtDNA haplotype carried by male *D. melanogaster* affects the fitness of the females they encounter. In other words, we test whether the *B* term in our modified Hamilton's rule differs from zero. *Drosophila* males can have strong effects on female fitness through both behavioural interactions (e.g. males continually harass females and attempt to mate; Partridge and Fowler 1990; Le Page et al. 2017) and mating (e.g. females need functional sperm, and male seminal fluid profoundly affects female physiology; Chapman 2008; Perry et al. 2013). Therefore, our first experiment tests for a causal effect of male mtDNA on the fitness of co-habiting females, by experimentally manipulating males' mtDNA haplotypes while holding constant other variables. We also varied the presence/absence of males, to test whether the effect of male presence depends upon what mtDNA the males carry. We also conducted a second, similarly-designed experiment to measure the direct effect of mtDNA on the fitness of females themselves, allowing us to compare the magnitude of the indirect and direct genetic effects of mtDNA on female fitness.

Methods

Drosophila cultures

Mitochondrial strains – We used five strains of *D. melanogaster* sourced from a mitochondrial reference panel (Camus et al. 2012; Wolff et al. 2016a). Each strain carries a distinct mtDNA haplotype originally sourced from a diverse global origin; the strains were established by Clancy (2008) and are named after the geographic locations where their mtDNA originated. All strains have the same isogenic nuclear genome: the commonly used genotype w^{1118} (Bloomington stock number: 5905). The strains were propagated by backcrossing virgin females from each strain to males from a single stock of w^{1118} for over 100 generations prior to use in our experiments. Furthermore, the w^{1118} stock used to source the males for these backcrosses is maintained by mating one full-sibling pair per generation. This ensures the w^{1118} stock is virtually homozygous at all loci in the nuclear genome, and prevents the nuclear genomes of each of the mitochondrial strains from diverging over time. To ensure that cytoplasmic genetic differences were limited to the mitochondrial genome, the strains were treated with tetracycline to remove any infections by intracellular bacteria, such as *Wolbachia*, dozens of generations before this study. One of the mitochondrial strains we examined (Brownsville)

is known to cause total male sterility when paired with the w^{1118} nuclear background; the other four strains are fertile (Clancy et al. 2011; Camus and Dowling 2018).

DGRP lines – To test for male mtDNA-encoded phenotypic effects on females during Experiment 1, we utilised two inbred, wild-type strains from the *Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel (DGRP; Mackay et al. 2012). Like our mitochondrial strains, DGRP strains have a nuclear genome that is >99% homozygous, which should help minimise extraneous variation in female fitness; we arbitrarily selected the DGRP strains from among the ~200 available by picking stocks that were easy to culture in our laboratory. All the females in Experiment 1 came from the DGRP-517 strain (Bloomington: 25197), while the non-mitochondrial strain males came from DGRP-352 (Bloomington: 28177). Finally, in Experiment 2, we exposed mitochondrial strain females to males from DGRP-324 (Bloomington stock no. 25182)

All flies were cultured on standard cornmeal food medium (adapted from Brent and Oster 1974) at 25°C, under natural light. To reduce extraneous phenotypic variation, all flies used in the experiments were reared at a standardised density by adding 100 first-instar larvae to each food vial. Each mitochondrial strain was reared in several different vials. We collected recently-eclosed (<4h) virgin flies under light CO₂ anaesthesia, and housed them in single-sex groups to mature for 3-4 days, at which point they were used in the experiments. Experiments 1 and 2 were run concurrently and were each partitioned into seven blocks of roughly equal size; each mitochondrial strain was equally represented within each block. Experiment 1 measured the fitness of 217 DGRP-517 females, while Experiment 2 measured 169 mitochondrial strain females.

Experiment 1: Effects of male mtDNA on female fitness

We tested for effects of male mtDNA on female fitness by measuring female offspring production, in the presence of different mitochondrial strain males. To begin the experiment, we placed pairs of virgin flies (a DGRP-517 female and a DGRP-352 male) into each of several food vials, and selected pairs that were observed mating for use in the next phase of the experiment. The purpose of this initial mating was to ensure every female had mated with a standardised male genotype at the commencement of the experiment, removing one possible source of variation in female offspring production. Additionally, one of our mitochondrial strains, Brownsville, has sterile males (in the w^{1118} nuclear background), and so the fitness of females housed with Brownsville males would always be zero had we not provided this initial mating plus continued access to a DGRP-352 male. We expect that females housed with Brownsville males would not be sperm limited in the first few days of the experiment since they had just mated, but might have become sperm-limited in the latter days.

Following mating, we randomly and evenly divided the mated pairs between two treatments, termed 'high male exposure' and 'low male exposure'. In the high male exposure treatment, we introduced three virgin males – all from one of the mitochondrial strains – to each vial. The original DGRP-352 male was left in the vial and accompanied the female throughout the experiment (i.e. 4 males and 1 female per vial). In the low male exposure treatment, no additional males were added, so the vial contained only the female and her DGRP-352 mate. In both treatments, we pushed down the cotton plug of each vial to restrict the flies to a volume of around 9cm³, making behavioural interactions more frequent (Figure 1).

On day three (72±2h after the initial set up), we transferred the females from the high male exposure treatment to the low male exposure treatment, and *vice versa*. This was accomplished by aspirating the female (with her original DGRP-352 mate) into a fresh vial and adding either zero (low male exposure) or three (high male exposure) six- to seven-day-old mitochondrial strain males. We repeated this procedure on days six and nine, such that females spent three days in each of four vials as they aged – two low male exposure vials, and two high male exposure vials (Figure 1). Within experimental blocks, we used the same pool of males (within each mitochondrial strain) throughout, such that the males aged alongside the females, but we rotated them between females at each treatment change, so that females never spent more than three days with the same individual mitochondrial strain males (to minimise any sexual familiarity effects; see Tan et al. 2013). Dead males were replaced with males of the same age and genotype at the time of female vial transition; these males came from a same-aged stock reared alongside the main experiment at the same 4:1 male:female ratio as in the high male exposure treatment. We monitored each vial daily until day 12 or until the female died. To assess female fitness, we counted the number of offspring produced from each vial. This was accomplished by keeping all vials for a further 13 days after removal of the female, at which time they were frozen; we later counted the number of male and female adult progeny.

Experiment 2: Direct effects of female mtDNA on fitness

To assess the direct effect of mtDNA haplotype on female fitness in a similar experimental context, individual three- to four-day-old virgin females from each of the five strains were mated with age-matched virgin DGRP-352 males. Following copulation, the male was discarded, and each female was randomly allocated to either a high male exposure treatment or a no-male treatment (Figure 1). Females in the high male exposure treatment were housed with three DGRP-324 males, while females in the no-male treatment were housed alone (Figure 1). As with Experiment 1, females were alternated between the two treatments every three days over a 12-day period or until they died; the volume in the vial was reduced to c. 9cm³; females were never exposed to the same males twice, and

dead males were replaced daily with same-aged males reared at the same sex ratio as in the high male exposure treatment. The total number of offspring produced in the four vials from each female was assessed as for Experiment 1.

Statistical analysis

We analysed the results of both experiments using Bayesian multivariate generalized linear mixed models implemented in the *brms* package for R, which interfaces with the Stan statistical programming language (Bürkner 2017). All models of offspring production assumed a zero-inflated negative binomial distribution; this distribution was chosen because the response variable is overdispersed count data containing an excess of zeros. As the response variable, we used the number of offspring eclosing from each of the focal female's four vials, with the four offspring counts forming a 4-component multivariate observation. This formulation allowed each of the four offspring counts to have its own intercept (allowing productivity to change non-linearly as females aged), and allowed for correlations between vials belonging to the same female. We chose to use multivariate models (rather than a univariate model with repeated measures in each vial) for the practical reason that it makes it easier to place a different prior on data from Vial 1, which was necessary because of the design of Experiment 1. In Experiment 1, half of the females never encountered mitochondrial strain males until their second vial, and so we have a strong expectation that the effect of male mtDNA should be zero in Vial 1 for these females. We therefore imposed a prior that constrained the effect of male mitochondrial strain on offspring production in Vial 1 to be zero for females in the "Exposed second" treatment. In a pilot analysis, we found that analysing the data using a more traditional univariate model, with Vial as a fixed factor and *brms*' default (weak) priors, gave qualitatively identical results despite the incorrect prior. With the exception of the special prior just discussed, we used *brms*' default weak priors. Lastly, all models of Experiment 1 dealt with missing values (which resulted from the accidental loss of 16 vials in Experiment 1 and three vials in Experiment 2 before they were counted) by imputing them using the R package *mice*, and pooling the results of ten models run on 10 sets of imputed data (via the *brm_multiple* function in *brms*); this imputation prevented the need to discard data for females for which <4 vials were counted.

For both experiments, the 'full model' contained the predictors *Mitochondrial strain*, a 5-level factor describing the mtDNA haplotype carried by the focal males or females, *Order of exposure*, a 2-level factor identifying whether the female was housed with multiple males in vials 1 and 3 (the 'Exposed first' treatment), or in vials 2 and 4 ('Exposed second'), and their 2-way interaction; we also included experimental block as a random effect. To evaluate competing causal hypotheses, we fit these full models and all their component models (see Tables 1-2), and ranked them by their posterior model

probabilities (estimated using bridge sampling via the `post_prob` function in *brms*; Gronau et al. 2019). Posterior model probabilities can be interpreted as the probability that each model is the best-fitting one in the set under comparison.

We also used the full model to calculate the posterior distribution for the treatment group means, as well as various informative differences between treatment group means. For example, we computed the posterior for the pairwise differences in total offspring production between females housed with the various mitochondrial strain males in Experiment 1. We also estimated how much these pairwise differences differed between the 'Exposed first' and 'Exposed second' treatments. This exercise serves a similar purpose to post-hoc tests or planned contrasts. Following convention, we interpret differences for which the 95% credible intervals exclude zero as noteworthy. Note that these pairwise comparisons do not constitute multiple independent tests: all of the information used to calculate each comparison is contained in the model's posterior, and thus it is not necessary to apply false discovery rate correction.

In Experiment 2 (where 34/169 females died during the experiment), we ran a survival analysis to test for mtDNA effects on female mortality up to day 12. The response variable was the vial in which the female died, and we fit a Weibull-distributed mixed model with right-censoring implemented in *brms*. We fitted *Mitochondrial strain*, *Order of exposure*, and their interaction as fixed effects, with experimental block as a random effect. Very few females died during Experiment 1 (8 out of 224), so we did not perform a survival analysis.

Finally, we tested whether mtDNA haplotype affected offspring sex ratio, using a separate model for each experiment. This was accomplished by fitting a binomial mixed model with block and female ID as random effects, and mtDNA haplotype as a fixed effect. We compared posterior model probabilities for models with and without the mtDNA haplotype effect to test for effects on the sex ratio.

Results

Experiment 1: Effects of male mtDNA on female fitness

The mtDNA carried by males significantly predicted the number of progeny produced by females that they interacted with. Figure 2 shows the values of the group means predicted by the full model, Table 1 compares the fit of different models to the data, Table 2 and Figure 4 summarise the pairwise differences in offspring production between mitochondrial strains, and Tables S1-6 give complete model results, group means, and summary statistics.

The three models that included male mitochondrial strain as a predictor topped the list of models and had a combined posterior model probability of >99% (Table 1), demonstrating that variation in the mtDNA haplotype harboured by males influences how these males affect female offspring production. Specifically, the posterior estimate of total progeny production (i.e. the sum of the estimates in vials 1-4) was higher for females living with Dahomey or Israel males, relative to Barcelona, Brownsville, or Sweden males – at least in the ‘Exposed first’ treatment (Figure 4; Table 2). When exposed second, only the Brownsville vs Dahomey or Israel comparisons remained statistically significant; Brownsville was also significantly lower than Sweden in the ‘Exposed second’ treatment (Figure 4; Table 2).

The best-supported model included the interaction between male mitochondrial strain and *Order of exposure*, although models lacking this interaction were also plausible (Table 1; posterior probability = 22%). To investigate further, we estimated the difference in mean progeny production of females that were initially exposed to males in their first versus second vial, separately for each male mtDNA haplotype group, and then compared the size of this difference for each pair of mitochondrial strains. Only one difference was statistically significant: females paired with Dahomey males were more strongly affected by the *Order of exposure* treatment than were females paired with Sweden males (Table S4).

Lastly, we found minor differences in offspring sex ratio between mitochondrial strains (Figure S1). However, the between-strain variation was not significantly greater than expected by chance (Table S6).

Experiment 2: Effects of female mtDNA on fitness under high male density

The number of progeny produced by females carrying different mtDNA haplotypes varied, though posterior model probabilities suggest that the results were equivocal (Figures 3-4, Table 3). Full model results, group means, and summary statistics pertaining to Experiment 2 are given in Tables S7-S13.

The posterior model probabilities indicate that a female’s mtDNA had little effect on the number of offspring produced: mtDNA genotype did not appear in either of the top two models (Table 3). Despite the low amount of variation explained by female mtDNA genotype, there was evidence that Barcelona females were less productive (particularly relative to Brownsville, Israel, and Sweden), at least in the treatment group that encountered males in their second vial (Figures 3-4; Table 4). Dahomey females were also somewhat less fit.

The effect of the *Order of exposure* treatment was significantly stronger for Barcelona females than for all other haplotypes in at least one age category (Figure 4; Table S9), implying that a female's mtDNA influences how much her fitness is affected by interacting with males. However, this conclusion was (at best) weakly-supported: the best-ranked model that included the mtDNA x *Order of exposure* 2-way interaction had a posterior model probability <1% (Table 3).

A mixed effects survival analysis suggested that neither female mtDNA, *Order of exposure* treatment, nor their interaction affected the likelihood of surviving the 12-day experiment (Tables S11-12). Lastly, the offspring sex ratio was broadly similar between haplotypes (Figure S1), and this variation was not significantly greater than expected by chance (Table S13).

Discussion

Our experiment was predicated on the assertion that the male-specific effects of maternally-inherited genes (such as mtDNA) can respond to selection, provided that two conditions are met. Firstly, the mtDNA of a male must affect the fitness of females he interacts with; that is, there must be a mitochondrial indirect genetic effect (mtIGE). Secondly, males and females must interact non-randomly with respect to their mtDNA (i.e. there must be 'mitochondrial relatedness' between interacting individuals; $r_{mt} \neq 0$). Experiment 1 provides experimental evidence that the first condition can be met in *D. melanogaster*: manipulating the mitochondrial genotype of interacting males altered the fitness of co-habiting females. Our study does not prove that such a similar mtIGE is also present in wild populations under field conditions, nor did we test whether $r_{mt} \neq 0$ in the wild. Therefore, it would be premature to conclude that a response to selection on male mtDNA-encoded phenotypes occurs in this species, in nature. Nonetheless, it seems plausible that similar mtIGEs exist in the wild, particularly for mtDNA haplotypes with strong effects on fertility, such as the Brownsville haplotype. Additionally, it is well-documented that *D. melanogaster* males are capable of kin discrimination in the context of mating (Carazo et al. 2014; Le Page et al. 2017), and there is evidence to suggest that mating pairs assort by relatedness in some populations (Loyau et al. 2012; Robinson et al. 2012a, b).

In Experiment 1, females housed with males carrying the Brownsville haplotype had reduced fitness. Though we ensured that all females mated with at least one fertile male at the start of both experiments, the decrease in offspring production caused by Brownsville males might well be explained by the previously-documented infertility of these males (Clancy et al. 2011; Camus and Dowling 2018). *Drosophila* females primarily use sperm from their most recent mate (Gromko et al. 1984; Snook and Hosken 2004), so females that re-mated to a Brownsville male might have impaired fertility. The Brownsville haplotype contains a point mutation in the mitochondrial gene *Cytochrome B*

which appears to cause total male sterility when paired with the w^{1118} nuclear genome used in our experiments (Clancy et al. 2011; Camus et al. 2015). Moreover, the Barcelona mtDNA haplotype had the second-lowest male fertility after the Brownsville haplotype in a previous study (Camus and Dowling 2018), and was associated with the second-worst offspring production in Experiment 1; this again suggests that mitochondrially-encoded variation in male fertility underlies some, potentially all, of the mtIGEs we observed.

Our data do not exclude the possibility that male traits other than fertility vary between mitochondrial strains. Future studies could examine whether mtDNA influences the behaviour of males towards females, e.g. by altering the frequency or severity of female-harming male behaviours such as persistent courtship (Partridge and Fowler 1990). Nuclear genetic variance in male-induced harm has been demonstrated for *D. melanogaster*, and this nuclear indirect genetic effect explains a significant proportion of the variance in female egg production (Filice and Long 2016). Similar variance stemming from the mitochondrial genome is plausible given the energetically demanding courtship behaviour of *D. melanogaster* males, and the close association between mtDNA and respiration (Liu et al. 2002; Koch and Hill 2018; Dowling and Adrian 2019).

In Experiment 2, we found some evidence that females carrying different mitochondrial haplotypes varied in their reproductive output, consistent with the results of similar experiments in insects (Dowling et al. 2009; Immonen et al. 2016; Camus and Dowling 2018). Females carrying the Dahomey and Barcelona haplotypes had reduced offspring production compared to Brownsville, Israel and Sweden. Surprisingly, Barcelona strain females showed a uniquely strong response to the *Order of exposure* treatment relative to the other four haplotypes, suggesting elevated sensitivity to the presence/absence of male within particular age classes. One possible explanation for this result is that females interacting with males need to undertake energy-intensive behaviours such as decampment or kicking in response to excessive courtship (Rowe 1994; Jormalainen et al. 2001; Blanckenhorn et al. 2002). Variation in these behaviours might be partly explained by variation in mtDNA, given the relationship between mtDNA and respiration (Kurbalija Novičić et al. 2015; Wolff et al. 2016b).

Though experimental evidence that male mtDNA has indirect fitness effects on females is currently scarce (present study; Immonen et al. 2016), we believe it is very likely that selection on male mtDNA has evolutionary consequences in at least some species with strict maternal inheritance of mtDNA. This is because variation in mtDNA affects so many male traits across a variety of species (Trifunovic et al. 2004; Nakada et al. 2006; Smith et al. 2010; Innocenti et al. 2011; Camus et al. 2012; Yee et al. 2013; Dobler et al. 2014; Immonen et al. 2016; Mossman et al. 2016; Wolff et al. 2016b; Milot et al. 2017; Camus and Dowling 2018), and because kin-directed interactions are so common in nature. For

example, some species have obligate sib-sib inbreeding, including fig wasps (where siblings mate inside a sealed fig; Herre et al. 1997) and some haplodiploid mites (where mothers mate with their asexually-produced haploid sons if males are not available; McCulloch and Owen 2012); mtDNA that caused male infertility would be selected out in these species. Interactions between males and females with negative mitochondrial relatedness are also likely to be common because of inbreeding avoidance (Szulkin et al. 2013) and sex-biased dispersal (Li and Kokko 2019). Moreover, it is uncontroversial that kin-selected, male-specific adaptations can evolve in other maternally-transmitted genetic elements, such as the endosymbiotic bacteria *Wolbachia* and *Spiroplasma*. For example, some strains of *Wolbachia* and *Spiroplasma* kill males that inherit them, which removes these males as competitors and thereby confers indirect benefits to related symbionts inside the dead males' female relatives (Hurst 1991). Also, some *Wolbachia* strains induce 'cytoplasmic incompatibility' (Yen and Barr 1971; Hoffmann and Turelli 1988; Stevens and Wade 1990; Stouthamer et al. 1999), in which the sperm of *Wolbachia*-infected males are modified in such a way that they inactivate the eggs of uninfected females upon fertilisation, which increases the relative fitness of *Wolbachia*-infected females (whose eggs are protected from inactivation).

In the Introduction, we noted that although mtIGEs allow adaptation of male phenotypes encoded by mtDNA, the strength or direction of adaptation has no dependence on the male's own fitness. This means that mtIGEs can either increase or decrease the severity of mother's curse. Whether mother's curse is worsened, ameliorated, or unaffected by mtIGEs depends on three factors: mitochondrial relatedness between interacting males and females (r_{mt}), the sign of the effect of the mtIGE on female fitness (B), and the covariance between the mtIGE and male fitness (absent from the equation). For example, when males tend to interact with positively mitochondrially-related females (e.g. sisters), and these females benefit from the males being viable and fertile, mtDNA mutations that enhance male survival/fertility should be selected for, which incidentally lowers mother's curse (Cosmides and Tooby 1981; Unckless and Herren 2009; Wade and Brandvain 2009; Hedrick 2012; Zhang et al. 2012). The reversal of mother's curse might be especially strong in species in which almost all individuals breed with their siblings, such as fig wasps, because a new male-sterilising or male-killing mtDNA mutation would rapidly go extinct. However, if instead females benefit when interacting males carry a male-harming mtDNA mutation (e.g. because the mutation kills males and thereby lowers competition on the females), then the mtIGE would cause males to evolve reduced survival. Similarly, if males preferentially interact with mitochondrial non-relatives ($r_{mt} < 0$), mother's curse will be lessened if males harbouring male-benign (or beneficial) mitochondria are more harmful to females, or worsened when males with male-benign (or beneficial) mitochondria are less harmful to females. Interestingly, these predictions mean that the evolution of inbreeding avoidance via changes to the

nuclear genome may create selection for male-sterilising mitochondrial alleles, while the evolution of inbreeding would select against male-sterilising mtDNA. Thus, mother's curse (and its mitigation or strengthening via mtIGEs) may be an overlooked factor in the evolution of mating systems and sociality.

To sum up, we argue that there are at least three evolutionary mechanisms that can create male-harming mitochondria: ineffective selection on male-harming mutations due to female-limited inheritance ('weak form of Mother's curse'; Frank and Hurst 1996; Dowling and Adrian 2019; Havird et al. 2019), selection for male-detrimental mtDNA with pleiotropic benefits to female fitness ('strong form of Mother's Curse' ; Camus and Dowling 2018; Dowling and Adrian 2019; Havird et al. 2019), and kin selection for male-harming mutations that pleiotropically cause a selectively favourable mtIGE (Cosmides and Tooby 1981; Engelstädter and Charlat 2006; Unckless and Herren 2009; Wade and Brandvain 2009; Hedrick 2012; Zhang et al. 2012). These mtIGEs can also lessen mother's curse if they happen to have pleiotropic benefits to males, which might occur when females benefit from their male relatives being healthy and/or fertile. Future work would benefit by focusing on natural populations, e.g. by testing whether mtIGEs also occur under field conditions, and/or whether interacting males and females show non-zero mitochondrial relatedness at a biologically relevant scale. Future laboratory-based studies could experimentally create groups of males and females with positive, random, or negative mitochondrial relatedness (while standardising other factors), and then examine the ensuing evolution of mtDNA haplotypes with pronounced male-specific effects.

Data accessibility

A website presenting all of the R code used to analyse and plot the data, along with the raw data files, can be found at <https://tomkeaney.github.io/maleMitochondria/>. Raw data can also be found at https://datadryad.org/stash/share/jqP1xs6r_A-qJ7FxjjvJo3p8w_vyqraaY375GAMi8w.

Acknowledgements

We thank Winston Yee for maintaining and providing the mitochondrial strains, and Michael Murray for providing lab space and advice.

References

Arnqvist, G., D. K. Dowling, P. Eady, L. Gay, T. Tregenza, M. Tuda, and D. J. Hosken. 2010. Genetic architecture of metabolic rate: environment specific epistasis between mitochondrial and nuclear genes in an insect. *Evolution* 64:3354-3363. 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01135.x

- 425 Beekman, M., D. K. Dowling, and D. K. Aanen. 2014. The costs of being male: are there sex-specific
426 effects of uniparental mitochondrial inheritance? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
427 *Society B: Biological Sciences* 369:20130440. 10.1098/rstb.2013.0440
- 428 Birky, C. W. 1995. Uniparental inheritance of mitochondrial and chloroplast genes: mechanisms and
429 evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 92:11331-11338.
430 10.1073/pnas.92.25.11331
- 431 Blanckenhorn, W. U., D. J. Hosken, O. Y. Martin, C. Reim, Y. Teuschl, and P. I. Ward. 2002. The costs of
432 copulating in the dung fly *Sepsis cynipsea*. *Behavioral Ecology* 13:353-358.
433 10.1093/beheco/13.3.353
- 434 Brent, M. and I. Oster. 1974. Nutritional substitution: a new approach to microbial control for
435 *Drosophila* cultures. *Drosophila Information Service* 51:155-157.
- 436 Bürkner, P.-C. 2017. brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using Stan. *Journal of*
437 *statistical software* 80:1.
- 438 Camus, M. F., David J. Clancy, and Damian K. Dowling. 2012. Mitochondria, Maternal Inheritance, and
439 Male Aging. *Current Biology* 22:1717-1721. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.07.018>
- 440 Camus, M. F. and D. K. Dowling. 2018. Mitochondrial genetic effects on reproductive success:
441 signatures of positive intrasexual, but negative intersexual pleiotropy. *Proceedings - Royal*
442 *Society. Biological Sciences* 285. 10.1098/rspb.2018.0187
- 443 Camus, M. F., Jochen B. W. Wolf, Edward H. Morrow, and Damian K. Dowling. 2015. Single
444 Nucleotides in the mtDNA Sequence Modify Mitochondrial Molecular Function and Are
445 Associated with Sex-Specific Effects on Fertility and Aging. *Current Biology* 25:2717-2722.
446 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.09.012>
- 447 Carazo, P., C. K. W. Tan, F. Allen, S. Wigby, and T. Pizzari. 2014. Within-group male relatedness
448 reduces harm to females in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 505:672-675. 10.1038/nature12949
- 449 Chapman, T. 2008. The soup in my fly: evolution, form and function of seminal fluid proteins. *PLoS*
450 *biology* 6:e179-e179. 10.1371/journal.pbio.0060179

- 451 Clancy, D. J. 2008. Variation in mitochondrial genotype has substantial lifespan effects which may be
452 modulated by nuclear background. *Aging cell* 7:795-804. 10.1111/j.1474-9726.2008.00428.x
- 453 Clancy, D. J., G. R. Hime, and A. D. Shirras. 2011. Cytoplasmic male sterility in *Drosophila melanogaster*
454 associated with a mitochondrial CYTB variant. *Heredity* 107:374. 10.1038/hdy.2011.12
- 455 Cosmides, L. M. and J. Tooby. 1981. Cytoplasmic inheritance and intragenomic conflict. *Journal of*
456 *Theoretical Biology* 89:83-129. 10.1016/0022-5193(81)90181-8
- 457 Dobler, R., B. Rogell, F. Budar, and D. K. Dowling. 2014. A meta-analysis of the strength and nature of
458 cytoplasmic genetic effects. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 27:2021-2034. 10.1111/jeb.12468
- 459 Đorđević, M., B. Stojković, U. Savković, E. Immonen, N. Tucić, J. Lazarević, and G. Arnqvist. 2017. Sex-
460 specific mitonuclear epistasis and the evolution of mitochondrial bioenergetics, ageing, and
461 life history in seed beetles. *Evolution* 71:274-288.
- 462 Dowling, D. K. and R. E. Adrian. 2019. Challenges and Prospects for Testing the Mother's Curse
463 Hypothesis. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*. 10.1093/icb/icz110
- 464 Dowling, D. K., A. A. Maklakov, U. Friberg, and F. Hailer. 2009. Applying the genetic theories of ageing
465 to the cytoplasm: cytoplasmic genetic covariation for fitness and lifespan. *Journal Of*
466 *Evolutionary Biology* 22:818-827.
- 467 Dowling, D. K., A. L. Nowostawski, and G. Arnqvist. 2007. Effects of cytoplasmic genes on sperm
468 viability and sperm morphology in a seed beetle: implications for sperm competition theory?
469 *Journal Of Evolutionary Biology* 20:358-368. 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01189.x
- 470 Dowling, D. K., D. M. Tompkins, and N. J. Gemmell. 2015. The Trojan Female Technique for pest
471 control: a candidate mitochondrial mutation confers low male fertility across diverse nuclear
472 backgrounds in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolutionary Applications* 8:871-880.
473 10.1111/eva.12297
- 474 Engelstädter, J. and S. Charlat. 2006. Outbreeding selects for spiteful cytoplasmic elements.
475 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 273:923-929. 10.1098/rspb.2005.3411

- 476 Filice, D. C. S. and T. A. F. Long. 2016. Genetic variation in male-induced harm in *Drosophila*
477 *melanogaster*. *Biology Letters* 12. 10.1098/rsbl.2016.0105
- 478 Frank, S. A. and L. D. Hurst. 1996. Mitochondria and male disease. *Nature* 383:224-224.
479 10.1038/383224a0
- 480 Gardner, A. and S. A. West. 2006. Spite. *Current Biology* 16:R662-R664. 10.1016/j.cub.2006.08.015
- 481 Gemmell, N. J., V. J. Metcalf, and F. W. Allendorf. 2004. Mother's curse: the effect of mtDNA on
482 individual fitness and population viability. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 19:238-244.
483 10.1016/j.tree.2004.02.002
- 484 Gromko, M., D. Gilbert, and R. Richmond. 1984. Sperm transfer and use in the multiple mating system
485 of *Drosophila*. Pp. 371-426 *in* R. Smith, ed. *Sperm competition and the evolution of animal*
486 *mating systems*. Academic press (London).
- 487 Gronau, Q. F., E.-J. Wagenmakers, D. W. Heck, and D. Matzke. 2019. A Simple Method for Comparing
488 Complex Models: Bayesian Model Comparison for Hierarchical Multinomial Processing Tree
489 Models Using Warp-III Bridge Sampling. *Psychometrika* 84:261-284. 10.1007/s11336-018-
490 9648-3
- 491 Hamilton, W. D. 1964. The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*
492 7:1-16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(64\)90038-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4)
- 493 Havird, J. C., E. S. Forsythe, A. M. Williams, J. H. Werren, D. K. Dowling, and D. B. Sloan. 2019. Selfish
494 Mitonuclear Conflict. *Current Biology* 29:R496-R511.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.03.020>
- 496 Hedrick, P. W. 2012. Reversing mother's curse revisited. *Evolution* 66:612-616. 10.1111/j.1558-
497 5646.2011.01465.x
- 498 Herre, E. A., S. A. West, J. M. Cook, S. G. Compton, and F. Kjellberg. 1997. Fig-associated wasps:
499 pollinators and parasites, sex-ratio adjustment and male polymorphism, population structure
500 and its consequences. Pp. 226-239 *in* B. J. Crespi, and J. C. Choe, eds. *The Evolution of Mating*
501 *Systems in Insects and Arachnids*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

502 Hoekstra, R. F. 2000. Evolutionary origin and consequences of uniparental mitochondrial inheritance.
503 Human Reproduction 15:102-111. 10.1093/humrep/15.suppl_2.102

504 Hoffmann, A. A. and M. Turelli. 1988. Unidirectional incompatibility in *Drosophila simulans*:
505 inheritance, geographic variation and fitness effects. Genetics 119:435-444.

506 Hurst, L. D. 1991. The Incidences and Evolution of Cytoplasmic Male Killers. Proceedings - Royal
507 Society. Biological Sciences 244:91-99. DOI 10.1098/rspb.1991.0056

508 Immonen, E., M. Collet, J. Goenaga, and G. Arnqvist. 2016. Direct and indirect genetic effects of sex-
509 specific mitonuclear epistasis on reproductive ageing. Heredity 116:338-347.
510 10.1038/hdy.2015.112

511 Innocenti, P., E. H. Morrow, and D. K. Dowling. 2011. Experimental evidence supports a sex-specific
512 selective sieve in mitochondrial genome evolution. Science 332:845-848.
513 10.1126/science.1201157

514 Jormalainen, V., S. Merilaita, and J. Riihimäki. 2001. Costs of intersexual conflict in the isopod *Idotea*
515 *baltica*. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 14:763-772. 10.1046/j.1420-9101.2001.00325.x

516 Koch, R. E. and G. E. Hill. 2018. Behavioural mating displays depend on mitochondrial function: a
517 potential mechanism for linking behaviour to individual condition. Biological Reviews
518 93:1387-1398. doi:10.1111/brv.12400

519 Kurbalija Novičić, Z., E. Immonen, M. Jelić, M. Anđelković, M. Stamenković Radak, and G. Arnqvist.
520 2015. Within-population genetic effects of mtDNA on metabolic rate in *Drosophila*
521 *subobscura*. Journal Of Evolutionary Biology 28:338-346. 10.1111/jeb.12565

522 Le Page, S., I. Sepil, E. Flinham, T. Pizzari, P. Carazo, and S. Wigby. 2017. Male relatedness and
523 familiarity are required to modulate male-induced harm to females in *Drosophila*.
524 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 284. 10.1098/rspb.2017.0441

525 Li, X.-Y. and H. Kokko. 2019. Sex-biased dispersal: a review of the theory. Biological Reviews 94:721-
526 736. 10.1111/brv.12475

- 527 Liu, Y., G. Fiskum, and D. Schubert. 2002. Generation of reactive oxygen species by the mitochondrial
528 electron transport chain. *Journal of Neurochemistry* 80:780-787. 10.1046/j.0022-
529 3042.2002.00744.x
- 530 Loyau, A., J. Cornuau, J. Clobert, É. Danchin, and T. Bilde. 2012. Incestuous Sisters: Mate Preference
531 for Brothers over Unrelated Males in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS ONE* 7:e51293.
532 10.1371/journal.pone.0051293
- 533 Mackay, T. F. C., S. Richards, E. A. Stone, A. Barbadilla, J. F. Ayroles, D. Zhu, S. Casillas, Y. Han, M. M.
534 Magwire, J. M. Cridland, M. F. Richardson, R. R. H. Anholt, M. Barrón, C. Bess, K. P.
535 Blankenburg, M. A. Carbone, D. Castellano, L. Chaboub, L. Duncan, Z. Harris, M. Javaid, J. C.
536 Jayaseelan, S. N. Jhangiani, K. W. Jordan, F. Lara, F. Lawrence, S. L. Lee, P. Librado, R. S.
537 Linheiro, R. F. Lyman, A. J. Mackey, M. Munidasa, D. M. Muzny, L. Nazareth, I. Newsham, L.
538 Perales, L.-L. Pu, C. Qu, M. Ràmia, J. G. Reid, S. M. Rollmann, J. Rozas, N. Saada, L. Turlapati, K.
539 C. Worley, Y.-Q. Wu, A. Yamamoto, Y. Zhu, C. M. Bergman, K. R. Thornton, D. Mittelman, and
540 R. A. Gibbs. 2012. The *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic Reference Panel. *Nature* 482:173.
541 10.1038/nature10811
542 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature10811#supplementary-information>
- 543 Martikainen, M. H., J. P. Grady, Y. S. Ng, C. L. Alston, G. S. Gorman, R. W. Taylor, R. McFarland, and D.
544 M. Turnbull. 2017. Decreased male reproductive success in association with mitochondrial
545 dysfunction. *Eur J Hum Genet* 25:1162-1164. 10.1038/ejhg.2017.114
- 546 McCulloch, J. B. and J. P. Owen. 2012. Arrhenotoky and oedipal mating in the northern fowl mite
547 (*Ornithonyssus sylviarum*) (Acari: Gamasida: Macronyssidae). *Parasites & vectors* 5:281.
548 10.1186/1756-3305-5-281
- 549 Milot, E., C. Moreau, A. Gagnon, A. A. Cohen, B. Brais, and D. Labuda. 2017. Mother's curse
550 neutralizes natural selection against a human genetic disease over three centuries. *Nature*
551 *Ecology & Evolution* 1:1. 10.1038/s41559-017-0276-6
- 552 Mossman, J. A., L. M. Biancani, C.-T. Zhu, and D. M. Rand. 2016. Mitonuclear Epistasis for
553 Development Time and Its Modification by Diet in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* 203:463.
554 10.1534/genetics.116.187286

555 Nakada, K., A. Sato, K. Yoshida, T. Morita, H. Tanaka, S.-I. Inoue, H. Yonekawa, and J.-I. Hayashi. 2006.
 556 Mitochondria-related male infertility. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
 557 *United States of America* 103:15148-15153. 10.1073/pnas.0604641103

558 Partridge, L. and K. Fowler. 1990. Non-mating costs of exposure to males in female *Drosophila*
 559 *melanogaster*. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 36:419-425. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910(90)90059-O)
 560 [1910\(90\)90059-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910(90)90059-O)

561 Patel, M. R., G. K. Miriyala, A. J. Littleton, H. Yang, K. Trinh, J. M. Young, S. R. Kennedy, Y. M.
 562 Yamashita, L. J. Pallanck, and H. S. Malik. 2016. A mitochondrial DNA hypomorph of
 563 cytochrome oxidase specifically impairs male fertility in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *eLife*
 564 5:e16923. 10.7554/eLife.16923

565 Perry, J. C., L. Sirot, and S. Wigby. 2013. The seminal symphony: how to compose an ejaculate. *Trends*
 566 *in ecology & evolution* 28:414-422. 10.1016/j.tree.2013.03.005

567 Pitnick, S. and F. García-González. 2002. Harm to females increases with male body size in *Drosophila*
 568 *melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 269:1821-1828.
 569 10.1098/rspb.2002.2090

570 Robinson, S. P., W. J. Kennington, and L. W. Simmons. 2012a. Assortative mating for relatedness in a
 571 large naturally occurring population of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal Of Evolutionary*
 572 *Biology* 25:716-725. 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2012.02466.x

573 Robinson, S. P., W. J. Kennington, and L. W. Simmons. 2012b. Preference for related mates in the fruit
 574 fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Animal behaviour* 84:1169-1176.

575 Rowe, L. 1994. The costs of mating and mate choice in water striders. *Animal Behaviour* 48:1049-
 576 1056. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1994.1338>

577 Smith, S., C. Turbill, and F. Suchentrunk. 2010. Introducing mother's curse: low male fertility
 578 associated with an imported mtDNA haplotype in a captive colony of brown hares. *Molecular*
 579 *Ecology* 19:36-43. 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04444.x

- Smith, S. R. T. and T. Connallon. 2017. The contribution of the mitochondrial genome to sex-specific fitness variance. *Evolution* 71:1417-1424. 10.1111/evo.13238
- Snook, R. R. and D. J. Hosken. 2004. Sperm death and dumping in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 428:939-941. 10.1038/nature02455
- Stevens, L. and M. J. Wade. 1990. Cytoplasmically inherited reproductive incompatibility in *Tribolium* flour beetles: the rate of spread and effect on population size. *Genetics* 124:367.
- Stouthamer, R., J. A. J. Breeuwer, and G. D. D. Hurst. 1999. *Wolbachia Pipientis*: Microbial Manipulator of Arthropod Reproduction. *Annual Review of Microbiology* 53:71-102. 10.1146/annurev.micro.53.1.71
- Szulkin, M., K. V. Stopher, J. M. Pemberton, and J. M. Reid. 2013. Inbreeding avoidance, tolerance, or preference in animals? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28:205-211. 10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.016
- Tan, C. K. W., H. Løvlie, E. Greenway, S. F. Goodwin, T. Pizzari, and S. Wigby. 2013. Sex-specific responses to sexual familiarity, and the role of olfaction in *Drosophila*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 280:20131691. 10.1098/rspb.2013.1691
- Trifunovic, A., A. Wredenberg, M. Falkenberg, J. N. Spelbrink, A. T. Rovio, C. E. Bruder, M. Bohlooly-Y, S. Gidlof, A. Oldfors, R. Wibom, J. Tornell, H. T. Jacobs, and N.-G. Larsson. 2004. Premature ageing in mice expressing defective mitochondrial DNA polymerase. *Nature* 429:417-423. http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v429/n6990/supinfo/nature02517_S1.html
- Unckless, R. L. and J. K. Herren. 2009. Population genetics of sexually antagonistic mitochondrial mutants under inbreeding. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 260:132-136. 10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.06.004
- Vaught, R. C. and D. K. Dowling. 2018. Maternal inheritance of mitochondria: implications for male fertility? *Reproduction* 155:R159-R168. 10.1530/REP-17-0600
- Wade, M. J. and Y. Brandvain. 2009. Reversing mother's curse: selection on male mitochondrial fitness effects. *Evolution* 63:1084-1089. 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00614.x

- Wallace, D. C., G. Singh, M. T. Lott, J. A. Hodge, T. G. Schurr, M. S. L. Angela, L. J. Elsas, and E. K. Nikoskelainen. 1988. Mitochondrial DNA Mutation Associated with Leber's Hereditary Optic Neuropathy. *Science* 242:1427-1430. 10.1126/science.3201231
- Wolf, J. B., E. D. Brodie III, J. M. Cheverud, A. J. Moore, and M. J. Wade. 1998. Evolutionary consequences of indirect genetic effects. *Trends in ecology & evolution* 13:64-69. 10.1016/s0169-5347(97)01233-0
- Wolff, J. N., M. F. Camus, D. J. Clancy, and D. K. Dowling. 2016a. Complete mitochondrial genome sequences of thirteen globally sourced strains of fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*) form a powerful model for mitochondrial research. *Mitochondrial DNA Part A* 27:4672-4674. 10.3109/19401736.2015.1106496
- Wolff, J. N., N. Pichaud, M. F. Camus, G. Côté, P. U. Blier, and D. K. Dowling. 2016b. Evolutionary implications of mitochondrial genetic variation: mitochondrial genetic effects on OXPHOS respiration and mitochondrial quantity change with age and sex in fruit flies. *Journal of evolutionary biology* 29:736-747. 10.1111/jeb.12822
- Xu, H., S. Z. DeLuca, and P. H. O'Farrell. 2008. Manipulating the Metazoan Mitochondrial Genome with Targeted Restriction Enzymes. *Science* 321:575-577. 10.1126/science.1160226
- Yee, W. K., K. L. Sutton, and D. K. Dowling. 2013. In vivo male fertility is affected by naturally occurring mitochondrial haplotypes. *Current Biology* 23:R55-R56. 10.1016/j.cub.2012.12.002
- Yen, J. H. and A. R. Barr. 1971. New hypothesis of the cause of cytoplasmic incompatibility in *Culex pipiens* L. *Nature* 232:657-658. 10.1038/232657a0
- Zhang, H., F. Guillaume, and J. Engelstädter. 2012. The dynamics of mitochondrial mutations causing male infertility in spatially structured populations. *Evolution* 66:3179-3188. 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01675.x

Tables

Table 1: Model selection table for Experiment 1. Five multivariate mixed models were compared, which differed only in their fixed effects. The most complex model had the highest

posterior model probability, but a simpler model lacking the 2-way interaction was also plausible given the data. The table suggests that offspring production was affected by male mitochondrial strain, and that this effect might differ between ‘Order of exposure’ treatments. We used a flat prior, meaning that all models were considered equally likely.

Fixed effects	Posterior model probability
Male mtDNA × Order of exposure	0.78
Male mtDNA + Order of exposure	0.18
Male mtDNA	0.04
Order of exposure	0.01
Intercept only	0.00

Table 2: Posterior estimates of the differences in mean offspring production for each possible pair of male haplotypes in Experiment 1, summed across the four vials, and split by ‘Order of exposure’ treatment. Males from the Dahomey, Israel and Sweden haplotypes were associated with higher offspring production than the Brownsville haplotype, and there were also differences between Dahomey and Sweden, Dahomey and Barcelona, and Israel and Sweden (particularly in vial 2; see Figures 2 and 4). Asterisks mark statistically significant differences. The numbers in parentheses are 95% credible intervals. The ‘Relative difference’ column gives the absolute difference in means divided by the mean for haplotype 1.

Haplotype 1	Haplotype 2	Order of exposure	Difference in offspring production	SE	Relative difference	
Brownsville	Barcelona	Exposed first	-5.05 (-18.47 to 8.47)	6.85	0.07 (0 to 0.2)	
Dahomey	Barcelona	Exposed first	15.79 (1.62 to 30.58)	7.36	0.13 (0.02 to 0.24)	*
Dahomey	Brownsville	Exposed first	20.84 (6.19 to 36.11)	7.63	0.17 (0.06 to 0.28)	*
Dahomey	Israel	Exposed first	1.35 (-13.81 to 16.56)	7.72	0.05 (0 to 0.15)	
Dahomey	Sweden	Exposed first	19.95 (5.89 to 34.74)	7.34	0.17 (0.05 to 0.27)	*
Israel	Barcelona	Exposed first	14.44 (0.42 to 29.01)	7.26	0.12 (0.01 to 0.23)	*
Israel	Brownsville	Exposed first	19.49 (4.95 to 34.5)	7.52	0.16 (0.05 to 0.27)	*
Sweden	Barcelona	Exposed first	-4.16 (-17.22 to 8.63)	6.56	0.06 (0 to 0.19)	
Sweden	Brownsville	Exposed first	0.88 (-12.54 to 14.14)	6.78	0.05 (0 to 0.15)	
Sweden	Israel	Exposed first	-18.6 (-33.14 to -4.77)	7.24	0.19 (0.05 to 0.35)	*
Brownsville	Barcelona	Exposed second	-7.3 (-18.32 to 3.38)	5.52	0.09 (0 to 0.23)	
Dahomey	Barcelona	Exposed second	4.98 (-6.31 to 16.39)	5.77	0.06 (0 to 0.16)	
Dahomey	Brownsville	Exposed second	12.28 (1.78 to 23.24)	5.46	0.13 (0.02 to 0.23)	*
Dahomey	Israel	Exposed second	-5.09 (-16.77 to 6.51)	5.91	0.07 (0 to 0.18)	
Dahomey	Sweden	Exposed second	-1.77 (-13.16 to 9.52)	5.78	0.05 (0 to 0.15)	
Israel	Barcelona	Exposed second	10.07 (-1.47 to 21.76)	5.89	0.1 (0.01 to 0.2)	
Israel	Brownsville	Exposed second	17.37 (6.43 to 28.96)	5.73	0.17 (0.07 to 0.27)	*
Sweden	Barcelona	Exposed second	6.75 (-4.71 to 18.41)	5.87	0.08 (0 to 0.18)	
Sweden	Brownsville	Exposed second	14.05 (3.34 to 25.35)	5.61	0.14 (0.04 to 0.24)	*
Sweden	Israel	Exposed second	-3.32 (-15.08 to 8.47)	5.98	0.06 (0 to 0.16)	

Table 3: Model selection table for Experiment 2. Five multivariate mixed models were compared, which differed only in their fixed effects. The intercept-only model had the highest posterior model probability, though a model containing ‘Order of exposure’ was also quite probable. Models containing ‘Female mtDNA’ were ranked low, suggesting that the mitochondrial strain of the females had little or no effect on offspring production. We used a flat prior, meaning that all models were considered equally likely.

Fixed effects	Posterior model probability
Intercept only	0.83
Order of exposure	0.17
Female mtDNA × Order of exposure	0.00
Female mtDNA + Order of exposure	0.00
Female mtDNA	0.00

Table 4: Posterior estimates of the differences in mean offspring production for each possible pair of female haplotypes in Experiment 2, summed across the four vials, and split by ‘Order of exposure’ treatment. Females carrying the Barcelona haplotype tended to have lower offspring production, but only in the ‘Exposed second’ treatment. There was also a difference in offspring production between females carrying the Dahomey and Sweden haplotypes. Asterisks mark statistically significant differences. The numbers in parentheses are 95% credible intervals. The ‘Relative difference’ column gives the absolute difference in means divided by the mean for haplotype 1.

Haplotype 1	Haplotype 2	Order of exposure	Difference in offspring production	SE	Relative difference	
Brownsville	Barcelona	Exposed first	0.35 (-19.34 to 20.24)	10.05	0.07 (0 to 0.2)	
Dahomey	Barcelona	Exposed first	-15.13 (-35.67 to 6.02)	10.58	0.17 (0.01 to 0.4)	
Dahomey	Brownsville	Exposed first	-15.48 (-36.37 to 5.7)	10.66	0.17 (0.01 to 0.4)	
Dahomey	Israel	Exposed first	-17.49 (-38.25 to 3.67)	10.61	0.19 (0.01 to 0.42)	
Dahomey	Sweden	Exposed first	-15.78 (-36.36 to 5.19)	10.56	0.17 (0.01 to 0.41)	
Israel	Barcelona	Exposed first	2.36 (-17.14 to 22.02)	9.95	0.07 (0 to 0.19)	
Israel	Brownsville	Exposed first	2.01 (-17.98 to 21.85)	10.10	0.07 (0 to 0.19)	
Sweden	Barcelona	Exposed first	0.65 (-18.97 to 20.38)	9.98	0.07 (0 to 0.2)	
Sweden	Brownsville	Exposed first	0.3 (-19.54 to 20.09)	10.08	0.07 (0 to 0.2)	
Sweden	Israel	Exposed first	-1.71 (-21.3 to 17.93)	9.97	0.07 (0 to 0.2)	
Brownsville	Barcelona	Exposed second	23.52 (5.49 to 42.96)	9.51	0.22 (0.06 to 0.36)	*
Dahomey	Barcelona	Exposed second	11.36 (-4.66 to 27.58)	8.17	0.12 (0.01 to 0.27)	
Dahomey	Brownsville	Exposed second	-12.16 (-31.36 to 5.94)	9.47	0.14 (0.01 to 0.36)	
Dahomey	Israel	Exposed second	-16.78 (-35.87 to 1.04)	9.35	0.19 (0.02 to 0.41)	
Dahomey	Sweden	Exposed second	-21.41 (-40.68 to -3.46)	9.47	0.23 (0.04 to 0.46)	*
Israel	Barcelona	Exposed second	28.13 (10.47 to 47.4)	9.37	0.25 (0.1 to 0.38)	*
Israel	Brownsville	Exposed second	4.62 (-15.59 to 24.87)	10.24	0.08 (0 to 0.21)	
Sweden	Barcelona	Exposed second	32.77 (14.76 to 52.33)	9.56	0.28 (0.14 to 0.4)	*
Sweden	Brownsville	Exposed second	9.25 (-11.15 to 29.89)	10.40	0.1 (0 to 0.24)	

Figure captions

Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the experimental design employed in Experiments 1 and 2. Black arrows represent either the transfer of a DGRP-517 female with her initial DGRP-352 mate into a new vial in Experiment 1, or a female from one of the five mitochondrial strains into a new vial in Experiment 2. Dashed lines indicate the transfer of three males into or out of vials. In Experiment 1, the male triad belonged to one of the five mitochondrial strains, while in Experiment 2, males from the 324 DGRP line were used. The illustration shows an example of the ‘exposed first’ treatment, as the female is exposed to the high male density treatment in her first and third vials. In the ‘exposed second’ treatment, females were exposed to a high male density in their second and fourth vials.

Figure 2: The mean number of progeny produced by females in Experiment 1, for each combination of predictor variables. The coloured points (green = high male exposure, yellow = low male exposure) show the posterior estimate of the mean, using the model shown in Table S1, and the error bars show 95% credible intervals. Dashed lines denote females exposed to the high male density treatment in their first and third vials; solid lines denote females exposed to the high male density treatment in their second and fourth vials.

Figure 3: The mean number of progeny produced by mitochondrial strain females in Experiment 2, for each combination of predictor variables. The coloured points (green = males present, yellow = males absent) show the posterior estimate of the mean, using the model shown in Table S6, and the error bars show 95% credible intervals.

Figure 4: The effects of mtDNA on female fitness. **a** The estimated indirect effects of mitochondrial haplotypes in males on female productivity. **b** The estimated direct effects of mitochondrial haplotypes on female productivity. **a-b** Black points represent the median of the posterior estimate of total offspring production over the entire experiment, innermost bars show 50% credible intervals, outermost bars show 95% credible intervals, and the coloured areas show the whole posterior (calculated from the full models of each

experiment). **c** summarised differences in mean female productivity for pairs of male mtDNA haplotypes during Experiment 1, split between the 'Exposed first' (upper triangles) and 'Exposed second' (lower triangles) treatments. **d** summarised differences in mean female productivity for pairs of female mtDNA haplotypes during Experiment 2, split between the 'Exposed first' (upper triangles) and 'Exposed second' (lower triangles) treatments. **c-d** The graphs show posterior estimates calculated from the full models of each experiment; asterisks mark comparisons for which the 95% credible intervals associated with this difference did not overlap zero.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Day 1

Day 1-3

Day 4-6

Day 7-9

Day 10-12

Author Manuscript

Males added to create high exposure treatment

Males added to create high exposure treatment

Female transferred after mating

Female transferred after 72 hrs

Female transferred after 72 hrs

Female transferred after 72 hrs

Vial 1

Vial 2

Vial 3






Vial 4

Males removed after 72 hrs



Males removed after 72 hrs

Female discarded after 72 hrs

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved




Mating vial



Experiment 1

jeb_13561_f2.pdf


DGRP-517 females interacting with mitochondrial strain males



Experiment 2



jeb_13561_f3.pdf

Mitochondrial strain females interacting with DGRP-324 males





Posterior distribution (bars show the median and 50% and 95% CIs)

Mean progeny produced
 (summed over all four vials)



Estimated difference in average total productivity between mtDNA haplotypes

Upper triangle: 'Exposed first' treatment Lower triangle: 'Exposed second' treatment



Absolute difference
 in mean progeny
 produced

