



# Transposable Elements and the Evolution of Insects

Clément Gilbert, Jean Peccoud, Richard Cordaux

## ► To cite this version:

Clément Gilbert, Jean Peccoud, Richard Cordaux. Transposable Elements and the Evolution of Insects. Annual Review of Entomology, 2021, 66 (1), pp.355-372. 10.1146/annurev-ento-070720-074650 . hal-03376520

**HAL Id: hal-03376520**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03376520>**

Submitted on 15 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Transposable elements and the evolution of insects

Clément Gilbert<sup>1\*</sup>, Jean Peccoud<sup>2</sup>, Richard Cordaux<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratoire Evolution, Génomes, Comportement, Écologie, Unité Mixte de Recherche 9191 Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and Unité Mixte de Recherche 247 Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>2</sup> Laboratoire Ecologie et Biologie des Interactions, Equipe Ecologie Evolution Symbiose, Unité Mixte de Recherche 7267 Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Université de Poitiers, Poitiers, France

\*Corresponding author : [clement.gilbert@egce.cnrs-gif.fr](mailto:clement.gilbert@egce.cnrs-gif.fr)

## Abstract

Insects are major contributors to our understanding of the interaction between transposable elements (TEs) and their hosts, owing to seminal discoveries, as well as to the growing number of sequenced insect genomes, population genomics and functional studies. Insect TE landscapes are highly variable both within and across insect orders, although phylogenetic relatedness appears to correlate with similarity in insect TE content. This correlation is unlikely to be solely due to inheritance of TEs from shared ancestors and may partly reflect preferential horizontal transfer of TEs between closely related species. The influence of insect traits on TE landscapes remains however unclear. Recent findings indicate that in addition to being involved in insect adaptations and aging, TEs are seemingly at the cornerstone of insect antiviral immunity. Thus, TEs are emerging as essential insect symbionts, which may have deleterious or beneficial consequences on their hosts depending on context.

## Keywords

Transposable elements, adaptation, antiviral immunity, aging, evolution, horizontal transfer

## Introduction

Transposable elements (TEs) are pieces of DNA able to move from one genomic locus to another, often duplicating themselves in the process (13). The large diversity of TE types is classified in two classes: retrotransposons (Class-I TEs), which move through a replicative process involving reverse transcription of the TE mRNA, and DNA transposons (Class-II TEs), which mobilize through replicative or non-replicative transposition of DNA copies (24, 144). TEs are found in the genomes of virtually all organisms, often in very large amounts. The structure of TEs, their mobility and repeated nature have profoundly shaped the evolution of their hosts (22, 39, 63, 123).

TEs were discovered in the 1940s by Barbara McClintock, who showed that some genetic elements could move in the maize genome. This activity would induce chromosome breaks and sometimes modify the expression of neighboring genes with visible changes in maize kernel color (92). These initial studies have been mostly ignored for over three decades until they were finally rewarded by the Nobel prize of Physiology or Medicine (in 1983). TEs then became increasingly considered as important drivers of evolution, notably owing to major discoveries made in insects, mainly in *Drosophila* flies (8). Examples include the hybrid dysgenesis phenomenon, whereby F1 hybrids between males harboring *P* elements (class-II TEs) and females lacking them showed several defects such as gonadal atrophy and sterility (17, 70, 72). The molecular underpinnings of hybrid dysgenesis were only deciphered in 2008 through the discovery of the PIWI-associated RNAs (piRNAs)-mediated control of TEs (15). In the meantime, molecular cloning and extensive studies of the *P* element led to the development of this TE as one of the most widely used germline transformation tools in *Drosophila* (87, 125). Other TE-based transformation systems were developed for non-*Drosophila* species, including the one using *Piggybac*, a TE from the cabbage looper moth (*Trichoplusia ni*) that was discovered because of its ability to jump into a baculovirus (41, 56).

Surveys of the distribution of *P* elements in wild and laboratory strains of various *Drosophila* species also revealed that horizontal transfer (HT) of genetic material (here TEs) was not restricted to bacteria but that it could occur in eukaryotes (27, 45). Other landmark TE discoveries made in *Drosophila* include the so-called *P* neogenes derived from stationary *P* element copies, which led to the realization that TE protein domains can be co-opted to fulfill cellular functions (95, 102, 108). Perhaps even more surprising, the finding that the classical telomeres had been replaced in *Drosophila* flies with *HetA/TART/TAHRE* retrotransposons, which only transpose at chromosome ends, revealed that *bona fide* TEs could be beneficial to their host (9, 101). Finally, seminal studies mapped the genetic basis of insecticide resistance in the tobacco budworm (*Heliothis virescens*) and

*D. melanogaster* to TE-driven mutations, which contributed to set TEs as powerful facilitators of genome evolution and host adaptation (26, 43, 98, 116).

These case-studies along with more recent multi-species, genome-wide surveys allow painting a general picture of the composition, evolution and potential roles of TEs in insects, which is the topic of this review. We first expose emerging macroevolutionary trends that underlie insect TE genomic landscapes. We then discuss how the latest major discoveries on the impact of TEs in insect adaptation, antiviral immunity and aging are continuously changing the way we view these genomic symbionts.

## **1 - Evolution of TEs within and across insect orders**

### **1 - 1 Diversity and abundance of insect TEs**

The first comprehensive characterizations of TE abundance, diversity, age and genome distribution in an insect were made possible thanks to analyses of the *D. melanogaster* genome (5, 7, 66, 69). These studies illustrated how estimates of TE abundance and diversity heavily depend on the completeness and quality of assembled genomes as well as on the methods used to annotate TEs. TE content ranged from 2% of the *D. melanogaster* genome in early studies of euchromatic regions relying only on similarity-based approaches, to about 15 % when heterochromatic regions were included and combined *de novo* annotation pipelines were developed. The *D. melanogaster* TE landscape is dominated by LTR-retrotransposons, which make up 10% of the genome, with non-LTR retrotransposons and DNA transposons altogether occupying ~5% of the genome. The TE distribution along *D. melanogaster* chromosomes is non-random, with a much lower density in euchromatic regions where TEs generally occur as single full-length copies, than in pericentromeric heterochromatin where TEs are arranged in dense islands of nested and often rearranged copies. Bergman et al. (7) proposed that expression of such TE islands would produce transcripts made of chimeric TEs which could be involved in suppressing the activity of multiple TE families. The hypothesis was later confirmed with the discovery of dozens of pericentromeric TE-rich regions called piRNA clusters acting as TE traps, the expression of which initiates piRNA-mediated TE suppression (15, 150). Early studies based on between-copy genetic distances within TE families found that most euchromatic TE copies resulted from very recent transposition events (14, 69). Their recent origin is in agreement with subsequent studies showing that >80% of polymorphic TE copies segregate at low (<0.2) frequency in *D. melanogaster* populations (75).

The analysis of other genomes quickly revealed that characteristics of fly TEs were not necessarily representative of those found in other insects and that TE landscapes were highly dynamic in this group (90). For example, although the overall content of classified TEs in the mosquito *Anopheles gambiae* (about 13%) was close to that of *D. melanogaster*, LTR retrotransposons occupy about the same amount of genomic space as non-LTR retrotransposons and DNA transposons in this species (61, 96). Genome sequencing of another mosquito (*Aedes aegypti*), a Coleoptera (*Tribolium castaneum*) and a Lepidoptera (*Bombyx mori*) further revealed that TE content varies substantially in insects (from 6% in *T. castaneum* to 48% in *A. aegypti*) and that both DNA transposons and non-LTR retrotransposons can be the dominant TEs in other species (97, 100, 139). The decrease in sequencing costs was then accompanied by a rapid augmentation of the number of genome papers with detailed sections on TE annotation (e.g. 19, 21, 23, 42, 44). One study reported that the antarctic midge (*Belgica antarctica*) had both the smallest genome and the lowest TE content among arthropods (71). It is now common to see papers reporting comparative analyses of multiple insect genomes with efforts dedicated to surveying the evolution of TE contents across genomes (e.g. 1, 6, 15, 21, 28, 37, 45), as well as studies specifically dedicated to comparisons of TE contents at scales ranging from insect genus to whole arthropods (55, 105, 110, 114, 148). We ourselves performed an automated TE annotation on 195 publicly available insect genomes (103) (Figure 1).

A recent study also reported automated *de novo* TE-annotation and comparison of 73 arthropod genomes (including 62 insects) (105). An interesting outcome of this analysis, as well as ours (Figure 1), is that the nature of a large fraction of the repetitive content of most insect genomes (11% in *D. simulans* up to 93% in *Ephemera danica*; mean 56%, (105)) cannot be assessed using automated procedures. Thus, interpretations on variation in TE content in insects must be taken with caution. Bearing this limitation in mind, broad-scale TE landscape analyses reveal a high diversity of TEs in insects, with most known TE superfamilies present in most insect species (105, 148). They also unveil some degree of homogeneity in TE composition among insect groups spanning diverse taxonomic levels (105). For example, in six tsetse fly species (*Glossina* spp), the genome proportion occupied by DNA transposons (12.8-14.7%), LTR (0.4-0.8%) and non-LTR (5.8-2.9%) retrotransposons has remained stable over 25 million years (2). In three Hemipteran species having diverged >200 million years ago (*Cimex lectularius*, *Halyomorpha halys* and *Oncopeltus fasciatus*), genome proportions of TE classes differ between species but non-LTR retrotransposons (7-14%) are always in higher amounts than DNA transposons (1.3-4%) and LTR retrotransposons (0.6-1.4%). The situation is similar in four lepidopteran species which diverged >100 million years ago (*Helicoverpa armigera*, *Bombyx mori*, *Danaus plexippus*, *Heliconius melpomene*), in which non-LTR retrotransposons (4.2-20.4%) are also always in higher amount than DNA transposons (0.9-3.1%) and LTR retrotransposons (0.3-0.7%).

While homogeneity in TE composition exists in some cases, pronounced differences have been found in other cases. In hemipterans for example, SINEs and DNA transposons of the pea aphid (*Acyrtosiphon pisum*) occupy the largest genome fraction (7.1% and 8.6%, respectively) while they are either present in low amount (mean=1.2% and 2.3%, respectively) and/or occupy the lowest genome fraction in the other six surveyed species (105). In coleopterans, DNA transposons occupy a much larger genome fraction than retrotransposons in *T. castaneum* and *Anoplophora glabripennis* while they are in minority compared to retrotransposons in *Agrilus plannipenis* and *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* (105). Large differences in TE landscapes also exist at the genus level. Among 16 *Heliconius* butterfly species, TE composition may be similar at the level of TE class (DNA transposons versus retrotransposons), but may differ drastically within each TE Class (110). For example, LTR retrotransposons are almost absent in *H. doris* and *H. burneyi* but they make up 2 to 6% of the genome of the other 14 species. Similarly, eight *Heliconius* species have a genome proportion of SINEs <1% while SINEs make up 2 to 6% of the genome of the remaining eight species.

## **1 – 2 The influence of vertical and horizontal transmission on insect TE landscapes**

The TE content of a genome is an equilibrium between the rate of TE acquisition, the replication dynamics of TEs within the genome and the rate of TE loss by degradation/deletion. TEs are acquired from ancestors (vertical inheritance) and potentially from other organisms (HT). TE replication dynamics reflect rates of TE insertions (TE activity), which may be suppressed by host factors, as well as the fate of these insertions under the influence of natural selection and genetic drift (73, 79, 115, 135). While the relative importance of the factors and processes shaping TE landscapes is not well understood, insects are one of the groups in which they have been the most intensely studied so far (see also (129) for a study in nematodes).

Multiple large-scale studies indicate a positive correlation between phylogenetic relatedness and similarity of TE landscapes in insects (see above and refs. (105, 148)), although this correlation is not formally tested. Variation in genome size also shows a strong phylogenetic signal and is positively correlated to TE content both at the scale of arthropods (102, 146) and within insect orders: in *Drosophila* species (40, 122), wood-white butterflies (130) and fireflies (84). This observation is somewhat expected given that TEs, like any other genome component, are inherited from parents to descendants. Yet in several pairs of closely related species showing relatively similar TE landscapes, such as *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*, most TE copies have originated from transposition events that are much more recent than the species split (14, 105). Their recent origin is further supported by the fact that TE insertions in *D. melanogaster* are generally polymorphic within the species (75). As a

result, relatively few TE copies may be inherited over millions of years in a context of ongoing TE activity, and species would be expected to diverge quickly with respect to their TE content.

On the other hand, a systematic survey of HT of TEs (HTT) between *D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans* and *D. yakuba*, which diverged 11 million years ago, revealed that at least one third of the TE families in these three species have been acquired through HTT, with an overall HTT rate of 0.035 events per TE family per million years (4). It was also found that the number of HTT was higher between closely related species than between distantly related ones, with twice as many events between *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* as between any of these species and *D. yakuba* (4). A similar study extended to 195 insect genomes inferred no fewer than 2248 HTT events between species having diverged >40 million years ago (103). In addition to showing that HTT is not infrequent and has had a strong impact on genome evolution in insects, with on average 2% of insect genome content deriving from horizontally transferred TEs (and up to 25%), this study confirmed the role of phylogenetic relatedness in favoring HTT. Preferential HTT between related species may thus explain the phylogenetic signal in insect TE landscape variation in conjunction to inheritance from shared ancestors.

In addition to phylogeny, geography was found to partly explain the distribution of HTT along the insect tree. More HTT was detected between species originating from the same biogeographic realm than between species from different ones (103). The observation that species more likely to be in (direct or indirect) contact are also more likely to exchange TEs supports a role for ecological relationships in shaping HTT. This is in line with a series of studies reporting HTT between animal hosts and their parasites (47, 78, 128, 137, 141), but not with a study that did not detect HTT between *Drosophila* species and two of their parasitoid wasps (99). Given the relatively high rate of HTT in insects (103), it is likely that future studies implementing appropriate taxon sampling will further delineate the types of ecological relationships, including host-parasite relationships, that affect HTT patterns in insects (135). Interestingly, it was recently found that lepidopterans were significantly more prone to HTT than other insect orders (112). The higher susceptibility of lepidopterans to HTT may be explained by a number of different factors, one of which being exposure to large double-stranded DNA viruses belonging to the Baculoviridae family. Most known baculoviruses indeed infect lepidopterans and a large number of TEs are able to jump from infected moth species to the genome of several baculoviruses, suggesting a role for these viruses as vectors of HTT (46).

### 1 - 3 Are insect TE landscapes shaped by ecological and life history traits?

The replication dynamics of TEs may depend on certain life history traits of their hosts, as these traits may condition the impact of TE insertions on fitness and how these insertions evolve in host populations. One candidate trait is reproductive mode, since reduced recombination rates in asexual taxa may lead to the accumulation of TE insertions, as seen in non-recombinant sex chromosomes (18). However, asexual arthropods (including asexual wasps) do not have more TEs than their sexual counterparts (6, 77, 119). By contrast, social complexity is negatively correlated with TE abundance and TE diversity in bees, which may be explained by increased recombination rates in highly social insects and/or the pronounced hygienic behavior in these insects, leading to a lower exposure to parasites that may act as vectors of HTT (68). Yet, in social ants displaying hygienic behavior, TE content and diversity are similar to non-solitary insects (42). Furthermore, in termites, the socially more complex *Macrotermes natalensis* has a larger genome (1.31 Gb) and higher TE content (about 30%) than *Zootermopsis nevadensis* (562 Mb and about 16%, respectively) (76). Thus, whether or not TE landscapes are shaped by levels of sociality in bees, the influence of this factor may not hold for other social insects.

The ecological niche has been proposed as a potential factor shaping insect TE landscapes. For example, the low TE content of the antarctic midge *B. antartica* (0.12%) is thought to result from the paucity of contacts this extreme specialist has with other organisms in the species-poor polar environment, combined to strong selective pressures due to pronounced physiological and ecological constraints (71). In apparent agreement with a link between ecological niche and TE content, another extreme specialist, the fig wasp *Ceratosolen solmsi* also has one of the lowest TE contents of all insects (6.4%) (149). Yet, when comparing TE landscapes between *Drosophila* species in a phylogenetic context, no significant difference was found between specialists and generalists (40). The level of ecological specialization of *Drosophila* species, which is not as extreme as in *B. antartica* and *C. solmsi*, may not be high enough to impact TE content. Thus, reevaluating TE content in a controlled phylogenetic framework including related specialist and generalist species is required to properly test the influence of ecological niche on this variable. More generally, how host physiology and ecology govern TE replication dynamics deserves further studies. Such works may help to assess how the similarity in TE contents among related species, despite sustained TE activity, reflects some form of stabilizing/parallel evolution under similar constraints.



## 2 – The fate and impact of TEs in insect genomes

The development of next-generation sequencing technologies and analytical tools have enabled studies of the population genomics of insect TEs, many of which have focussed on *D. melanogaster* (3, 12). These studies have shown that a large fraction of the TEs inserted in the *D. melanogaster* reference genome are not fixed in the species (106). In addition, thousands of non-reference TE insertions segregate in *D. melanogaster* populations (25, 74, 80, 83, 109).

The majority of polymorphic TE insertions are present at lower frequencies than expected for neutral variants, suggesting that purifying selection (deleterious effects) plays a major role in TE population dynamics in *D. melanogaster* (10). A similar pattern of TE dynamics has been found in *D. simulans* (75). The deleterious effect of TEs can in part be explained by insertional mutagenesis upon integration in the genome. Consistently, more than half of spontaneous mutant phenotypes in *D. melanogaster* are caused by TE insertions disrupting gene function (33) and very few TE insertions are found in protein-coding genes in natural populations (74, 106). At the post-insertional level, an important cause for TE deleteriousness is ectopic recombination between non allelic, homologous TE insertions, which can generate deleterious genomic rearrangements (74, 106). It will be interesting to assess to what extent TE insertions are deleterious for insects other than *Drosophila*.

### 2 - 1 Insect adaptation

Even though most TE insertions are deleterious or neutral, some insertions are expected to be beneficial to their carriers. This is the case of several TE-mediated mutations underlying resistance to insecticides in the pink bollworm *Pectinophora gossypiella*, a major pest of cotton, and in *D. melanogaster* (116). In *P. gossypiella*, several independent TE insertions disrupting the *PgCad1* gene confer resistance to the widely used *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ac toxin (37, 138). In *D. melanogaster*, *cis*-regulatory sequences of an *Accord* LTR retrotransposon inserted in the 5' regulatory region of the *Cyp6g1* gene are responsible for *Cyp6g1* upregulation and increased resistance to DDT (21, 26). Furthermore, an adaptive allelic series in *Cyp6g1* involving successive mutations (including *P* and *HMS-Beagle* TE insertions) was later found to be associated with increasing DDT resistance levels (120). Similarly, resistance to organophosphate insecticide is caused by a *Doc1420* LINE retrotransposon that truncates the *CHKov1* gene and produces altered transcripts (1). Interestingly, the new variant may have initially been selected as a defense against viral infections, thereby pre-adapting flies to insecticides (86). Yet another mechanism underlies TE-mediated increased resistance to cyclodiene dieldrin: *Rdl* gene duplication through ectopic recombination between *Roo* LTR retrotransposons (113). DNA transposons can also be involved in xenobiotic resistance, as exemplified by the *Pogo* TE affecting polyadenylation signal choice in the *CG11699* gene and

conferring resistance to carbofuran and benzaldehyde (89). These examples serve to highlight the diversity of TE families and molecular mechanisms through which TEs can be adaptive to their hosts, which is all the more spectacular with respect to insecticide resistance in *D. melanogaster*, when considering that this species is not a pest and has not been targeted by insecticides.

The contribution of TEs to *D. melanogaster* adaptation is not restricted to insecticide resistance, as genome-wide studies of TE insertion polymorphisms have identified dozens of candidate adaptive TE insertions (50, 51, 74, 80, 111). Population frequency distributions of TE insertions suggest that some may play a role in adaptation to temperate climates (*D. melanogaster* has originated in the afrotropics), often by induction of regulatory changes in nearby genes (50, 51). Functional gene categories such as stress response, behavior and development appear to be particularly prone to TE-mediated adaptation (111). In some cases, ecologically-relevant fitness benefits have been clearly connected to specific TE insertions, such as a *Bari1* DNA transposon mediating oxidative stress response (52, 54), *P*, *Jockey* and *Roo* elements involved in thermotolerance (81, 93) and an *invader4* retrotransposon inducing faster development time (133). Interestingly, negative fitness effects of such TE insertions have sometimes been identified, which may represent costs of selection and may explain why the TE insertions have not reached fixation (52, 133).

Adaptive TE insertions have also been found in various insects other than *D. melanogaster*. For example, in the peppered moth *Biston betularia*, industrial melanism is caused by a *carb-TE* DNA transposon in the first intron of the *cortex* gene which affects gene expression (60). This mutation underlies the replacement of a pale form by a black form driven by the interplay between bird predation and coal pollution during the Industrial Revolution in the UK. Wing color polymorphism is also associated with a TE insertion in the *Colias crocea* butterfly, conferring developmental and reproductive advantages (147). In Chinese populations of the migratory locust (*Locusta migratoria*), an *Lm1* SINE insertion in the third exon of the *Hsp90* gene produces an alternative splicing form associated with faster development and higher developmental synchrony (20). Remarkably, only heterozygotes are present in natural populations, suggesting there is an heterozygote advantage that is maintained by balancing selection. It has also been proposed that TEs may be powerful agents of rapid adaptation in invasive species (126), an hypothesis that has received empirical support from several insects such as the ant *Cardiocondyla obscurior* (121) and the Asian tiger mosquito *Aedes albopictus* (53).

While the aforementioned examples of adaptive TEs consider individual copies, the repetitive nature of TEs and existence of multiple homologous sequences scattered in genomes offer the perspective for TEs to collectively impact cellular processes. For example, *G2/Jockey-3* retrotransposons appear

to contribute to the structure and function of centromeres in *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* (19). TEs may also rewire regulatory networks by supplying *cis* regulatory elements at chromosomal scale, as shown with the recruitment of *Helitron* elements to regulate dosage compensation in *D. miranda* sex chromosomes (34, 35). There is however no formal demonstration that TEs have actually improved these cellular processes from their ancestral state. The involvement of TEs in these processes could represent neutral or even slightly deleterious mutational changes.

## **2 – 2 Antiviral immunity**

In addition to their role in adaptation of insect populations, recent studies are setting TEs as an important component of insect antiviral immunity. In insects, viruses are mainly restricted by RNA interference (RNAi) (134). This pathway relies on the recognition and cleavage of intracellular long viral double-stranded (ds) RNAs by the endoribonuclease Dicer2, yielding 21-nucleotide small interfering RNAs (siRNAs). One strand of siRNAs is then used by the endoribonuclease Argonaute 2 to target and cleave complementary long single-stranded viral RNAs, resulting in viral restriction. While this pathway confers immunity to infected insect cells, it has long remained unclear whether such immunity could spread systemically. In plants and nematodes, systemic RNAi spread relies on amplification of dsRNA molecules by RNA-dependent RNA-polymerases (RdRp) (59, 124), which are absent in insects (82). Yet, Goic et al. (48, 49) showed that antiviral RNAi can be amplified through a hitherto unknown mechanism in *Drosophila* flies and *Aedes* mosquitoes, which relies on the formation of viral DNA (vDNA). Remarkably, vDNAs are produced through reverse transcription of viral RNAs by insect retrotransposon proteins, instead of an RdRp. This process primarily takes place in hemocytes, in which viral dsRNAs released by infected cells accumulate (107, 131). vDNAs are then transcribed and they trigger the formation of secondary viral siRNAs which are loaded into exosome-like vesicles. They are then secreted in the extracellular environment and spread over the entire insect body, conferring systemic antiviral immunity (131). vDNAs are generated as both circular and linear molecules, some of which may end up being integrated into the host genome (132). Isolation and sequencing of episomal circular DNA from infected mosquito cells and *Drosophila* flies revealed that many circular vDNAs (cvDNAs) correspond to virus-LTR retrotransposon chimeras. Strikingly, the amount of circular DNA containing virus-LTR retrotransposon chimeras produced by mosquito cells is typically much higher than that containing chimeras of non-virus host sequence and retrotransposons (132). Furthermore, the viral portion of virus-LTR retrotransposon chimeras is enriched for defective viral genomes (107). Together, these observations suggest that viral defective RNAs are recognized and preferentially reverse-transcribed over non-viral RNAs by LTR retrotransposon-encoded reverse transcriptases, through a process involving copy-choice recombination and seemingly depending on Dicer2 (107, 131, 132). Importantly, inhibition of reverse

transcriptase activity in flies and mosquitoes leads to accelerated death of infected individuals (48, 49). Thus, in the context of viral infections, the presence of LTR retrotransposons capable of producing active reverse transcriptases is crucial for fly and mosquito survival. In principle, as long as sources of reverse transcriptase activity are available throughout the evolutionary history of insects, this antiviral protection system does not require co-option of a specific TE copy that would become stationary and evolve under purifying selection like a regular gene. Thus, while in conflict with their hosts because of the overall deleterious consequences of transposition, insect LTR retrotransposons may become beneficial when host individuals incur viral infections.

Even more remarkably, insect retrotransposons have recently been shown to catalyse vDNA integration into piRNA clusters of an *Aedes aegypti* cell line, leading to formation of endogenous viral elements (EVE) (132, 143). Such EVEs are co-transcribed with other TE remnants from piRNA clusters, leading to the production of anti-sense viral piRNAs that provide antiviral immunity. Thus, in addition to their role in the amplification and systemic spread of antiviral immunity, insect retrotransposons and their piRNA-mediated host surveillance system have the potential to confer transgenerational antiviral immunity to their hosts (132, 143). The finding that LTR retrotransposons may be essential to insect antiviral immunity opens new perspectives on the way we conceive insect/TE relationships. Much like other TEs such as *TBE* DNA transposons in the ciliate *Oxytricha trifallax* (136) or the telomeric non-LTR retrotransposons in *Drosophila* flies (118), and much like cellular endosymbionts such as *Wolbachia* and *Cardinium* (44, 65, 142), the position of insect LTR retrotransposons on the continuum of host/symbiont interactions may vary in unexpected ways between conflict and cooperation, depending on context (23).

## **2 – 3 Aging**

Aging is typically associated with the progressive alteration of genome regulation, notably due to the loss of repressive heterochromatin marks (145). Several studies have shown that this dysregulation is associated with an increase of TE expression in various eukaryotic organisms including yeasts (91), nematodes (30), mice (29) and human cell lines (28). Thus, it has been proposed that expression and transposition of TEs that are silenced in young individuals may strongly affect cell and genome integrity in old individuals, triggering or reinforcing aging symptoms (31, 145). A series of elegant experiments performed in *D. melanogaster* seemingly support this model. In particular, it was shown that Dicer2-mutant individuals had more DNA double-strand breaks, presumably caused by activated TEs, than controls in the nuclei of fat body cells (146). This is consistent with the known role of Dicer2 in the formation of repressive heterochromatin around repeated DNA (including TEs) via the recruitment of the Su(var)3-9 histone methyl-transferase (38, 104). Importantly, decreasing TE

activity in these Dicer2 mutants through the addition of a reverse-transcriptase inhibitor led to reduced transposition and increased lifespan. Thus, TE activity rather than the mere deterioration of chromatin structure could be directly implicated in aging in *D. melanogaster* (146). In apparent agreement, the lower lifespan of male versus female *D. melanogaster* flies has been attributed to a higher amount of heterochromatin in males, which possess a highly repeat- and heterochromatin-rich Y chromosome (16, 88).

The finding that TEs largely contribute to aging in *D. melanogaster* has recently been complemented by studies in social insects. These insects are ideal models in aging research because individuals from a given colony sharing an identical genotype show large differences in lifespan, depending on the caste they belong to. In the termite *Macrotermes bellicosus* for example, reproductive castes (kings and queens) can live for as long as 20 years whereas the lifespan of major and minor workers never exceeds a few months. Elsner et al. (36) have shown that, while overall TE and gene expression levels in heads were stable through the lifetime of kings and queens, several hundreds of TE copies were expressed at higher levels in old versus young major workers. The higher TE expression in old workers was associated with down-regulation of four genes involved in the piRNA pathway, suggesting that aging in major workers may be due to a decrease in TE suppression. Since these genes were expressed at equal levels in old and young reproductive castes, it was proposed that the longer lifespan of kings and queens evolved thanks to cooption of the piRNA pathway (36) to suppress TEs in their somatic tissues (here heads). Though interesting, this hypothesis does not explain why piRNA genes are expressed (and TEs suppressed) in heads of young major workers (85). In fact, somatic expression of the piRNA pathway has been inferred to be ancestral to all arthropods, with only few species (including *D. melanogaster*), having lost this pathway in the soma (82). Thus, rather than cooption of the piRNA pathway in heads of *M. bellicosus* reproductives, observations may be more consistent with a secondary loss of this pathway in heads of old major workers.

### **3 – Conclusions and perspectives**

Major breakthroughs in our understanding of eukaryote genome regulation and evolution have been made through the study of insect TEs. Our knowledge of TE landscapes and their impact on insect genomes and phenotypes has rapidly increased over the last ten years thanks to the availability of an increasing number of genome sequences. Current large-scale surveys of insect TE landscapes must be interpreted cautiously as TEs have been thoroughly mined only in a handful of insect genomes and new TE families are still being discovered even in the best annotated genomes (148). Yet, global trends emerge, suggesting that while TE landscapes can be highly variable both within and across

insect orders, phylogenetic relatedness generally correlates with similarity in TE content overall (84, 105, 122, 130, 148), even in cases where most extant TEs are not inherited from shared ancestors.

Vertical inheritance, horizontal transfer and the ecology/physiology of hosts are likely involved in shaping insect TE landscapes, and it will be interesting to assess their relative contribution along the insect phylogeny.

Because of their high diversity and the wide spectrum of molecular mechanisms through which they can generate evolutionary innovations (including insertion, deletion, rearrangement, dispersion of cis-regulatory elements and TE protein sequences), TEs appear to be involved in a variety of adaptive events in many insect species. Thus, insects may be good models to quantify the respective contribution of TE-mediated genomic change versus other mutations in adaptation.

The finding that retrotransposons are at the heart of antiviral response in some insects emerges as one of the most important discoveries made in invertebrate immunity in the last few years (94). Yet, the range of viruses that are targeted by TE-mediated small RNA responses in the wild remains to be defined and it is unclear to what extent retrotransposons play a role in suppressing viruses beyond *D. melanogaster* and *Aedes* mosquitoes. Whether and how retrotransposons involved in this response vary among insects is also unknown. In addition, it will be interesting to further decipher the mechanisms by which insect retrotransposons selectively recognize and reverse-transcribe viral RNAs over cellular RNAs.

Monitoring and manipulating insect TE expression in old versus young insects uncovered a likely causal role for TE activity in aging, in agreement with the retrotransposon theory of aging (31, 145). In social insects, it will be interesting to assess whether TE activity in old workers is associated with a deterioration of heterochromatin structure, as observed in *D. melanogaster*. Furthermore, a general prediction of the retrotransposon theory of aging is that individuals with higher heterochromatin loads should be shorter lived than individuals with low amounts of heterochromatin. While this hypothesis seems to hold in *D. melanogaster* (16), testing it could also take advantage of species in which B chromosomes, known to be largely heterochromatic, are present at substantial frequencies (57). More generally, these results call for a detailed evaluation of the impact of somatic transposition on insect biology.

## Figure legend

Figure 1. Proportions of DNA transposons, LTR, LINE and SINE retrotransposons in insect genomes. TEs were automatically annotated in 195 insect species (103). Because of space constraints, only one

species per clade that are  $\leq 45$  My old is shown here (to the exception of the pair *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*). The "Unclassified" category of TEs represents elements that were not classified (and categorized as "unknown") by the procedure. These exclude satellites and other repeat elements that are unlikely to be TEs. The design of the figure is inspired from figure 1 of ref. (105). The insect phylogeny on the left is that used in ref. (103). The data used to build the figure is available upon request.

## References

1. Aminetzach YT. 2005. Pesticide Resistance via Transposition-Mediated Adaptive Gene Truncation in *Drosophila*. *Science*. 309(5735):764–67
2. Attardo GM, Abd-Alla AMM, Acosta-Serrano A, Allen JE, Bateta R, et al. 2019. Comparative genomic analysis of six *Glossina* genomes, vectors of African trypanosomes. *Genome Biol.* 20(1):187
3. Barrón MG, Fiston-Lavier A-S, Petrov DA, González J. 2014. Population Genomics of Transposable Elements in *Drosophila*. *Annual Review of Genetics*. 48(1):561–81
4. Bartolome C, Bello X, Maside X. 2009. Widespread evidence for horizontal transfer of transposable elements across *Drosophila* genomes. *Genome Biol.* 10:R22
5. Bartolomé C, Maside X, Charlesworth B. 2002. On the abundance and distribution of transposable elements in the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19(6):926–37
6. Bast J, Schaefer I, Schwander T, Maraun M, Scheu S, Kraaijeveld K. 2016. No Accumulation of Transposable Elements in Asexual Arthropods. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 33(3):697–706
7. Bergman CM, Quesneville H, Anxolabéhère D, Ashburner M. 2006. Recurrent insertion and duplication generate networks of transposable element sequences in the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome. *Genome Biol.* 7(11):R112
8. Biémont C. 2010. A Brief History of the Status of Transposable Elements: From Junk DNA to Major Players in Evolution: Figure 1.—. *Genetics*. 186(4):1085–93
9. Biessmann H, Valgeirsdottir K, Lofsky A, Chin C, Ginther B, et al. 1992. HeT-A, a transposable element specifically involved in “healing” broken chromosome ends in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 12(9):3910–18
10. Blumenstiel JP, Chen X, He M, Bergman CM. 2014. An age-of-allele test of neutrality for transposable element insertions. *Genetics*. 196(2):523–38
11. Bonasio R, Zhang G, Ye C, Mutti NS, Fang X, et al. 2010. Genomic comparison of the ants *Camponotus floridanus* and *Harpegnathos saltator*. *Science*. 329(5995):1068–71

451 12. Bourgeois Y, Boissinot S. 2019. On the Population Dynamics of Junk: A Review on the Population  
452 Genomics of Transposable Elements. *Genes*. 10(6):419

453 13. Bourque G, Burns KH, Gehring M, Gorbunova V, Seluanov A, et al. 2018. Ten things you should  
454 know about transposable elements. *Genome Biology*. 19(1):

455 14. Bowen NJ, McDonald JF. 2001. Drosophila euchromatic LTR retrotransposons are much younger  
456 than the host species in which they reside. *Genome Res*. 11(9):1527–40

457 15. Brennecke J, Aravin AA, Stark A, Dus M, Kellis M, et al. 2007. Discrete small RNA-generating loci  
458 as master regulators of transposon activity in Drosophila. *Cell*. 128(6):1089–1103

459 16. Brown EJ, Nguyen AH, Bachtrog D. 2019. The Y chromosome contributes to sex-specific aging in  
460 Drosophila. *bioRxiv*

461 17. Bucheton A, Paro R, Sang HM, Pelisson A, Finnegan DJ. 1984. The molecular basis of I-R hybrid  
462 Dysgenesis in drosophila melanogaster: Identification, cloning, and properties of the I factor.  
463 *Cell*. 38(1):153–63

464 18. Chalopin D, Volff J-N, Galiana D, Anderson JL, Scharl M. 2015. Transposable elements and early  
465 evolution of sex chromosomes in fish. *Chromosome Research*. 23(3):545–60

466 19. Chang C-H, Chavan A, Palladino J, Wei X, Martins NMC, et al. 2019. Islands of retroelements are  
467 major components of Drosophila centromeres. *PLOS Biology*. 17(5):e3000241

468 20. Chen B, Zhang B, Xu L, Li Q, Jiang F, et al. 2017. Transposable Element-Mediated Balancing  
469 Selection at *Hsp90* Underlies Embryo Developmental Variation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,  
470 p. msx062

471 21. Chung H, Bogwitz MR, McCart C, Andrianopoulos A, ffrench-Constant RH, et al. 2007. Cis -  
472 Regulatory Elements in the *Accord* Retrotransposon Result in Tissue-Specific Expression of the  
473 *Drosophila melanogaster* Insecticide Resistance Gene *Cyp6g1*. *Genetics*. 175(3):1071–77

474 22. Cordaux R, Batzer MA. 2009. The impact of retrotransposons on human genome evolution. *Nat*  
475 *Rev Genet*. 10:691–703

476 23. Cosby RL, Chang N-C, Feschotte C. 2019. Host-transposon interactions: conflict, cooperation, and  
477 cooption. *Genes Dev*. 33(17–18):1098–1116

478 24. Craig, Chandler, Gellert, Lambowitz, Rice, Sandmeyer, eds. 2015. *Mobile DNA III*. American  
479 Society of Microbiology

480 25. Cridland JM, Macdonald SJ, Long AD, Thornton KR. 2013. Abundance and Distribution of  
481 Transposable Elements in Two Drosophila QTL Mapping Resources. *Molecular Biology and*  
482 *Evolution*. 30(10):2311–27

483 26. Daborn PJ, Yen JL, Bogwitz MR, Le Goff G, Feil E, et al. 2002. A single p450 allele associated with  
484 insecticide resistance in Drosophila. *Science*. 297(5590):2253–56



- 485 27. Daniels SB, Peterson KR, Strausbaugh LD, Kidwell MG, Chovnick A. 1990. Evidence for horizontal  
486 transmission of the P transposable element between *Drosophila* species. *Genetics*. 124:339–55
- 487 28. De Cecco M, Criscione SW, Peckham EJ, Hillenmeyer S, Hamm EA, et al. 2013. Genomes of  
488 replicatively senescent cells undergo global epigenetic changes leading to gene silencing and  
489 activation of transposable elements. *Aging Cell*. 12(2):247–56
- 490 29. De Cecco M, Criscione SW, Peterson AL, Neretti N, Sedivy JM, Kreiling JA. 2013. Transposable  
491 elements become active and mobile in the genomes of aging mammalian somatic tissues. *Aging*  
492 (*Albany NY*). 5(12):867–83
- 493 30. Dennis S, Sheth U, Feldman JL, English KA, Priess JR. 2012. *C. elegans* Germ Cells Show  
494 Temperature and Age-Dependent Expression of Cer1, a Gypsy/Ty3-Related Retrotransposon.  
495 *PLoS Pathogens*. 8(3):e1002591
- 496 31. Driver CJ, McKechnie SW. 1992. Transposable elements as a factor in the aging of *Drosophila*  
497 *melanogaster*. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 673:83–91
- 498 32. *Drosophila* 12 Genomes Consortium, Clark AG, Eisen MB, Smith DR, Bergman CM, et al. 2007.  
499 Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny. *Nature*. 450(7167):203–18
- 500 33. Eickbush T. 2002. Fruit flies and humans respond differently to retrotransposons. *Current*  
501 *Opinion in Genetics & Development*. 12(6):669–74
- 502 34. Ellison CE, Bachtrog D. 2013. Dosage Compensation via Transposable Element Mediated  
503 Rewiring of a Regulatory Network. *Science*. 342(6160):846–50
- 504 35. Ellison CE, Bachtrog D. 2015. Non-allelic gene conversion enables rapid evolutionary change at  
505 multiple regulatory sites encoded by transposable elements. *eLife*. 4:
- 506 36. Elsner D, Meusemann K, Korb J. 2018. Longevity and transposon defense, the case of termite  
507 reproductives. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 115(21):5504–9
- 508 37. Fabrick JA, Mathew LG, Tabashnik BE, Li X. 2011. Insertion of an intact CR1 retrotransposon in a  
509 cadherin gene linked with Bt resistance in the pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella*: CR1  
510 retrotransposon and Bt resistance. *Insect Molecular Biology*. 20(5):651–65
- 511 38. Fagegaltier D, Bougé A-L, Berry B, Poisot É, Sismeiro O, et al. 2009. The endogenous siRNA  
512 pathway is involved in heterochromatin formation in *Drosophila*. *Proceedings of the National*  
513 *Academy of Sciences*. 106(50):21258–63
- 514 39. Feschotte C, Pritham EJ. 2007. DNA transposons and the evolution of eukaryotic genomes. *Annu*  
515 *Rev Genet*. 41:331–68
- 516 40. Fonseca PM, Moura RD, Wallau GL, Loreto ELS. 2019. The mobilome of *Drosophila incompta*, a  
517 flower-breeding species: comparison of transposable element landscapes among generalist and  
518 specialist flies. *Chromosome Res*. 27(3):203–19

41. Fraser MJ, Smith GE, Summers MD. 1983. Acquisition of Host Cell DNA Sequences by Baculoviruses: Relationship Between Host DNA Insertions and FP Mutants of *Autographa californica* and *Galleria mellonella* Nuclear Polyhedrosis Viruses. *Journal of Virology*. 47:287–300
42. Gadau J, Helmkampf M, Nygaard S, Roux J, Simola DF, et al. 2012. The genomic impact of 100 million years of social evolution in seven ant species. *Trends Genet*. 28(1):14–21
43. Gahan LJ, Gould F, Heckel DG. 2001. Identification of a gene associated with Bt resistance in *Heliothis virescens*. *Science*. 293(5531):857–60
44. Gavotte L, Mercer DR, Stoeckle JJ, Dobson SL. 2010. Costs and benefits of *Wolbachia* infection in immature *Aedes albopictus* depend upon sex and competition level. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*. 105(3):341–46
45. Gilbert C, Feschotte C. 2018. Horizontal acquisition of transposable elements and viral sequences: patterns and consequences. *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development*. 49:15–24
46. Gilbert C, Peccoud J, Chateigner A, Moumen B, Cordaux R, Herniou EA. 2016. Continuous Influx of Genetic Material from Host to Virus Populations. *PLoS Genetics*. 12:e1005838
47. Gilbert C, Schaack S, Pace JK, Brindley PJ, Feschotte C. 2010. A role for host-parasite interactions in the horizontal transfer of transposons across phyla. *Nature*. 464:1347–50
48. Goic B, Stapleford KA, Frangeul L, Doucet AJ, Gausson V, et al. 2016. Virus-derived DNA drives mosquito vector tolerance to arboviral infection. *Nat Commun*. 7:12410
49. Goic B, Vodovar N, Mondotte JA, Monot C, Frangeul L, et al. 2013. RNA-mediated interference and reverse transcription control the persistence of RNA viruses in the insect model *Drosophila*. *Nature Immunology*. 14:396–403
50. González J, Karasov TL, Messer PW, Petrov DA. 2010. Genome-Wide Patterns of Adaptation to Temperate Environments Associated with Transposable Elements in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Genetics*. 6(4):e1000905
51. González J, Lenkov K, Lipatov M, Macpherson JM, Petrov DA. 2008. High Rate of Recent Transposable Element–Induced Adaptation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS Biology*. 6(10):e251
52. Gonzalez J, Macpherson JM, Petrov DA. 2009. A Recent Adaptive Transposable Element Insertion Near Highly Conserved Developmental Loci in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 26(9):1949–61
53. Goubert C, Henri H, Minard G, Valiente Moro C, Mavingui P, et al. 2017. High-throughput sequencing of transposable element insertions suggests adaptive evolution of the invasive Asian tiger mosquito towards temperate environments. *Molecular Ecology*. 26(15):3968–81
54. Guio L, Barrón MG, González J. 2014. The transposable element *Bari-Jheh* mediates oxidative stress response in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Ecology*. 23(8):2020–30

553 55. Han M-J, Zhou Q-Z, Zhang H-H, Tong X, Lu C, et al. 2016. iMITEdb: the genome-wide landscape of  
554 miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements in insects. *Database*. 2016:baw148

555 56. Handler AM, McCombs SD, Fraser MJ, Saul SH. 1998. The lepidopteran transposon vector,  
556 piggyBac, mediates germ-line transformation in the Mediterranean fruit fly. *Proceedings of the*  
557 *National Academy of Sciences*. 95(13):7520–25

558 57. Hanlon S, Hawley R. 2018. B Chromosomes in the *Drosophila* Genus. *Genes*. 9(10):470

559 58. Harrison MC, Jongepier E, Robertson HM, Arning N, Bitard-Feildel T, et al. 2018. Hemimetabolous  
560 genomes reveal molecular basis of termite eusociality. *Nat Ecol Evol*. 2(3):557–66

561 59. Himber C, Dunoyer P, Moissiard G, Ritzenthaler C, Voinnet O. 2003. Transitivity-dependent and -  
562 independent cell-to-cell movement of RNA silencing. *EMBO J*. 22(17):4523–33

563 60. Hof AE van't, Campagne P, Rigden DJ, Yung CJ, Lingley J, et al. 2016. The industrial melanism  
564 mutation in British peppered moths is a transposable element. *Nature*. 534(7605):102–5

565 61. Holt RA, Subramanian GM, Halpern A, Sutton GG, Charlab R, et al. 2002. The genome sequence  
566 of the malaria mosquito *Anopheles gambiae*. *Science*. 298(5591):129–49

567 62. Honeybee Genome Sequencing Consortium. 2006. Insights into social insects from the genome  
568 of the honeybee *Apis mellifera*. *Nature*. 443(7114):931–49

569 63. Hua-Van A, Le Rouzic A, Boutin TS, Filee J, Capi P. 2011. The struggle for life of the genome's  
570 selfish architects. *Biol Direct*. 6:19

571 64. International Aphid Genomics Consortium. 2010. Genome sequence of the pea aphid  
572 *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *PLoS Biol*. 8(2):e1000313

573 65. Joshi D, McFadden MJ, Bevins D, Zhang F, Xi Z. 2014. Wolbachia strain wAlbB confers both fitness  
574 costs and benefit on *Anopheles stephensi*. *Parasites & Vectors*. 7(1):336

575 66. Kaminker JS, Bergman CM, Kronmiller B, Carlson J, Svirskas R, et al. 2002. The transposable  
576 elements of the *Drosophila melanogaster* euchromatin: a genomics perspective. *Genome Biol*.  
577 3(12):research0084.1

578 67. Kanost MR, Arrese EL, Cao X, Chen YR, Chellapilla S, et al. 2016. Multifaceted biological insights  
579 from a draft genome sequence of the tobacco hornworm moth, *Manduca sexta*. *Insect Biochem*  
580 *Mol Biol*. 76:118–47

581 68. Kapheim KM, Pan H, Li C, Salzberg SL, Puiu D, et al. 2015. Social evolution. Genomic signatures of  
582 evolutionary transitions from solitary to group living. *Science*. 348(6239):1139–43

583 69. Kapitonov VV, Jurka J. 2003. Molecular paleontology of transposable elements in the *Drosophila*  
584 *melanogaster* genome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 100(11):6569–74

585 70. Kelleher ES. 2016. Reexamining the *P*-Element Invasion of *Drosophila melanogaster* Through the  
586 Lens of piRNA Silencing. *Genetics*. 203(4):1513–31

- 587 71. Kelley JL, Peyton JT, Fiston-Lavier A-S, Teets NM, Yee M-C, et al. 2014. Compact genome of the  
588 Antarctic midge is likely an adaptation to an extreme environment. *Nat Commun.* 5:4611
- 589 72. Kidwell MG, Kidwell JF. 1975. Cytoplasm–chromosome interactions in *Drosophila melanogaster*.  
590 *Nature.* 253(5494):755–56
- 591 73. Kofler R. 2019. Dynamics of Transposable Element Invasions with piRNA Clusters. *Molecular*  
592 *Biology and Evolution.* 36(7):1457–72
- 593 74. Kofler R, Betancourt AJ, Schlötterer C. 2012. Sequencing of Pooled DNA Samples (Pool-Seq)  
594 Uncovers Complex Dynamics of Transposable Element Insertions in *Drosophila melanogaster*.  
595 *PLoS Genetics.* 8(1):e1002487
- 596 75. Kofler R, Nolte V, Schlötterer C. 2015. Tempo and Mode of Transposable Element Activity in  
597 *Drosophila*. *PLOS Genetics.* 11(7):e1005406
- 598 76. Korb J, Poulsen M, Hu H, Li C, Boomsma JJ, et al. 2015. A genomic comparison of two termites  
599 with different social complexity. *Frontiers in Genetics.* 6:
- 600 77. Kraaijeveld K, Zwanenburg B, Hubert B, Vieira C, De Pater S, et al. 2012. Transposon proliferation  
601 in an asexual parasitoid. *Mol. Ecol.* 21(16):3898–3906
- 602 78. Kuraku S, Qiu H, Meyer A. 2012. Horizontal transfers of Tc1 elements between teleost fishes and  
603 their vertebrate parasites, lampreys. *Genome Biol Evol.* 4:929–36
- 604 79. Le Rouzic A, Dupas S, Capy P. 2007. Genome ecosystem and transposable elements species.  
605 *Gene.* 390(1–2):214–20
- 606 80. Lerat E, Goubert C, Guirao-Rico S, Merenciano M, Dufour A, et al. 2019. Population-specific  
607 dynamics and selection patterns of transposable element insertions in European natural  
608 populations. *Molecular Ecology.* 28(6):1506–22
- 609 81. Lerman DN, Feder ME. 2005. Naturally occurring transposable elements disrupt hsp70 promoter  
610 function in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 22(3):776–83
- 611 82. Lewis SH, Quarles KA, Yang Y, Tanguy M, Frézal L, et al. 2018. Pan-arthropod analysis reveals  
612 somatic piRNAs as an ancestral defence against transposable elements. *Nature Ecology &*  
613 *Evolution.* 2(1):174–81
- 614 83. Linheiro RS, Bergman CM. 2012. Whole Genome Resequencing Reveals Natural Target Site  
615 Preferences of Transposable Elements in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS ONE.* 7(2):e30008
- 616 84. Lower SS, Johnston JS, Stanger-Hall KF, Hjelman CE, Hanrahan SJ, et al. 2017. Genome Size in  
617 North American Fireflies: Substantial Variation Likely Driven by Neutral Processes. *Genome*  
618 *Biology and Evolution.* 9(6):1499–1512
- 619 85. Lucas ER, Keller L. 2018. New explanation for the longevity of social insect reproductives:  
620 Transposable element activity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 115(21):5317–18

621 86. Magwire MM, Bayer F, Webster CL, Cao C, Jiggins FM. 2011. Successive Increases in the  
622 Resistance of *Drosophila* to Viral Infection through a Transposon Insertion Followed by a  
623 Duplication. *PLoS Genetics*. 7(10):e1002337

624 87. Majumdar S, Rio DC. 2015. P Transposable Elements in *Drosophila* and other Eukaryotic  
625 Organisms. *Microbiol Spectr*. 3(2):MDNA3-0004–2014

626 88. Marais GAB, Gaillard J-M, Vieira C, Plotton I, Sanlaville D, et al. 2018. Sex gap in aging and  
627 longevity: can sex chromosomes play a role? *Biol Sex Differ*. 9(1):33

628 89. Mateo L, Ullastres A, González J. 2014. A Transposable Element Insertion Confers Xenobiotic  
629 Resistance in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Genetics*. 10(8):e1004560

630 90. Maumus F, Fiston-Lavier AS, Quesneville H. 2015. Impact of transposable elements on insect  
631 genomes and biology. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*. 7:30–36

632 91. Maxwell PH, Burhans WC, Curcio MJ. 2011. Retrotransposition is associated with genome  
633 instability during chronological aging. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.  
634 108(51):20376–81

635 92. McClintock B. 1950. The origin and behavior of mutable loci in maize. *Proceedings of the*  
636 *National Academy of Sciences*. 36(6):344–55

637 93. Merenciano M, Ullastres A, de Cara MAR, Barrón MG, González J. 2016. Multiple Independent  
638 Retroelement Insertions in the Promoter of a Stress Response Gene Have Variable Molecular and  
639 Functional Effects in *Drosophila*. *PLOS Genetics*. 12(8):e1006249

640 94. Miesen P, Joosten J, van Rij RP. 2016. PIWIs Go Viral: Arbovirus-Derived piRNAs in Vector  
641 Mosquitoes. *PLOS Pathogens*. 12(12):e1006017

642 95. Miller WJ, McDonald JF, Nouaud D, Anxolabéhère D. 1999. Molecular domestication--more than  
643 a sporadic episode in evolution. *Genetica*. 107(1–3):197–207

644 96. Neafsey DE, Waterhouse RM, Abai MR, Aganezov SS, Alekseyev MA, et al. 2015. Mosquito  
645 genomics. Highly evolvable malaria vectors: the genomes of 16 *Anopheles* mosquitoes. *Science*.  
646 347(6217):1258522

647 97. Nene V, Wortman JR, Lawson D, Haas B, Kodira C, et al. 2007. Genome sequence of *Aedes*  
648 *aegypti*, a major arbovirus vector. *Science*. 316(5832):1718–23

649 98. Oliver KR, Greene WK. 2012. Transposable elements and viruses as factors in adaptation and  
650 evolution: an expansion and strengthening of the TE-Thrust hypothesis. *Ecology and Evolution*.  
651 2(11):2912–33

652 99. Ortiz MF, Wallau GL, Graichen DA, Loreto EL. 2015. An evaluation of the ecological relationship  
653 between *Drosophila* species and their parasitoid wasps as an opportunity for horizontal  
654 transposon transfer. *Molecular Genetics and Genomics*. 290:67–78

100. Osanai-Futahashi M, Suetsugu Y, Mita K, Fujiwara H. 2008. Genome-wide screening and characterization of transposable elements and their distribution analysis in the silkworm, *Bombyx mori*. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 38(12):1046–57
101. Pardue M-L, DeBaryshe PG. 2011. Retrotransposons that maintain chromosome ends. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108(51):20317–24
102. Paricio N, Pèrez-Alonso M, Martínez-Sebastián maria J, de Frutos R. 1991. P sequences of *Drosophilla Subobscura* lack exon 3 and may encode a 66 kd repressor-like protein. *Nucleic Acids Research.* 19(24):6713–18
103. Peccoud J, Loiseau V, Cordaux R, Gilbert C. 2017. Massive horizontal transfer of transposable elements in insects. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 114(18):4721–26
104. Peng JC, Karpen GH. 2007. H3K9 methylation and RNA interference regulate nucleolar organization and repeated DNA stability. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 9(1):25–35
105. Petersen M, Armisén D, Gibbs RA, Hering L, Khila A, et al. 2019. Diversity and evolution of the transposable element repertoire in arthropods with particular reference to insects. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 19(1):11
106. Petrov DA, Fiston-Lavier A-S, Lipatov M, Lenkov K, Gonzalez J. 2011. Population Genomics of Transposable Elements in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution.* 28(5):1633–44
107. Poirier EZ, Goic B, Tomé-Poderti L, Frangeul L, Boussier J, et al. 2018. Dicer-2-Dependent Generation of Viral DNA from Defective Genomes of RNA Viruses Modulates Antiviral Immunity in Insects. *Cell Host & Microbe.* 23(3):353-365.e8
108. Quesneville H, Nouaud D, Anxolabehere D. 2005. Recurrent Recruitment of the THAP DNA-Binding Domain and Molecular Domestication of the P-Transposable Element. *Molecular Biology and Evolution.* 22(3):741–46
109. Rahman R, Chirn G, Kanodia A, Sytnikova YA, Brembs B, et al. 2015. Unique transposon landscapes are pervasive across *Drosophila melanogaster* genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research.* 43(22):10655–72
110. Ray DA, Grimshaw JR, Halsey MK, Korstian JM, Osmanski AB, et al. 2019. Simultaneous TE Analysis of 19 Heliconiine Butterflies Yields Novel Insights into Rapid TE-Based Genome Diversification and Multiple SINE Births and Deaths. *Genome Biol Evol.* 11(8):2162–77
111. Rech GE, Bogaerts-Márquez M, Barrón MG, Merenciano M, Villanueva-Cañas JL, et al. 2019. Stress response, behavior, and development are shaped by transposable element-induced mutations in *Drosophila*. *PLOS Genetics.* 15(2):e1007900

112. Reiss D, Mialdea G, Miele V, de Vienne DM, Peccoud J, et al. 2019. Global survey of mobile DNA horizontal transfer in arthropods reveals Lepidoptera as a prime hotspot. *PLOS Genetics*. 15(2):e1007965
113. Remnant EJ, Good RT, Schmidt JM, Lumb C, Robin C, et al. 2013. Gene duplication in the major insecticide target site, *Rdl*, in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 110(36):14705–10
114. Rius N, Guillen Y, Delprat A, Kapusta A, Feschotte C, Ruiz A. 2016. Exploration of the *Drosophila buzzatii* transposable element content suggests underestimation of repeats in *Drosophila* genomes. *BMC Genomics*. 17:344
115. Robillard É, Le Rouzic A, Zhang Z, Capy P, Hua-Van A. 2016. Experimental evolution reveals hyperparasitic interactions among transposable elements. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 113(51):14763–68
116. Rostant WG, Wedell N, Hosken DJ. 2012. Transposable Elements and Insecticide Resistance. In *Advances in Genetics*. 78:169–201. Elsevier
117. Sadd BM, Barribeau SM, Bloch G, de Graaf DC, Dearden P, et al. 2015. The genomes of two key bumblebee species with primitive eusocial organization. *Genome Biol*. 16:76
118. Saint-Leandre B, Nguyen SC, Levine MT. 2019. Diversification and collapse of a telomere elongation mechanism. *Genome Res*. 29(6):920–31
119. Schaack S, Pritham EJ, Wolf A, Lynch M. 2010. DNA transposon dynamics in populations of *Daphnia pulex* with and without sex. *Proc. Biol. Sci*. 277(1692):2381–87
120. Schmidt JM, Good RT, Appleton B, Sherrard J, Raymant GC, et al. 2010. Copy Number Variation and Transposable Elements Feature in Recent, Ongoing Adaptation at the *Cyp6g1* Locus. *PLoS Genetics*. 6(6):e1000998
121. Schrader L, Kim JW, Ence D, Zimin A, Klein A, et al. 2014. Transposable element islands facilitate adaptation to novel environments in an invasive species. *Nature Communications*. 5(1):
122. Sessegolo C, Burlet N, Haudry A. 2016. Strong phylogenetic inertia on genome size and transposable element content among 26 species of flies. *Biology Letters*. 12(8):20160407
123. Siguier P, Gourbeyre E, Chandler M. 2014. Bacterial insertion sequences: their genomic impact and diversity. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*. 38(5):865–91
124. Sijen T, Fleenor J, Simmer F, Thijssen KL, Parrish S, et al. 2001. On the Role of RNA Amplification in dsRNA-Triggered Gene Silencing. *Cell*. 107(4):465–76
125. Spradling A, Rubin G. 1982. Transposition of cloned P elements into *Drosophila* germ line chromosomes. *Science*. 218(4570):341–47
126. Stapley J, Santure AW, Dennis SR. 2015. Transposable elements as agents of rapid adaptation may explain the genetic paradox of invasive species. *Molecular Ecology*. 24(9):2241–52

127. Suen G, Teiling C, Li L, Holt C, Abouheif E, et al. 2011. The genome sequence of the leaf-cutter ant *Atta cephalotes* reveals insights into its obligate symbiotic lifestyle. *PLoS Genet.* 7(2):e1002007
128. Suh A, Witt CC, Menger J, Sadanandan KR, Podsiadlowski L, et al. 2016. Ancient horizontal transfers of retrotransposons between birds and ancestors of human pathogenic nematodes. *Nat Commun.* 7:11396
129. Szitenberg A, Cha S, Opperman CH, Bird DM, Blaxter ML, Lunt DH. 2016. Genetic Drift, Not Life History or RNAi, Determine Long-Term Evolution of Transposable Elements. *Genome Biol Evol.* 8(9):2964–78
130. Talla V, Suh A, Kalsoom F, Dincă V, Vila R, et al. 2017. Rapid Increase in Genome Size as a Consequence of Transposable Element Hyperactivity in Wood-White (Leptidea) Butterflies. *Genome Biology and Evolution.* 9(10):2491–2505
131. Tassetto M, Kunitomi M, Andino R. 2017. Circulating Immune Cells Mediate a Systemic RNAi-Based Adaptive Antiviral Response in *Drosophila*. *Cell.* 169(2):314-325.e13
132. Tassetto M, Kunitomi M, Whitfield ZJ, Dolan PT, Sánchez-Vargas I, et al. 2019. Control of RNA viruses in mosquito cells through the acquisition of vDNA and endogenous viral elements. *eLife.* 8:
133. Ullastres A, Petit N, González J. 2015. Exploring the Phenotypic Space and the Evolutionary History of a Natural Mutation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution.* 32(7):1800–1814
134. van Rij RP, Saleh M-C, Berry B, Foo C, Houk A, et al. 2006. The RNA silencing endonuclease Argonaute 2 mediates specific antiviral immunity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genes & Development.* 20(21):2985–95
135. Venner S, Miele V, Terzian C, Biémont C, Daubin V, et al. 2017. Ecological networks to unravel the routes to horizontal transposon transfers. *PLOS Biology.* 15(2):e2001536
136. Vogt A, Goldman AD, Mochizuki K, Landweber LF. 2013. Transposon domestication versus mutualism in ciliate genome rearrangements. *PLoS Genet.* 9(8):e1003659
137. Walsh AM, Kortschak RD, Gardner MG, Bertozzi T, Adelson DL. 2013. Widespread horizontal transfer of retrotransposons. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110(3):1012–16
138. Wang L, Wang J, Ma Y, Wan P, Liu K, et al. 2019. Transposon insertion causes cadherin missplicing and confers resistance to Bt cotton in pink bollworm from China. *Scientific Reports.* 9(1):
139. Wang S, Lorenzen MD, Beeman RW, Brown SJ. 2008. Analysis of repetitive DNA distribution patterns in the *Tribolium castaneum* genome. *Genome Biol.* 9(3):R61
140. Wang X, Fang X, Yang P, Jiang X, Jiang F, et al. 2014. The locust genome provides insight into swarm formation and long-distance flight. *Nat Commun.* 5:2957



141. Wang X, Liu X. 2016. Close ecological relationship among species facilitated horizontal transfer of retrotransposons. *BMC Evol Biol.* 16:201
142. White JA, Kelly SE, Cockburn SN, Perlman SJ, Hunter MS. 2011. Endosymbiont costs and benefits in a parasitoid infected with both *Wolbachia* and *Cardinium*. *Heredity.* 106(4):585–91
143. Whitfield ZJ, Dolan PT, Kunitomi M, Tassetto M, Seetin MG, et al. 2017. The Diversity, Structure, and Function of Heritable Adaptive Immunity Sequences in the *Aedes aegypti* Genome. *Current Biology.* 27(22):3511-3519.e7
144. Wicker T, Sabot F, Hua-Van A, Bennetzen JL, Capy P, et al. 2007. A unified classification system for eukaryotic transposable elements. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 8(12):973–82
145. Wood JG, Helfand SL. 2013. Chromatin structure and transposable elements in organismal aging. *Front Genet.* 4:274
146. Wood JG, Jones BC, Jiang N, Chang C, Hosier S, et al. 2016. Chromatin-modifying genetic interventions suppress age-associated transposable element activation and extend life span in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 113(40):11277–82
147. Woronik A, Tunström K, Perry MW, Neethiraj R, Stefanescu C, et al. 2019. A transposable element insertion is associated with an alternative life history strategy. *Nature Communications.* 10(1):
148. Wu C, Lu J. 2019. Diversification of Transposable Elements in Arthropods and Its Impact on Genome Evolution. *Genes (Basel).* 10(5):
149. Xiao J-H, Yue Z, Jia L-Y, Yang X-H, Niu L-H, et al. 2013. Obligate mutualism within a host drives the extreme specialization of a fig wasp genome. *Genome Biol.* 14(12):R141
150. Zanni V, Eymery A, Coiffet M, Zytnicki M, Luyten I, et al. 2013. Distribution, evolution, and diversity of retrotransposons at the flamenco locus reflect the regulatory properties of piRNA clusters. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110(49):19842–47

