



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Sex-specific transcription and DNA methylation landscapes of the Asian citrus psyllid, a vector of huanglongbing pathogens

Citation for published version:

Yu, X, Marshall, H, Liu, Y, Xiong, Y, Zeng, X, Yu, H, Chen, W, Zhou, G, Zhu, B, Ross, L & Lu, Z 2023, 'Sex-specific transcription and DNA methylation landscapes of the Asian citrus psyllid, a vector of huanglongbing pathogens', *Evolution*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/evolut/qpad036>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1093/evolut/qpad036](https://doi.org/10.1093/evolut/qpad036)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Evolution

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Sex-specific transcription and DNA methylation landscapes of the Asian citrus psyllid, a vector of huanglongbing pathogens

Xiudao Yu¹, Hollie Marshall^{2,3} , Yan Liu¹, Yu Xiong¹, Xiangdong Zeng¹, Haizhong Yu¹, Wei Chen¹, Guchun Zhou¹, Bo Zhu¹, Laura Ross³, Zhanjun Lu¹

¹Ganzhou Key Laboratory of Nanling Insect Biology/Ganzhou Key Laboratory of Greenhouse Vegetables/National Navel Orange Engineering Research Center, College of Life Sciences, Gannan Normal University, Jiangxi, China

²The Department of Genetics and Genome Biology, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom

³The Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Corresponding authors: Ganzhou Key Laboratory of Nanling Insect Biology/Ganzhou Key Laboratory of Greenhouse Vegetables/National Navel Orange Engineering Research Center, College of Life Sciences, Gannan Normal University, Jiangxi, China. Email: yuxiudao@163.com; The Department of Genetics and Genome Biology, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom. Email: hollie_marshall@hotmail.co.uk
X.Y. and H.M. contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

The relationship of DNA methylation and sex-biased gene expression is of high interest, it allows research into mechanisms of sexual dimorphism and the development of potential novel strategies for insect pest control. The Asian citrus psyllid, *Diaphorina citri* Kuwayama, is a major vector for the causative agents of Huanglongbing (HLB), which presents an unparalleled challenge to citrus production worldwide. Here, we identify the X chromosome of *D. citri* and investigate differences in the transcription and DNA methylation landscapes between adult virgin males and females. We find a large number of male-biased genes on the autosomes and a depletion of such on the X chromosome. We have also characterized the methylome of *D. citri*, finding low genome-wide levels, which is unusual for an hemipteran species, as well as evidence for both promoter and TE methylation. Overall, DNA methylation profiles are similar between the sexes but with a small number of differentially methylated genes found to be involved in sex differentiation. There also appears to be no direct relationship between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression. Our findings lay the groundwork for the development of novel epigenetic-based pest control methods, and given the similarity of the *D. citri* methylome to some other insect species, these methods could be applicable across agricultural insect pests.

Keywords: *Diaphorina citri*, sexual dimorphism, X chromosome, DNA methylation, sex-biased expression, transposable elements

Sexual dimorphisms in behavior, morphology, and physiology are widespread across sexually reproducing organisms, oftentimes producing dramatic phenotypic differences between sexes. Sexual dimorphisms between males and females have been associated with a number of genomic processes across taxa such as genetic differences, e.g., sex chromosomes (Mank, 2009), alternative splicing (Wexler et al., 2019), genomic imprinting (Zou et al., 2020), and epigenetic mechanisms (Bain et al., 2021). These mechanisms result in sex-biased gene expression, which is generally thought to underlie most sex-specific differentiation (Ledón-Rettig et al., 2017).

DNA methylation of cytosines, one of the most studied and conserved epigenetic modifications, is an important mechanism for regulating patterns of gene expression in some species, yet its role in shaping sex-specific expression in insects remains unclear. However, recently, it has been shown to be important in sexual dimorphism in some hemipteran insects (Bain et al., 2021; Mathers et al., 2019). This finding was surprising given that in comparison with mammals and plants, insect genomes have sparse methylation mainly restricted to exons of transcribed genes (although see Lewis et al. (2020)), with typically

less than 3% of cytosines methylated (Glastad et al., 2019). Some holometabolous insects are even reported to have no detectable levels of DNA methylation—e.g., the coleopteran *Tribolium castaneum* and dipteran *Drosophila* (Bewick et al., 2017; Zemach & Zilberman, 2010). DNA methylation in arthropods is preferentially targeted to genes that perform core and conserved “housekeeping” functions (Bewick et al., 2017; Glastad et al., 2019), with DNA methylation thought to stabilize their expression. Therefore, it was thought to be unlikely that it could play a role in more targeted gene regulation such as sex-specific expression. However, more recently, it has become clear that the distribution and function of DNA methylation varies between taxa. While in holometabolous insects, it is largely confined within coding regions (Bewick et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2020), hemimetabolous insects have a relatively higher and more global DNA methylation system, in which DNA methylation extends to the introns of some species (Falckenhayn et al., 2013; Lo et al., 2018) and in some cases even to transposable elements (TEs) and gene promoters (Bain et al., 2021; Lewis et al., 2020). Even more remarkably, for a process that is so evolutionarily conserved, there can be

Received June 1, 2022; revisions received February 2, 2023; accepted February 21, 2023

© The Author(s) 2023. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of The Society for the Study of Evolution (SSE).

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

substantial diversity within insect orders. It is therefore clear that in order to understand the evolution and role of DNA methylation in regulating insect sex-specific gene expression we need to broaden our taxonomic sampling.

Here, we provide such analysis in the Asian citrus psyllid, *Diaphorina citri* Kuwayama. This species is an emerging citrus pest with large economic impact. It transmits *Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus* (CLAs) pathogen, which causes citrus huanglongbing disease in most citrus-producing regions of the world (Grafton-Cardwell et al., 2013; Yu & Killiny, 2020). We identify genome-wide differences in DNA methylation between male and female *D. citri*, including the relationship of DNA methylation with gene expression and the DNA methylation differences in the sex chromosomes. We hypothesize that if DNA methylation does play a causal role in regulating sex-specific gene expression then we will identify the same genes showing differential DNA methylation and differential expression between the sexes. Additionally, we would expect these common genes to be enriched for processes related to sex differences, e.g., reproduction. In order to test this, we performed investigations as follows: (a) an identification of the X chromosome; (b) a study of the sex-specific DNA methylation landscape; (c) an analysis of sex-biased gene expression and DNA methylation; and (d) a genome-wide comparison between DNA methylation and gene expression.

Methods

Insect rearing

A *D. citri* colony was continuously reared at the National Navel Orange Engineering Research Center, Gannan Normal University, Jiangxi, China. The culture was established in 2015 using field populations from Nankang District, Jiangxi and maintained on *Murraya exotica* seedlings in a greenhouse set at 27°C ± 1°C and relative humidity of 70% ± 5% with a 14:10 hr light:dark photoperiod. Newly emerged adults were collected for sex separation under a stereomicroscope, and then kept in separated cages with new *M. exotica* seedlings.

RNA and DNA extraction and sequencing

Groups of twenty 3-day virgin females or males for DNA/RNA extraction were collected between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. every day to avoid differences due to the circadian rhythm (Pegoraro et al., 2016). RNA extraction was performed using an RNeasy Kit (QIAGEN, Valencia, CA, USA), and genomic DNA was extracted using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (QIAGEN), according to the manufacturer's instructions. RNA/DNA degradation and contamination was validated on 1% agarose gels. The concentration was measured using the Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA, USA). An amount of 100 ng genomic DNA (for whole-genome sequencing—WGS) or 100 ng genomic DNA spiked with 0.5 ng lambda DNA (for whole-genome bisulfite sequencing—WGBS) were fragmented by sonication to 200–300 bp with Covaris S220 (Covaris, Inc., Woburn, MA, USA). For WGBS, the fragmented DNA samples were treated with bisulfite using EZ DNA Methylation-GoldTM Kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA, USA). For RNA-seq, a total of 3.0 µg RNA per sample was used to prepare the sequencing libraries using the NEBNext UltraTM RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina (NEB, Ipswich, MA, USA). All above libraries

were constructed and sequenced by Novogene Corporation (Beijing, China). 150 bp paired-end sequencing of each sample was performed on an Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA). Library quality was assessed on the Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 system (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, US).

X chromosome identification

Whole-genome sequencing of a pool of males and a pool of females was used to identify the X chromosome. Data were quality checked using Fastqc v0.11.8 (Andrews, 2010) and aligned to the reference genome (Diaci v3.0, Hosmani et al. (2019)) using Bowtie2 v2.3.5.1 (Langmead & Salzberg, 2013) in *–sensitive* mode. Coverage per chromosome was then calculated using samtools v.1.9 (Li et al., 2009). Coverage levels were normalized by chromosome length and mean coverage per sample and the log2 ratio of male to female coverage was plotted using R v4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020). We also repeated the above analysis using 10,000 bp windows across each chromosome to check for any incorrectly assembled X-linked regions.

To provide further evidence for the identification of the X chromosome, we carried out a synteny analysis between *D. citri* and the psyllid *Pachypsylla venusta* (genome: Pven_dove-tail (Li et al., 2020)). The protein sequences of single copy genes from *D. citri* were blasted against those from *P. venusta* using blastp v2.2.31 (Camacho et al., 2009) with an e-value of 1e⁻¹⁰. MCScanX (Wang et al., 2012) was then used to identify collinearity blocks across genomes using the interspecies setting and requiring a minimum of 10 genes per block. Results were visualized using Synvisio (Bandi & Gutwin, 2020).

Differential gene expression

RNA-seq was carried out on pools of males and females with three replicates per sex. Data were quality checked using Fastqc v0.11.8 (Andrews, 2010) and quality trimmed using CutAdapt v1.18 (Martin, 2011). Reads were aligned to the reference genome (Diaci v3.0 (Hosmani et al., 2019)) and transcript abundances were calculated using RSEM v1.3.3 (Li & Dewey, 2011) implementing STAR v2.7.3a (Dobin et al., 2013). DESeq2 v1.28.1 (Love et al., 2014) was used to determine differentially expressed genes between males and females. A gene was considered differentially expressed if the corrected *p*-value was <.05 (adjusted for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995)) and the log2 fold-change was >1.5. Chromosome enrichment of sex-biased genes was determined using the hypergeometric test implemented in R v4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020).

Genome-wide DNA methylation and differential DNA methylation

Whole-genome bisulfite sequencing data were quality checked using Fastqc v0.11.8 (Andrews, 2010) and reads were aligned to the reference genome (Diaci v3.0 (Hosmani et al., 2019)) using Bismark v0.20.0 (Krueger & Andrews, 2011). Reads were also aligned to the *E. coli* phage lambda reference (NCBI Accession: PRJNA485481) in order to determine the bisulfite conversion efficiency. Weighted methylation levels of genomic features were calculated as in Schultz et al. (2012).

Differentially methylated CpG sites were determined using the R package MethylKit v1.16.0 (Akalın et al., 2012). Coverage outliers (above the 99.9 percentile) and bases with <10 coverage were removed. A binomial test was then carried

out per CpG position per sample using the lambda conversion rate as the probability of success and correcting p -values using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). Only sites which were classified as methylated in at least one sample were used for final differential methylation analysis. A logistic regression model implemented by MethylKit (Akalin et al., 2012) was then used to determine differentially methylated CpGs between sexes. A site was classified as differentially methylated if the Benjamini–Hochberg (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995) corrected p -value was $<.01$ and the overall methylation difference was $>10\%$. Exon regions were classed as differentially methylated if they contained at least two differentially methylated CpGs and had an overall weighted methylation difference of $>15\%$. Two CpGs were chosen as Xu et al. (2021) found methylation of two CpGs within a region was enough to induce gene expression changes via histone recruitment in the silk moth.

Relationship between gene expression and DNA methylation

The relationship between DNA methylation and gene expression was determined using linear models implemented by custom scripts in R (R Core Team, 2020) available at DOI:10.5281/zenodo.7385397. Interaction effects were determined using the *anova* function and post-hoc testing of fixed factors was done using the *glht* function from the multcomp R package (Hothorn et al., 2008) with correction for multiple testing by the single-step method. Correlations were calculated using Spearman's rank correlation *rho*.

Additional genome annotation and gene ontology enrichment

Transposable elements were de novo annotated in the *D. citri* genome using the EDTA pipeline (Ou et al., 2019). Putative promoter regions were defined as 500 bp upstream of UTR regions. We excluded any promoters which overlap with other genomic features. Intergenic regions were determined as regions between gene end and gene start sites (excluding the newly annotated putative promoters and excluding any TE overlap).

Additional gene ontology annotations were generated from the protein sequences of all genes from the official gene set (Dcitr_OGS v3.0, Hosmani et al. (2019)) using eggNOG-mapper v2.0.0 with standard parameters (Cantalapiedra et al., 2021). A total of 14,133 genes were able to be annotated with GO terms. GO enrichment was carried out in R using GOSTats v2.56.0 (Falcon & Gentleman, 2007) which implements a hypergeometric test with Benjamini–Hochberg correction for multiple testing (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). GO biological processes were classed as over represented if the correct p -value was $<.05$. REVIGO (Supek et al., 2011) was then used to visualize GO terms. GO terms for genes with high DNA methylation and differentially methylated genes between the sexes were tested against all methylated genes as a background. Hypermethylated genes per sex were tested against a background of all differentially methylated genes. Differentially expressed genes were tested against a background of all genes present in the RNA-seq data with detectable expression, >10 fragments per kilobase of transcript per million mapped fragments (FPKM) in at least one sample. Over-expressed genes per sex were tested against a background of all differentially expressed genes.

Results

X chromosome identification

Whole-genome sequencing of a pool of males and a pool of females was used to identify the X chromosome of *D. citri*. Around 80% of reads mapped to the *D. citri* reference genome (Supplementary 1.0.0), which resulted in 50× coverage for the female sample and 51× coverage for the male sample. Most psyllid species possess an XO sex determination system (Riemann, 1966; Maryańska-nadachowska et al., 2014), where females carry two X chromosomes and males carry a single X and no Y. Using a coverage-based analysis we have found that chromosome 08 shows roughly half coverage in males compared to females (Figure 1A and B), indicating this is likely the X chromosome. We confirm this by showing high synteny between chromosome 08 of *D. citri* and the related psyllid *P. venusta* X chromosome (Figure 1C). Finally, as the reference genome is primarily based on male data we were able to search for a divergent Y chromosome. We checked the coverage ratio of 10,000bp windows across the genome, finding no clear peaks with a log2 male to female coverage ratio greater than 0.5 (Supplementary Figure S1) which would indicate higher coverage in males compared to females, this suggests there is no Y chromosome in *D. citri*.

Sex-biased gene expression

Using RNA-seq from pools of males and females we have identified differentially expressed genes between the sexes. The majority of variation within the data (97%) is caused by sex (Figure 2A) and while we find many genes have equal expression in both sexes, a large number of genes are only expressed in males (Figure 2B). Sample F1 also accounts for around 1.5% of the variation in gene expression. We explored this further, finding a small number of genes are responsible for the variation, none of which have GO annotations (Supplementary Figure S2). In total, we have identified 1,259 genes out of 12,420 which are differentially expressed between the sexes (adjusted p -value $<.05$ and log2 fold-change >1.5 , Supplementary 1.0.1 and Supplementary Figure S3). Of these, significantly more are upregulated in males compared to females (Chi-squared goodness of fit: $X\text{-squared} = 907.67$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$). 1,164 are upregulated in males (9.4% of all genes tested) and 95 are upregulated in females (0.8% of all genes tested). A large number of the genes upregulated in males are also sex-limited (484 total, 41.6% of all male upregulated genes), meaning they have zero expression in females. While only 12/95 genes (12.6%) upregulated in females are sex-limited (Figure 2C and D).

GO term enrichment analysis revealed differentially expressed genes from both sexes compared to all genes in the RNA-seq data set were enriched for a large variety of processes, interestingly some of these included hypermethylation of CpG islands and the regulation of various histone modifications (Supplementary 1.0.2). Male-biased genes compared to all differentially expressed genes are enriched for multiple cellular processes and many regulatory processes, such as “negative regulation of gene expression” (GO:0010629) and “regulation of neuron differentiation” (GO:0045664) (Supplementary 1.0.2). Female-biased genes compared to all differentially expressed genes are enriched for various biological processes and specifically reproductive related processes such as “reproductive behaviour” (GO:0019098) and “pheromone biosynthetic process” (GO:0042811) (Supplementary 1.0.2).




Figure 1. Identification of the X chromosome. (A) Bar plot of the coverage per chromosome for males and females normalized by the genome-wide average coverage. Chromosome 13 is missing from this graph as it represents unplaced scaffolds. (B) Histogram of the log₂ male to female coverage ratio for 10,000 bp windows across each chromosome. (C) Synteny plot showing collinearity blocks between *D. citri* (DC) and *P. venusta* (PV). Each line represents at least 10 orthologous genes.

It has been predicted that in XO sex determination systems the X chromosome may show an accumulation of male- or female- overexpressed genes which serves as a mechanism to balance the presence of sexually antagonistic alleles (Jaquière et al., 2013). We found that the X chromosome showed a depletion of male biased genes, with a significantly higher proportion of male biased genes being found on the autosomes (Chi-squared goodness of fit: $X\text{-squared} = 9.171$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$, Figure 3). We also found this was not the case for female biased genes, with no significant difference between the proportion of female biased genes found between the autosomes and X chromosome (Chi-squared goodness of fit: $X\text{-squared} = 0.021662$, $df = 1$, $p = .88$, Figure 3). These results indicate a de-masculinization of the X chromosome in *D. citri*.

Finally, we also checked the expression levels of genes involved in DNA methylation and sexual dimorphism in *D. citri*. *D. citri* possesses two potential copies of *DNMT1* and no apparent *DNMT3* gene (Bewick et al., 2017). *DNMT1* is important for DNA methylation maintenance and *DNMT3* is involved in *de novo* DNA methylation. We blasted the *DNMT* gene sequences identified in Bewick et al. (2017) to the current genome annotation which resulted in two single matches, Dcitr08g10610.1.2 and Dcitr08g05090.1.1, which we will refer to as *DNMT1a* and *DNMT1b* respectively. *DNMT1b* has no detectable expression in our RNA-seq dataset for adult males or females. *DNMT1a* shows slightly higher expression in females compared to males (Supplementary Figure S4),

however, overall expression is low in both sexes (<4 FPKMs) and so the difference is not significant.

We also carried out a reciprocal blast with all *Drosophila melanogaster* isoforms of *doublesex*, *fruitless* and *transformer*. While we find no matches for *transformer*, we have identified Dcitr03g16970.1 as a *doublesex* ortholog and Dcitr01g04580.1 as a *fruitless* ortholog. There are two currently annotated isoforms for the *D. citri doublesex* ortholog which are not expressed in the adult stage of either sex. There is only one annotated isoform of the *fruitless* ortholog which is not differentially expressed between sexes (Supplementary Figure S4c) and shows overall low expression (<3 FPKMs).

Sex-specific DNA methylation landscape of *D. citri*

Here we examine the first genome-wide methylome of a psyllid species, comparing virgin males and females. As a CpG observed/expected analysis revealed *D. citri* likely displayed DNA methylation (Supplementary Figure S5), we carried out WGBS to examine the methylome at base-pair resolution. We find low overall genome wide levels, with around 0.3% of CpGs showing methylation and zero methylation in a non-CpG context (Supplementary 1.0.3 and Supplementary Figure S6). Genome-wide, males and females display similar CpG methylation profiles with some slight clustering by sex (Figure 4A). DNA methylation is also found throughout the genome in both sexes with exons showing the highest levels and intergenic regions displaying the lowest levels (Figure 4B). We specifically find a more bimodal pattern of either high or




Figure 2. Differential gene expression between sexes. (A) Principle component analysis (PCA) plot based on the expression of all genes ($n = 12,420$) showing 97% of the variation in expression is caused by sex. (B) Histogram of the specificity measure (SPM) (measure of specificity (Xiao et al., 2010), calculated as female FPKM squared divided by female FPKM squared plus male FPKM squared) per gene ($n = 12,420$) showing a large number of genes are expressed only in males. (C) Stacked bar plot showing the number of sex-biased genes. Sex-limited genes refers to those with zero expression in one sex. (D) Scatter plot of the log₁₀ fragments per kilobase of transcript per million mapped reads (FPKM) of all genes ($n = 12,420$). Significantly differentially expressed genes (corrected p -value < .05 and log₂ fold-change > 1.5) are colored by sex and level of differential expression, unbiased genes are shown in gray.

low methylation in putative promoter, UTR and exon regions compared to intergenic, intron, and TE regions which show a right-skewed methylation distribution, i.e., very few regions are highly methylated (Supplementary Figures S7 and S8).

We next classified genes as showing low, medium, high, and no methylation to determine if highly methylated genes show different functions to genes with lower methylation. We find highly methylated genes in both males and females are enriched for a large variety of cellular processes (Supplementary 1.0.4). We also find all chromosomes, including the X, show similar proportions of genes in each methylation level category (Supplementary Figure S9), indicating no particular chromosome is enriched or depleted for methylated genes in either males or females.

DNA methylation has been associated with transposable element silencing in other species (Zemach & Zilberman, 2010), we therefore characterized the TE landscape of *D. citri* to examine the possibility of DNA methylation-based TE regulation. We found 3.3% of the *D. citri* genome was

made up of TEs with the retrotransposon *Gypsy* occupying the largest proportion of the genome, totaling around 1.5% of the autosomes and around 0.8% of the X chromosome (Supplementary Figure S10). Similar DNA methylation levels of all TEs are observed between males and females (Figure 4C), however, the *Copia* class of retrotransposon shows considerably higher DNA methylation compared to all other TEs, this particular class of repeat is also only found on the autosomes and not on the X chromosome (Supplementary Figure S10). Finally, we checked to see if the DNA methylation levels in the *Copia* class of TEs could be caused by higher enrichment of this class within gene bodies. We find 46% of all TE length is located within gene bodies, a similar level is found for the *Copia* class (42%, Chi-squared test for given probabilities: X -squared = 0.18403, $df = 1$, $p = .6679$). This indicates that it is not gene occupancy which drives the higher levels of DNA methylation in this class. However, generally across all TEs we find that if a TE is located within a gene then the DNA methylation levels are slightly higher than if the TE




Figure 3. Male biased genes are depleted on the X chromosome. Bar plots showing the percentage of genes with sex-specific expression on the autosomes (A) and the X chromosome (B).

is located outside of a gene (linear model: $df = 15,009$, $t = 7.065$, $p = <.01$, [Supplementary Figure S10](#)). This relationship is not influenced by sex (two-way ANOVA: $F_{2,15009} = 0.0062$, $p = .9373$).

Sex-biased DNA methylation

A differential DNA methylation analysis of individual CpG positions between the sexes identified 763 differentially methylated CpGs (q -value <0.01 and minimum percentage difference $>10\%$). Of these, significantly more were hypermethylated in females compared to males (Chi-squared goodness of fit: $X\text{-squared} = 19.828$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$), with 443 CpGs hypermethylated in females and 320 hypermethylated in males. The majority of differentially methylated CpGs are located in genes and intergenic regions ([Figure 4D](#)). Chromosomes DC3.0sc01, DC3.0sc02, and DC3.0sc05 contain the most differentially methylated CpGs, although this number is not considerably different to all other chromosomes and there is no clear sex-bias in any specific chromosome ([Supplementary Figure S11](#)).

To create a list of confident differentially methylated features, we filtered all features to keep only those which contained at least two differentially methylated CpGs and with a minimum overall methylation difference across the entire feature of 15%. This left a final list of 12 genes containing a least one differentially methylated exon ([Supplementary 1.0.5](#)). Of these 10 were hypermethylated in females and three were hypermethylated in males with one gene containing two differentially methylated exons, one hypermethylated in females and one in males ([Supplementary 1.0.5](#)). None of these genes are located on the X chromosome ([Supplementary Figure S12](#)).

It is worth noting all differentially methylated genes identified above do not show overall large differences in DNA methylation ([Supplementary Figure S12](#)). While we have carried out a GO term enrichment analysis for these genes, the results should be interpreted with care due to the relatively small changes in methylation. Differentially methylated genes from both sexes compared to all methylated genes are enriched for a variety of GO terms, however these terms do include, “*sex determination*” (GO:0007530), “*primary*

sex determination” (GO:0007539), “*female germ-line sex determination*” (GO:0019099), and “*heterochromatin organization involved in chromatin silencing*” (GO:0070868) ([Supplementary 1.0.6](#)). Genes containing hypermethylated exons in females compared to all genes containing differentially methylated exons have no enriched GO terms, and neither do genes containing hypermethylated exons in males compared to all genes containing differentially methylated exons.

Genome-wide relationship between DNA methylation and gene expression

In many insect species, gene-body DNA methylation is positively correlated with gene expression (e.g., [Bonasio et al., 2012](#); [Glastad et al., 2016](#)). We find this is also the case for *D. citri* with higher methylation being significantly associated with higher expression (linear model: $df = 23971$, $t = 2.428$, $p = .0152$, [Figure 5A and B](#)). The relationship between gene expression and methylation is similar in both sexes as there is no significant interaction between sex and methylation level (two-way ANOVA: $F_{2,23971} = 2.952$, $p = .433$). On a genome-wide scale, it is clear that this relationship is conserved in only the most highly methylated genes ([Figure 5C and D](#)).

We also examined the relationship between DNA methylation and expression separately for the autosomes and the X chromosome. We find that the association between methylation and expression is only significant for the autosomes, and not the genes on the X chromosome (Autosomes: linear model: $df = 22543$, $t = 2.538$, $p = .0112$, X chromosomes: linear model: $df = 1425$, $t = -1.692$, $p = .0909$, [Supplementary Figures S13 and S14](#)).

Relationship between sex-specific DNA methylation and expression

The role of differential DNA methylation in regulating differential gene expression between insect sexes appears to differ between species within Hemiptera ([Bain et al., 2021](#); [Mathers et al., 2019](#)). We therefore searched for a potential relationship between differential DNA methylation and sex-specific gene expression in *D. citri*. We find no difference in the expression levels of genes which are differentially methylated or not




Figure 4. Genome-wide DNA methylation distribution in *D. citri*. (A) PCA plot based on the methylation level per CpG for all CpGs which were classed as methylated in at least one sex ($n = 107,710$). (B) Bar plot of the mean methylation level of each genomic feature for males and females. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals of the mean. (C) Methylation levels of different types of TEs by sex. (D) Component bar plot showing the number of differentially methylated CpGs per genomic feature, colored by the hypermethylated sex. Some differentially methylated CpG positions are counted twice if they overlap multiple features.

(linear model: $df = 23958$, $t = 0.183$, $p = .99$, Figure 6A). We do, however, find genes with unbiased expression have significantly higher levels of DNA methylation compared to differentially expressed genes (linear model: $df = 23968$, $t = 3.893$, $p < .01$, Figure 6B), this effect is not sex-specific (two-way ANOVA: $F_{2,23968} = 0.0122$, $p = .9879$). Finally, on a single gene level there is no correlation between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression between the sexes (Supplementary Figure S15).

Discussion

In this study, we present the first detailed analysis of genome-wide sex-specific DNA methylation patterns in the agriculturally important insect pest, *D. citri*, evaluating its effects on gene expression and sexual differentiation. Our major findings include: the identification of the X chromosome (chromosome 08 in Diaci_v3), sex-biased gene expression characterized by a large number of male limited genes, a depletion of male-biased genes on the X chromosome, overall low genome-wide

levels of DNA methylation, with DNA methylation targeted to exons but also present in TEs and potentially present in promoter regions, a small number of differentially methylated genes between the sexes and no apparent *cis*-driven relationship between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression. This final result suggests that DNA methylation does not drive sex-specific gene expression patterns in this species, at least at the resolution of whole-body tissue sampling.

Sex-biased gene expression in an X0 system

D. citri harbors an XX/X0 sex determination system, whereby females carry two X chromosomes and males only one X. Aside from initial sex determination, genes on the sex chromosomes are theorized to play a disproportionately large role in phenotypic differences between males and females (Dean & Mank, 2014). Here, we found a de-masculinization of the X chromosome in *D. citri* indicated by a reduction in genes showing male biased expression relative to the autosomes. A similar de-masculinization of the X has been observed in




Figure 5. Genome-wide DNA methylation and gene expression relationship. (A and B) Scatter graphs of the mean weighted methylation level per gene (averaged across replicates) plotted against the mean expression level. Each dot represents a gene, the black lines show a fitted linear regression with gray areas indicating 95% confidence intervals. (C) Binned genes by mean weighted methylation level with the mean expression level plotted for each bin with fitted LOESS regression lines per sex. Gray areas indicate 95% confidence areas. (D) Violin plots showing the distribution of the data via a mirrored density plot, meaning the widest part of the plots represent the most genes. Weighted methylation level per gene per sex, averaged across replicates, was binned into four categories, no methylation, low (>0–0.3), medium (>0.3–0.7) and high (>0.7–1). The red dot indicates the mean with 95% confidence intervals.

many *Drosophila* species (Sturgill et al., 2007), nematodes (Reinke et al., 2004), as well as in Hemiptera, *Halyomorpha halys* and *Oncopeltus fasciatus* (Pal & Vicoso, 2015). This is in line with classic evolutionary theories that hold the X chromosome, whose sex-biased transmission sees it spending more time in females, should value females more than males by de-masculinization and/or feminization (Hitchcock & Gardner, 2020). While we found de-masculinization of the X, we did not find any evidence for a feminized X chromosome, based on gene-expression differences, which was also predicted to be present by these theories. Considering that a gene's impact on phenotype may become diluted when it moves from a haploid to a diploid setting (Otto, 2007), recent theoretical predictions suggest the relative power of an X-linked gene to induce fitness effects may be lower in a female carrier than in a male. This power asymmetry is proposed to generate a bias toward male-beneficial strategies that offset, and even overturn, the X-linked gene's feminization (Hitchcock & Gardner, 2020; Jaquière et al., 2013), which

may explain the interesting observations that female-biased genes on the X chromosome were not over-represented in this study.

We also observe that most genes present on the X-chromosome show unbiased expression levels between the sexes. This is indicative of dosage compensation, as males only carry one X-chromosome. Previous work in the pea aphid has found dosage compensation of the X is achieved through more open chromatin in males compared to females (Richard et al., 2017). DNA methylation in the silk moth has been linked to the creation of open chromatin through the recruitment of histone acetylation (Xu et al., 2021). If this were occurring in *D. citri* we may expect higher levels of DNA methylation across the X chromosome in males compared to females. However, we do not observe this (Supplementary Figure S9) and none of the differentially methylated genes between sexes occur on the X chromosome. Whole-body comparisons of RNA-seq and WGBS data between sexes are somewhat limited though, and potentially introduce biases in




Figure 6. Relationship between differential DNA methylation and differential expression. (A) Violin plot of the expression levels of genes which are differentially methylated or not between sexes. The red dot represents the mean with 95% confidence intervals. (B) Violin plot of the methylation levels of genes which are either unbiased or show sex-specific expression bias. The red dot represents the mean with 95% confidence intervals.

the analysis (Pal & Vicoso, 2015; Perry et al., 2014). Further comparisons using the data from different male and female tissues will be necessary to confirm the extent of de-masculinization on the X chromosome and whether DNA methylation may drive open chromatin and dosage compensation in male *D. citri*.

Similar DNA methylation profiles between males and females

In addition to characterizing chromosome-specific differential expression between sexes, we also looked at sex-specific genome-wide DNA methylation differences. We find overall considerably lower levels of DNA methylation in *D. citri* compared to other hemipteran insects which generally have been found to show >2% CpG methylation (Bain et al., 2021; Bewick et al., 2017; Mathers et al., 2019). The low levels found here (0.3%) more closely match the low levels found in Hymenoptera and Lepidoptera (Bewick et al., 2017). This shows the importance of investigating epigenetic profiles in individual species and not making assumptions based on related species. This idea is also highlighted by the recent finding of promoter DNA methylation in some insects (Lewis et al., 2020) for which we also see some evidence for in *D. citri*, although it should be noted that the levels are similar to background intergenic levels.

We also find no difference in DNA methylation profiles between the autosomes and the X chromosome, this has rarely been investigated to date due to the lack of chromosome level assemblies for non-model insects. However, Mathers et al. (2019) do find a depletion in highly methylated genes on the X chromosome of a species of aphid, again these differences highlight the diversity of species-specific epigenetic profiles. Additionally, we find no genome-wide sex differences across genomic regions between sexes. This is similar to two jewel wasp species, *Nasonia vitripennis* and *Nasonia giraulti*, in which more than 75% of expressed genes displayed sex-biased expression, but no sex differences in DNA methylation were observed (Wang et al., 2015). However, extreme sex-biased DNA methylation has been observed in other insect systems including *M. persicae*, *Zootermopsis nevadensis*, and *P. citri* (Bain et al.,

2021; Glastad et al., 2016; Mathers et al., 2019). Examples include a unique sex-specific pattern in *P. citri*, in which males display more uniform low levels of methylation across the genome, while females display more targeted high levels (Bain et al., 2021). Other than the above mentioned studies, very little work has examined insect DNA methylation sex differences using sequencing-based approaches. However, based on methylation-sensitive amplification polymorphism assays, a related planthopper species does appear to show sex differences in terms of DNA methylation levels (Zhang et al., 2014, 2015b). The extreme diversity of DNA methylation systems between and even within insect clades, in terms of both DNA methylation distribution and its potential effects on gene expression, highlights the importance of assessing individual species profiles. For example, contradicting results have been found in multiple studies, in terms of DNA methylation influencing alternative splicing in related species (e.g., Flores et al., 2012; Marshall et al., 2019), it is only by assessing these relationships on the species level can we begin to use DNA methylation as a potential tool in later research.

The fact that DNA methylation is so similar between *D. citri* sexes may be considered when developing a molecular control system, e.g., RNAi strategy against *D. citri* as a pest species. RNAi-mediated gene knockdown has shown tremendous potential for controlling the hemipteran aphids and psyllids (Jain et al., 2021; Yu & Killiny, 2020; Yu et al., 2016). Our results may indicate that RNAi of a target DNA methylation gene should have similar silencing efficiency in both sexes of *D. citri*. It has recently been shown that knockdown of *DNMT1* in *Phenacoccus solenopsis* by RNAi resulted in offspring death (Omar et al., 2020); similar observations were recorded in another hemipteran insect, *Nilaparvata lugens*, that silencing *DNMT1* and *DNMT3* caused fewer offspring (Zhang et al., 2015a), suggesting such a strategy may hold potential for the control of *D. citri*.

DNA methylation does not drive sex-specific gene expression

We have identified the relationship between DNA methylation and gene expression in *D. citri*. We find highly methylated

genes show generally higher levels of gene expression, which appears common within insects (e.g., Bonasio et al., 2012; Glastad et al., 2016; Marshall et al., 2019), although see Bain et al. (2021). This trend is common between both sexes and we also find no relationship between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression, again this has been shown to be the case in multiple other insect studies exploring sex-specific DNA methylation profiles (Glastad et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2015), although see Mathers et al. (2019).

It has recently been suggested that DNA methylation may play a temporal role in regulating gene expression (Li-Byarlay et al., 2020), whereby DNA methylation creates changes in chromatin structure through the recruitment of histone modifications (Xu et al., 2021) and this allows a later change in gene expression which would not be present in samples taken during the same time frame. The initial DNA methylation event may then be lost accounting for the lack of association between gene expression and DNA methylation, although this idea is yet to be tested. If DNA methylation were functioning in this temporal fashion in *D. citri*, we may expect to see DNA methylation differences between different developmental stages. Indeed, the small number of differentially methylated genes we have identified between sexes are involved in sex differentiation and heterochromatin formation.

In this study, we used whole-body samples and as such the DNA methylation differences in the above genes may be due to tissue-specific profiles (Pai et al., 2011). While it is possible this could also explain the lack of association between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression, we do not think this is the case. Previous work sampling specific tissues in honeybees has shown the lack of association remains consistent and that tissue-specific DNA methylation profiles are uncommon (Harris et al., 2019). Additionally, a recent multi-species analysis across invertebrates of the relationship between differential DNA methylation and differential gene expression also confirms the lack of a direct relationship (Dixon & Matz, 2022). There is growing evidence that, rather than directly regulating gene expression the underlying genomic sequence drives DNA methylation patterns in many insect species (Harris et al., 2019; Marshall et al., 2019; Yagound et al., 2020; Yagound et al., 2019). In order to determine if this is the case in *D. citri*, different tissues and developmental stages should be sampled. This may allow for a targeted approach to epigenetic pest control which would be applicable across the lifespan of the species.

Conserved TE methylation

Finally, in order to explore TE methylation, we characterized TEs within the *D. citri* genome. An interesting outcome of our study is the low TE proportion in *D. citri*. TEs, known as jumping genes propagating in genomes, are associated with a variety of mechanisms contributing to shape genome architecture and evolution (Gilbert et al., 2021). In insects, TEs mediate genomic changes which have been reported to play a pivotal role in the development of insecticide resistance, as well as adaptation to climate change, and local adaptation (Adrión et al., 2019; González et al., 2010; Itokawa et al., 2010). Dedicated comparative analyses of TE composition reveals insect TE landscapes are highly variable between insect orders and among species of the same order. The genomic portion of TEs ranges from as little as 0.12% in the antarctic midge, *Belgica antarctica*, to as large as 60% in

the migratory locust *Locusta migratoria* (Kelley et al., 2014; Petersen et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2014). Even within closely related species, TE composition can be drastically different; *Aedes aegypti* TEs contribute about 47% of the whole genome, followed by 29% in *Culex quinquefasciatus*, 20% in *D. melanogaster*, 16% in *Anopheles gambiae*, and 0.12% in *B. Antarctica* (Arensburger et al., 2010; Kelley et al., 2014; Nene et al., 2007; Quesneville et al., 2005; Sharakhova et al., 2007). In this study, we found only 3.3% of the *D. citri* genome was made up of TEs, a small proportion compared with other reported hemipteran insects such as *Cimex lectularius* (30%), *A. pisum* (25%), *H. halys* (39%), *Pachypsylla venusta* (24%), and *O. fasciatus* (21%) (Petersen et al., 2019). By investigating the 195 insect genomes, a study uncovered large-scale horizontal transfer of TEs from host plants or a bacterial/viral infection (Peccoud et al., 2017), and makes this mechanism likely to be the source of high variation in insect genomic TE composition. Meanwhile, TE content is usually positively correlated with arthropod genome size (Gilbert et al., 2021; Petersen et al., 2019); and *D. citri* does indeed show a relatively small genome, at around 475Mb (Hosmani et al., 2019).

We additionally find evidence of TE methylation in *D. citri*. TE methylation is generally found across plants and animals (Law & Jacobsen, 2010). It was thought to be absent in arthropods (Keller et al., 2016; Zemach et al., 2010), although this was based on a small number of investigated species. Recently, TE methylation has been shown to be present in centipedes and a species of mealybug (Lewis et al., 2020) as well as in the desert locust (Falckenhayn et al., 2013). While, we also show TE methylation in *D. citri*, it is worth remembering the genome-wide level of DNA methylation in *D. citri* is particularly low (0.3%) and as such methylation of TEs may not be functioning to silence TE movement as in other highly methylated species. This discovery does, however, add to the growing evidence that the function of DNA methylation is highly variable between insect species.

Conclusion

This study provides a fundamental basis for future research exploring epigenetic mechanisms of insect control in an important agricultural pest species, *D. citri*. We have further characterized the current *D. citri* reference genome by identifying the X chromosome in this species and explored the TE content, finding low genome-wide TE levels. We also find a large number of genes show male-biased expression and find the X-chromosome is depleted for male-biased genes. Importantly, we characterize the sex-specific methylome of *D. citri* finding evidence for TE methylation and potential promoter methylation, although genome-wide *D. citri* shows considerably lower DNA methylation levels than most hemipteran species currently studied. These results contribute to the striking differences in patterns of DNA methylation within Hemiptera, suggesting rapid evolution of DNA methylation function in this order. This leaves an open question as to what could be driving such diverse species-specific DNA methylation patterns.

Additionally, given that the small number of differentially methylated genes we do find between sexes are involved in processes such as sex differentiation, we suggest DNA methylation may play a more functional role in earlier developmental stages. Finally, we find no relationship between *cis*-acting DNA

methylation and differential gene expression, as is common in many insects, although this cannot rule out a temporal mechanism by which *cis*-acting DNA methylation may function. The similar DNA methylation profiles between sexes reported here would help to develop an epigenetic-based pest control method targeted at DNA methylation for *D. citri* management.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available online at *Evolution* (<https://academic.oup.com/evolut/qp4036>)

Data availability

All RNA-seq, BS-seq and whole-genome sequencing data generated for this study were deposited in GenBank under Bio-Project accession number PRJNA774108. All scripts are available at: DOI:10.5281/zenodo.7385397. New genome annotations and GO terms can be found at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17013980.v1>.

Author contributions

X.Y., H.M., L.R., and Z.L. conceived the study. X.Y., Y.L., Y.X., X.Z., H.Y., W.C., G.Z., and B.Z. reared the insects and conducted the laboratory work. H.M. carried out all analyses. X.Y. and H.M. wrote the initial manuscript. All authors contributed to the final manuscript.

Funding

This work is funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant no. 32160634 and 31601379), the Natural Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars of Jiangxi province (grant no. 20212ACB215001), the Double Thousand Plan of Jiangxi Province (grant no. jxsq2019101058), and the Major Science and Technology R&D Program of Jiangxi Province (grant no. 20194ABC28007). H.M. was funded by the ERC Grant “PGEpro” awarded to L.R.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

We thank the reviewers and editors for helpful comments to improve this manuscript. We thank Dr. Kamil Jaron for valuable advice regarding X chromosome identification.

References

Adrion, J. R., Begun, D. J., & Hahn, M. W. (2019). Patterns of transposable element variation and clinality in *Drosophila*. *Molecular Ecology*, 28(6), 1523–1536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14961>

Akalin, A., Kormaksson, M., Li, S., Garrett-bakelman, F. E., Figueroa, M. E., Melnick, A., & Mason, C. E. (2012). methylKit: A comprehensive R package for the analysis of genome-wide DNA methylation profiles. *Genome Biology*, 13(R87), R87. <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2012-13-10-r87>

Andrews, S. 2010. Babraham Bioinformatics - FastQC A Quality Control tool for High Throughput Sequence Data. <http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/>, Accessed December 12, 2020.

Arensburger, P., Megy, K., Waterhouse, R. M., Abrudan, J., Amedeo, P., Antelo, B., Bartholomay, L., Bidwell, S., Caler, E., Camara, F., Campbell, C. L., Campbell, K. S., Casola, C., Castro, M. T., Chandramouliswaran, I., Chapman, S. B., Christley, S., Costas, J., Eisenstadt, E., ... Atkinson, P. W. (2010). Sequencing of *Culex quinquefasciatus* establishes a platform for mosquito comparative genomics. *Science*, 330(6000), 86–88.

Bain, S. A., Marshall, H., Folia, A. G., Laetsch, D. R., Husnik, F., & Ross, L. (2021). Sex-specific expression and DNA methylation in a species with extreme sexual dimorphism and paternal genome elimination. *Molecular Ecology*, 30(22), 5687–5703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15842>

Bandi, V., & Gutwin, C. (2020). Interactive exploration of genomic conservation. Graphics Interface Conference on Proceedings of Graphics Interface 2020 (GI'20), Canadian Human-Computer Communications Society, Waterloo, CAN.

Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 57(1), 289–300.

Bewick, A. J., Vogel, K. J., Moore, A. J., & Schmitz, R. J. (2017). Evolution of DNA methylation across insects. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 34(3), 654–665. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw264>

Bonasio, R., Li, Q., Lian, J., Mutti, N., Jin, L., Zhao, H., Zhang, P., Wen, P., Xiang, H., Ding, Y., Jin, Z., Shen, S., Wang, Z., Wang, W., Wang, J., Berger, S., Liebig, J., Zhang, G., & Reinberg, D. (2012). Genome-wide and caste-specific DNA methylomes of the ants *Camponotus floridanus* and *Harpegnathos saltator*. *Current Biology*, 22(19), 1755–1764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.07.042>

Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., & Madden, T. L. (2009). BLAST+: Architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 10, 1–9.

Cantalapiedra, C. P., Hern, A., & Huerta-Cepas, J. (2021). eggNOG-mapper v2: Functional annotation, orthology assignments, and domain prediction at the metagenomic scale. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, msab293, 5.

Dean, R., & Mank, J. E. (2014). The role of sex chromosomes in sexual dimorphism: Discordance between molecular and phenotypic data. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 27(7), 1443–1453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12345>

Dixon, G., & Matz, M. (2022). Changes in gene body methylation do not correlate with changes in gene expression in Anthozoa or Hexapoda. *BMC Genomics*, 23(1), 234. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-022-08474-z>

Dobin, A., Davis, C. A., Schlesinger, F., Drenkow, J., Zaleski, C., Jha, S., Batut, P., Chaisson, M., & Gingeras, T. R. (2013). STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*, 29(1), 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635>

Falckenhayn, C., Boerjan, B., Raddatz, G., Frohme, M., Schoofs, L., & Lyko, F. (2013). Characterization of genome methylation patterns in the desert locust *Schistocerca gregaria*. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 216(8), 1423–1429.

Falcon, S., & Gentleman, R. (2007). Using GOstats to test gene lists for GO term association. *Bioinformatics*, 23(2), 257–258. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl567>

Flores, K., Wolschin, E., Corneveaux, J. J., Allen, A. N., Huentelman, M. J., & Amdam, G. V. (2012). Genome-wide association between DNA methylation and alternative splicing in an invertebrate. *BMC Genomics*, 13(1), 480. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-13-480>

Gilbert, C., Peccoud, J., Cordaux, R. (2021). Transposable elements and the evolution of insects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 66(1), 355–372.

Glastad, K. M., Gokhale, K., Liebig, J., & Goodisman, M. A. D. (2016). The caste- and sex-specific DNA methylome of the termite *Zootermopsis nevadensis*. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 37110.

Glastad, K. M., Hunt, B. G., & Goodisman, M. A. (2019). Epigenetics in insects: Genome regulation and the generation of phenotypic diversity. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 64(1), 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-011118-111914>

- González, J., Karasov, T. L., Messer, P. W., & Petrov, D. A. (2010). Genome-wide patterns of adaptation to temperate environments associated with transposable elements in drosophila. *PLoS Genetics*, 6(4), e1000905. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000905>
- Grafton-Cardwell, E. E., Stelinski, L. L., & Stansly, P. A. (2013). Biology and management of Asian citrus psyllid, vector of the huanglong-bing pathogens. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 58(1), 413–432. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-120811-153542>
- Harris, K. D., Lloyd, J. P. B., Domb, K., Zilberman, D., & Zemach, A. (2019). DNA methylation is maintained with high fidelity in the honey bee germline and exhibits global non-functional fluctuations during somatic development. *Epigenetics & Chromatin*, 12(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13072-019-0307-4>
- Hitchcock, T. J., & Gardner, A. (2020). A gene's-eye view of sexual antagonism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 287(1932), 20201633. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1633>
- Hosmani, P. S., Flores-Gonzalez, M., Shippy, T., Vosburg, C., Massimino, C., Tank, W., Reynolds, M., Tamayo, B., Miller, S., Norus, J., Kercher, K., Grace, B., Jernigan, M., Harper, D., Adkins, S., DeLaFlor, Y., Paris, T., Vandervoort, S., Adams, R., ... Saha, S. (2019). Chromosomal length reference assembly for *Diaphorina citri* using single-molecule sequencing and Hi-C proximity ligation with manually curated genes in developmental, structural and immune pathways. *bioRxiv*, <https://doi.org/10.1101/869685>
- Hothorn, T., Bretz, F., & Westfall, P. (2008). Simultaneous inference in general parametric models. *Biometrical Journal*, 50(3), 346–363. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.200810425>
- Itokawa, K., Komagata, O., Kasai, S., Okamura, Y., Masada, M., & Tomita, T. (2010). Genomic structures of Cyp9m10 in pyrethroid resistant and susceptible strains of *Culex quinquefasciatus*. *Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 40(9), 631–640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibmb.2010.06.001>
- Jain, R. G., Robinson, K. E., Asgari, S., & Mitter, N. (2021). Current scenario of RNAi-based Hemipteran control. *Pest Management Science*, 77(5), 2188–2196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6153>
- Jaquière, J., Rispe, C., Roze, D., Legeai, F., Le Trionnaire, G., Stoeckel, S., Mieuze, L., Da Silva, C., Poulain, J., Prunier-Leterme, N., Séguens, B., Tagu, D., & Simon, J.-C. (2013). Masculinization of the X chromosome in the pea aphid. *PLoS Genetics*, 9(8), e1003690. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003690>
- Keller, T. E., Han, P., & Yi, S. V. (2016). Evolutionary transition of promoter and gene body DNA methylation across invertebrate-vertebrate boundary. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(4), 1019–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msv345>
- Kelley, J. L., Peyton, J. T., Fiston-Lavier, A. -S., Teets, N. M., Yee, M. -C., Johnston, J. S., Bustamante, C. D., Lee, R. E., & Denlinger, D. L. (2014). Compact genome of the Antarctic midge is likely an adaptation to an extreme environment. *Nature Communications*, 5(1), 4611. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms5611>
- Krueger, F., & Andrews, S. R. (2011). Bismark: A flexible aligner and methylation caller for Bisulfite-Seq applications. *Bioinformatics*, 27(11), 1571–1572. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr167>
- Langmead, B., & Salzberg, S. L. (2013). Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature Methods*, 9(4), 357–359.
- Law, J. A., & Jacobsen, S. E. (2010). Establishing, maintaining and modifying DNA methylation patterns in plants and animals. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 11(3), 204–220. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2719>
- Ledón-Rettig, C. C., Zattara, E. E., & Moczek, A. P. (2017). Asymmetric interactions between doublesex and tissue- and sex-specific target genes mediate sexual dimorphism in beetles. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 14593. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14593>
- Lewis, S. H., Ross, L., Bain, S. A., Pahita, E., Smith, S. A., Cordaux, R., Miska, E. A., Lenhard, B., Jiggins, F. M., & Sarkies, P. (2020). Widespread conservation and lineage-specific diversification of genome-wide DNA methylation patterns across arthropods. *PLoS Genetics*, 16(6), e1008864. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1008864>
- Li, B., & Dewey, C. N. (2011). RSEM: Accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12(323). <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2105/12/323>.
- Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R., & Subgroup, G. P. D. P. (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, 25(16), 2078–2079.
- Li, Y., Zhang, B., & Moran, N. A. (2020). The aphid X chromosome is a dangerous place for functionally important genes: diverse evolution of hemipteran genomes based on chromosome-level assemblies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 37(8), 2357–2368. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msaa095>
- Li-Byarlay, H., Boncristiani, H., Howell, G., Herman, J., Clark, L., Strand, M. K., Tarp, D., & Rueppell, O. (2020). Transcriptomic and epigenomic dynamics of honey bees in response to lethal viral infection. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 11, 566320. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2020.566320>
- Lo, N., Simpson, S. J., & Sword, G. A. (2018). Epigenetics and developmental plasticity in orthopteroid insects. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 25, 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2017.11.003>
- Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology*, 15(12), 550.
- Mank, J. (2009). Sex chromosomes and the evolution of sexual dimorphism: Lessons from the genome. *The American Naturalist*, 173(2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1086/595754>
- Marshall, H., Lonsdale, Z. N., & Mallon, E. B. (2019). Methylation and gene expression differences between reproductive and sterile bumblebee workers. *Evolution Letters*, 3(5), 485–499. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.129>
- Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. *EMBnet journal*, 17(11), 10. <https://doi.org/10.14806/ej.17.1.200>
- Maryńska-nadachowska, A., Kuznetsova, V. G., Yang, C. -t, Woudstra, I. H., Kuznetsova, V. G., & Yang, C. -t. (2014). New data on karyotypes and the number of testicular follicles in the psyllid families Aphalaridae, Psyllidae, Carsidaridae and Trioziidae. *Caryologia*, 49(3-4), 279–285.
- Mathers, T. C., Mugford, S. T., Percival-Alwyn, L., Chen, Y., Kaithakkottil, G., Swarbreck, D., Hogenhout, S. A., & van Oosterhout, C. (2019). Sex-specific changes in the aphid DNA methylation landscape. *Molecular Ecology*, 28(18), 4228–4241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15216>
- Nene, V., Wortman, J. R., Lawson, D., Haas, B., Kodira, C., Tu, Z. J., Loftus, B., Xi, Z., Megy, K., Grabherr, M., Ren, Q., Zdobnov, E. M., Lobo, N. F., Campbell, K. S., Brown, S. E., Bonaldo, M. F., Zhu, J., Sinkins, S. P., Hogenkamp, D. G., ... Severson, D. W. (2007). Genome sequence of *Aedes aegypti*, a major arbovirus vector. *Science*, 316(5832), 1718–1723.
- Omar, M. A., Li, M., Liu, F., He, K., Qasim, M., Xiao, H., Jiang, M., & Li, F. (2020). The roles of DNA methyltransferases 1 (DNMT1) in regulating sexual dimorphism in the cotton mealybug, *Phenacoccus solenopsis*. *Insects*, 11(2), 121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects11020121>
- Otto, S. P. (2007). The evolutionary consequences of polyploidy. *Cell*, 131(3), 452–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.10.022>
- Ou, S., Su, W., Liao, Y., Chougule, K., Ware, D., Peterson, T., Jiang, N., Hirsch, C. N., & Hufford, M. B. (2019). Benchmarking transposable element annotation methods for creation of a streamlined, comprehensive pipeline. *Genome Biology*, 20(275), 1–18.
- Pai, A. A., Bell, J. T., Marioni, J. C., Pritchard, J. K., & Gilad, Y. (2011). A genome-wide study of DNA methylation patterns and gene expression levels in multiple human and chimpanzee tissues. *PLoS Genetics*, 7(2), e1001316. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1001316>
- Pal, A., & Vicoso, B. (2015). The X chromosome of hemipteran insects: Conservation, dosage compensation and sex-biased expression. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 7(12), 3259–3268. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evv215>
- Peccoud, J., Loiseau, V., Cordaux, R., & Gilbert, C. (2017). Massive horizontal transfer of transposable elements in insects. *Proceedings*

- of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(18), 4721–4726. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1621178114>
- Pegoraro, M., Bafna, A., Davies, N. J., Shuker, D. M., & Tauber, E. (2016). DNA methylation changes induced by long and short photoperiods in *Nasonia*. *Genome Research*, 26(2), 203–210. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.196204.115>
- Perry, J. C., Harrison, P. W., & Mank, J. E. (2014). The ontogeny and evolution of sex-biased gene expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 31(5), 1206–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu072>
- Petersen, M., Armisén, D., Gibbs, R. A., Hering, L., Khila, A., Mayer, G., Richards, S., Niehuis, O., & Misof, B. (2019). Diversity and evolution of the transposable element repertoire in arthropods with particular reference to insects. *BMC Ecology and Evolution*, 19(1), 11.
- Quesneville, H., Bergman, C. M., Andrieu, O., Autard, D., Nouaud, D., Ashburner, M., & Anxolabehere, D. (2005). Combined evidence annotation of transposable elements in genome sequences. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 1(2), e22. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.0010022>
- R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Reinke, V., Gil, I. S., Ward, S., & Kazmer, K. (2004). Genome-wide germline-enriched and sex-biased expression profiles in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Development*, 131(2), 311–323. <https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.00914>
- Richard, G., Legeai, F., Prunier-Leterme, N., Bretaudeau, A., Tagu, D., Jaquiéry, J., & Le Trionnaire, G. (2017). Dosage compensation and sex-specific epigenetic landscape of the X chromosome in the pea aphid. *Epigenetics & Chromatin*, 10(30).
- Riemann, J. G. (1966). Chromosome numbers in the hackberry psyllids pachyphylla and tetragonocephala (Homoptera: Psyllidae). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 59(6), 1088–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/59.6.1088>
- Schultz, M. D., Schmitz, R. J., & Ecker, J. R. (2012). ‘Leveling’ the playing field for analyses of single-base resolution DNA methylomes. *Trends in Genetics*, 28(12), 583–585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2012.10.012>
- Sharakhova, M. V., Hammond, M. P., Lobo, N. F., Krzywinski, J., Unger, M. F., Hillenmeyer, M. E., Bruggner, R. V., Birney, E., & Collins, F. H. (2007). Update of the *Anopheles gambiae* PEST genome assembly. *Genome Biology*, 8(1), R5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-1-r5>
- Sturgill, D., Zhang, Y., Parisi, M., & Oliver, B. (2007). Demasculinization of X chromosomes in the *Drosophila* genus. *Nature*, 450(7167), 238–241. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06330>
- Supek, F., Bošnjak, M., Škunca, N., & Šmuc, T. (2011). Revigo summarizes and visualizes long lists of gene ontology terms. *PLoS One*, 6(7), e21800. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021800>
- Wang, X., Fang, X., Yang, P., Jiang, X., Jiang, F., Zhao, D., Li, B., Cui, F., Wei, J., Ma, C., Wang, Y., He, J., Luo, Y., Wang, Z., Guo, X., Guo, W., Wang, X., Zhang, Y., Yang, M., ... Kang, L. (2014). The locust genome provides insight into swarm formation and long-distance flight. *Nature Communications*, 5(1), 2957. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3957>
- Wang, Y., Tang, H., Debarry, J. D., Tan, X., Li, J., Wang, X., Lee, T. H., Jin, H., Marler, B., Guo, H., Kissinger, J. C., & Paterson, A. H. (2012). MScanX: A toolkit for detection and evolutionary analysis of gene synteny and collinearity. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 40(7), 1–14.
- Wang, X., Werren, J. H., & Clark, A. G. (2015). Genetic and epigenetic architecture of sex-biased expression in the jewel wasps *Nasonia vitripennis* and *giraulti*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(27), E3545–E3554.
- Wexler, J., Delaney, E. K., Belles, X., Schal, C., Wada-Katsumata, A., Amicucci, M. J., & Kopp, A. (2019). Hemimetabolous insects elucidate the origin of sexual development via alternative splicing. *eLife*, 8, e47490. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.47490>
- Xiao, S. J., Zhang, C., Zou, Q., & Ji, Z. L. (2010). TiSGeD: A database for tissue-specific genes. *Bioinformatics*, 26(9), 1273–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq109>
- Xu, G., Lyu, H., Yi, Y., Peng, Y., Feng, Q., Song, Q., Gong, C., Peng, X., Palli, S. R., & Zheng, S. (2021). Intragenic DNA methylation regulates insect gene expression and reproduction through the MBD/Tip60 complex. *iScience*, 24(2), 102040. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.102040>
- Yagound, B., Remnant, E. J., Buchmann, G., & Oldroyd, B. P. (2020). Intergenerational transfer of DNA methylation marks in the honey bee. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(51), 32519–32527. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2017094117>
- Yagound, B., Smith, N. M. A., Buchmann, G., Oldroyd, B. P., & Remnant, E. J. (2019). Unique DNA methylation profiles are associated with cis-variation in honey bees. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 11(9), 2517–2530. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evz177>
- Yu, X., & Killiny, N. (2020). RNA interference-mediated control of Asian citrus psyllid, the vector of the huanglongbing bacterial pathogen. *Tropical Plant Pathology*, 45(3), 298–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40858-020-00356-7>
- Yu, X. -D., Liu, Z. -C., Huang, S. -L., Chen, Z. -Q., Sun, Y. -W., Duan, P. -F., Ma, Y. -Z., & Xia, L. -Q. (2016). RNAi-mediated plant protection against aphids: RNAi-mediated plant protection against aphids. *Pest Management Science*, 72(6), 1090–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4258>
- Zemach, A., McDaniel, I. E., Silva, P., & Zilberman, D. (2010). Genome-wide evolutionary analysis of eukaryotic DNA methylation. *Science*, 328(5980), 916–919. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1186366>
- Zemach, A., & Zilberman, D. (2010). Evolution of eukaryotic DNA methylation and the pursuit of safer sex. *Current Biology*, 20(17), R780–R785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2010.07.007>
- Zhang, M., Chen, J. -L., Liang, S. -K., Li, G. -H., Wang, F. -H., & Ahmad, I. (2015b). Differentially methylated genomic fragments related with sexual dimorphism of rice pests, *Sogatella furcifera*: DNA methylation in *S. furcifera*. *Insect Science*, 22(6), 731–738. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7917.12179>
- Zhang, M., Chen, J. -L., Zhou, X. -S., Liang, S. -K., Li, G. -H., & Wang, F. -H. (2014). Different genomic DNA methylation patterns between male and female adults of white-backed planthoppers *Sogatella furcifera*. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology*, 17(4), 917–921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2014.10.007>
- Zhang, J., Xing, Y., Li, Y., Yin, C., Ge, C., & Li, F. (2015a). DNA methyltransferases have an essential role in female fecundity in brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens*. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*, 464(1), 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.05.114>
- Zou, Y., Geuversink, E., Beukeboom, L. W., Verhulst, E. C., & van de Zande, L. (2020). A chimeric gene paternally instructs female sex determination in the haplodiploid wasp *Nasonia*. *Science*, 370(6520), 1115–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb8949>