

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

**An age-of-allele test of neutrality for transposable
element insertions.**

Justin P. Blumenstiel^{*}, Xi Chen^{*}, Miaomiao He[§] and Casey M.
Bergman[§]

^{*} Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of
Kansas, Lawrence, KS, 66049

[§] Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK,
M21 0RG

1 **Running Head:** A neutral model of transposable element dynamics

2

3 **Key Words:** Transposable Elements, Test of Neutrality, *Drosophila*
4 *melanogaster*, genome evolution, population genomics

5

6

7 **Corresponding author:**

8 Justin P. Blumenstiel

9 Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

10 University of Kansas

11 1200 Sunnyside Ave.

12 Lawrence, KS 66049

13

14 Tel: 785-864-3915

15 Email: jblumens@ku.edu

16

1 **Abstract**

2 How natural selection acts to limit the proliferation of transposable elements
3 (TEs) in genomes has been of interest to evolutionary biologists for many years.
4 To describe TE dynamics in populations, previous studies have used models of
5 transposition-selection equilibrium that assume a constant rate of transposition.
6 However, since TE invasions are known to happen in bursts through time, this
7 assumption may not be reasonable. Here we propose a test of neutrality for TE
8 insertions that does not rely on the assumption of a constant transposition rate.
9 We consider the case of TE insertions that have been ascertained from a single
10 haploid reference genome sequence. By conditioning on the age of an individual
11 TE insertion allele (inferred by the number of unique substitutions that have
12 occurred within the particular TE sequence since insertion), we determine the
13 probability distribution of the insertion allele frequency in a population sample
14 under neutrality. Taking models of varying population size into account, we then
15 evaluate predictions of our model against allele frequency data from 190
16 retrotransposon insertions sampled from North American and African
17 populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Using this non-equilibrium neutral model,
18 we are able to explain about 80% of the variance in TE insertion allele frequencies
19 based on age alone. Controlling for both non-equilibrium dynamics of
20 transposition and host demography, we provide evidence for negative selection
21 acting against most TEs as well as for positive selection acting on a small subset
22 of TEs. Our work establishes a new framework for the analysis of the
23 evolutionary forces governing large insertion mutations like TEs, gene
24 duplications or other copy number variants.

1 **Introduction**

2 Natural selection against transposable element (TE) insertions is considered to be
3 one of the primary forces preventing their proliferation in populations. The
4 action of negative selection against these genetic parasites is thought to come in
5 three predominant forms: selection against insertions in functional regions
6 (CHARLESWORTH and LANGLEY 1989), chromosomal abnormalities arising from
7 ectopic recombination (MONTGOMERY *et al.* 1987; LANGLEY *et al.* 1988), and costs
8 associated with the transposition process itself (NUZH DIN *et al.* 1996).
9 Understanding the relative importance of each of these forces has been of
10 substantial interest for many years (CHARLESWORTH and LANGLEY 1989;
11 CHARLESWORTH *et al.* 1994; NUZH DIN 1999; LEE and LANGLEY 2010). To
12 understand the nature of selection acting on TEs, a common practice is to
13 measure the allele frequency distribution of TE insertions within natural
14 populations (MONTGOMERY *et al.* 1987; BIEMONT *et al.* 1994; PETROV *et al.* 2003;
15 YANG and NUZH DIN 2003; GONZALEZ *et al.* 2008; PETROV *et al.* 2011; KOFLER *et al.*
16 2012). These studies have found that TE insertion alleles segregate at low allele
17 frequencies in *D. melanogaster*, and this observation has been used to support the
18 idea that negative selection acts to prevent TE insertions from increasing in
19 frequency in populations (CHARLESWORTH and LANGLEY 1989).

20

21 A limitation of previous studies on the dynamics of TE evolution is that the
22 frequency distribution under different models of selection is typically evaluated
23 under the assumption of transposition-selection balance within the population
24 (CHARLESWORTH and LANGLEY 1989; PETROV *et al.* 2003; LOCKTON *et al.* 2008;
25 GONZALEZ *et al.* 2009; LEE and LANGLEY 2010). A crucial assumption of models
26 that posit transposition-selection balance is that the transposition process can be
27 modeled as a constant rate over time. This is often unlikely to be the case, as
28 episodes of transposition are known to occur in bursts. For example, the *P*-
29 element invaded and proliferated in *D. melanogaster* only within the past several

1 decades (KIDWELL 1983; DANIELS *et al.* 1990). Likewise, analysis of genome
2 sequences has demonstrated waves of transposition for a number of other TE
3 families (SANMIGUEL *et al.* 1998; LANDER *et al.* 2001; DE LA CHAUX and WAGNER
4 2009; LU *et al.* 2012). In cases of recent transposition bursts, insertion allele
5 frequencies will not be at equilibrium because there will not have been sufficient
6 time to drift to moderate or high allele frequencies, even under strict neutrality.
7 Therefore recent insertion alone may explain the pattern of low allele frequencies
8 for TE insertions observed in natural populations of *D. melanogaster* (BERGMAN
9 and BENSASSON 2007). Alternatively, negative selection may explain the pattern
10 since equilibrium can be achieved quickly when TEs are harmful. To distinguish
11 among these possibilities, it would be beneficial to relax the assumption of
12 transposition-selection balance in models of TE evolution. We develop such an
13 approach here. To relax equilibrium assumptions we ask: are TE insertion allele
14 frequencies consistent with neutrality, conditional on the inferred time that has
15 elapsed since insertion? If so, then one may conclude that genetic drift and
16 demography are the major factors shaping the evolution of TE insertion allele
17 frequencies. However, If TE insertions are observed at a lower frequency than
18 predicted based on their age, we may infer that negative selection is limiting
19 their increase. Alternately, if a TE insertion is at a higher frequency than expected
20 based on its age, we may infer the action of positive selection acting on that
21 locus.

22

23 Critical to this approach is being able to estimate the time that has elapsed since
24 origination of the insertion allele. For most mutations, information about allele
25 age is provided solely by the frequency of the allele itself or in the amount of
26 linked variation (SLATKIN 2000). Under neutrality, a low frequency allele is on
27 average younger than a high frequency allele (KIMURA and OHTA 1973) and
28 alleles with low levels of linked variation and greater haplotype structure tend to
29 be younger because there has not been sufficient time to accumulate mutations or
30 undergo recombination (SLATKIN 2000).

1

2 For large insertions like TEs, an additional source of age information can be
3 obtained from the insertion sequence itself. Specifically, the age of a TE insertion
4 ascertained from a single genome can be inferred by estimating the number of
5 unique substitutions that have accumulated in the TE sequence since its
6 insertion, relative to the entire transposing lineage. After insertion, most TE
7 sequences evolve under an unconstrained, pseudogene-like mode of evolution
8 (PETROV *et al.* 1996). Thus, by determining the number of nucleotide differences
9 between the actively transposing lineages and a particular TE insertion, one can
10 estimate the age of that particular insertion event under the standard
11 assumptions of a molecular clock. Dating the age of TE insertions (in terms of
12 nucleotide substitutions on their terminal branches) has been proven
13 instrumental in determining spontaneous rates of insertion and deletion in
14 *Drosophila* where classical pseudogenes are relatively rare (PETROV *et al.* 1996).
15 Information about the age since insertion has also previously proven useful in
16 understanding the dynamics of TE invasion in the history of a species (BERGMAN
17 and BENSASSON 2007).

18

19 Here we use results from coalescent theory to determine the neutral probability
20 distribution of allele frequency for a neutral TE insertion identified in a reference
21 genome, conditional on its estimated time since insertion. This method is
22 particularly suitable for genotyping or resequencing studies in which TEs
23 identified in a well-assembled genome are subsequently assayed for their allele
24 frequency in populations (BLUMENSTIEL *et al.* 2002; PETROV *et al.* 2003; FRANCHINI
25 *et al.* 2004; NEAFSEY *et al.* 2004; LIPATOV *et al.* 2005; GONZALEZ *et al.* 2008; PETROV *et*
26 *al.* 2011). Since the age of an insertion allele cannot be exactly determined, we
27 incorporate uncertainty in age estimates into our approach by integrating over
28 the Bayesian posterior distribution of time since insertion. Our approach allows
29 one to test whether TE insertion frequencies are as expected under neutrality,
30 without assuming constancy of transposition rate or constant host population

1 size. We apply this method to a sample of 190 retrotransposon insertions in *D.*
2 *melanogaster* that have previously been shown to undergo the pseudogene-like
3 mode of sequence evolution (BERGMAN and BENSASSON 2007). Using published
4 demographic scenarios of population history in *D. melanogaster* as exemplars, we
5 demonstrate that a neutral model that takes age of insertion into account can
6 explain more than 80% of the variation in TE insertion frequencies. In addition,
7 we show how conditioning on time since insertion enables the detection of
8 negative and positive selection acting on TEs without assuming equilibrium TE
9 and host dynamics.

1 **Materials and Methods**

2 *Estimating the age of a TE insertion ascertained from a reference genome*

3 To estimate time of TE insertion we count the number of substitutions (s) that are
4 unique to a particular TE insertion relative to all other sequenced paralogous
5 copies of a TE family residing in a single reference genome (Fig 1A). We note that
6 our estimate of age is not the time to the most recent common ancestor (MRCA)
7 based on intra-allelic variation within orthologous copies of a particular insertion
8 allele (see Fig 1B). We discount substitutions that are shared among paralogous
9 copies because these represent differences that occurred prior to the origin of
10 distinct, actively transposing lineages of the same family. Assuming that a newly
11 inserted TE is not co-opted for some function by the host, unique substitutions
12 within a TE sequence accumulate under an unconstrained, pseudogene-like
13 mode of evolution and these can serve as a measure of time since insertion. A
14 lack of constraint on substitutions after insertion can be demonstrated by
15 generating multiple alignments of paralogous TE copies of a family within a
16 single reference genome and identifying substitutions that occur on active TE
17 lineages (shared among copies) versus those that occur within individual TE
18 insertions (unique to single copies). Previous work has shown that shared
19 substitutions are only abundant at third positions within codons, consistent with
20 selection to maintain a functional amino acid sequence, whereas unique
21 substitutions do not show this pattern (PETROV *et al.* 1996; BERGMAN and
22 BENSASSON 2007). A limitation of this method is that TEs that have inserted in the
23 very recent past will all have zero unique substitutions, making it difficult to
24 precisely determine how old they are.

25

26 *The probability of i copies in a sample of n alleles, conditional on the age of an insertion* 27 *sequence*

28 To relax the assumption of transposition-selection balance in a test of neutrality
29 for TEs, we seek the probability distribution of neutral TE insertion allele

1 frequency conditional only on time of allele origination and host population
 2 history. In this way, we free ourselves from the assumption of a constant
 3 transposition rate because we focus only on the individual frequency of a
 4 retrotransposon insertion allele that cannot excise. This is in contrast to
 5 approaches that compare the entire distribution of allele frequencies from
 6 multiple TE insertions with an equilibrium distribution generated assuming
 7 constant transposition rate.

8

9 Here we determine the probability that a neutral TE insertion allele ascertained
 10 from a haploid genome will be present in i copies in a sample of n alleles,
 11 conditional on the time since insertion (Figure 1B). An example of this approach
 12 was previously used to discriminate TEs based on age that are expected to be
 13 polymorphic rather than fixed in pufferfish (NEAFSEY *et al.* 2004). This probability
 14 is conditional on 1) the number of sample ancestors present at time t of insertion,
 15 2) the probability that a lineage which received the insertion at time t is
 16 represented in i descendants within n sampled alleles and 3) ascertainment of the
 17 TE insertion from a single haploid genome (which specifies the ancestor at time
 18 t).

19

20 The probability than n sampled alleles have j ancestors at time t is given by:

21

$$P(j | t, n) = \sum_{k=j}^n \rho_k(t) \frac{(2k-1)(-1)^{k-j} j_{(k-1)} n_{[k]}}{j!(k-j)!n_{(k)}}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq n$$

(1)

22

$$P(j | t, n) = 1 - \sum_{k=2}^n \rho_k(t) \frac{(2k-1)(-1)^k n_{[k]}}{i_{(k)}} \quad j=1$$

23

24 where $\rho_k(t) = \exp\{-k(k-1)t/2\}$, $a_{(k)} = a(a+1)\dots(a+k-1)$, $a_{[k]} = a(a-1)\dots(a-k+1)$ and t is in
 25 units of N_e (the effective population size) generations under a haploid model or
 26 $2N_e$ generations under a diploid, two sex model (TAVARE 1984; MOHLE 1998). In

1 this treatment, we consider scenarios of varying population size that have been
2 proposed by others for *Drosophila* (LI and STEPHAN 2006; DUCHEN *et al.* 2013). To
3 achieve this, t in equation 1 can be rescaled as a function of $2N_e$ at appropriate
4 times (GRIFFITHS and TAVARE 1998). For example, going backwards in time, a
5 halving of the population size at a given time would lead to t being scaled in
6 $2N_e/2$ generations at the point and further backwards.

7

8 Conditional on j ancestors at time t , the probability that a single non-specified
9 ancestor that received an insertion is represented by i copies in a sample of size n
10 under random sampling is a combinatorial probability given by:

11

$$12 \quad P(i | j, n) = \frac{(j-1)(n-i-1)!(n-j)!}{(n-1)!(n-j-i+1)!} \quad (2)$$

13 (SLATKIN 1996; SHERRY *et al.* 1997). Here, i ranges from 1 (only the ascertained
14 allele is present) to n (fixed in the sample) and we define the probability equal to
15 zero when $i > (n - j) + 1$. When j equals 1, we define all the probability to be at $i =$
16 n and when $j = n$ we define all the probability to be at $i = 1$. Interestingly, and as
17 pointed out by others (FELSENSTEIN 1992; SHERRY *et al.* 1997), when $j=2$, the
18 probability distribution is uniform from $i = 1$ to $n-1$. Note that n here includes the
19 haploid genome sample from which the insertion was ascertained and the single
20 ancestor of the haploid genome, among j ancestors, is not specified. In fact,
21 equation 2 is the probability for any chosen single ancestor out of j ancestors,
22 which may not be a reference genome ancestor. Accounting for specification of
23 the reference ancestor is achieved in the correction for ascertainment bias below.

24

25 An assumption of this model is that there are no full-length excisions of the TE
26 over this time period. This assumption is valid for RNA-based retrotransposons
27 but make the model less applicable to DNA-based transposons which undergo

1 excisions resulting in descendants of the specified ancestor that subsequently
2 lack the insertion.

3

4 Combining equations (1) and (2), the probability of i copies, conditional on t time
5 of insertion and n samples, is given by the probability of i copies conditional on j
6 ancestors, multiplied by the probability of j ancestors conditional on time t ,
7 summed over all j :

8

$$9 \quad P(i | t, n) = \sum_{j=1}^n P(i | j, n) P(j | t, n) \quad (3)$$

10

11 Equation (3) provides the probability that an insertion that occurred at time t is
12 present in a sample on n alleles, but it does not account for how the allele was
13 discovered. For TE insertions identified in a single reference genome sequence,
14 there is ascertainment bias since insertions that occur at time t and are absent
15 from the reference but present elsewhere in the sample are ignored. In this way,
16 the single ancestor for which the insertion occurred at time t must be specified.
17 To deal with this ascertainment bias, it is necessary to condition on the
18 probability that a TE of a certain specified allele count (designated i_s) in a sample
19 n is in the reference genome sequence. The probability of being ascertained in the
20 genome is the frequency in the total sample that includes the genomic reference:
21 i_s/n . Therefore, the final probability of i conditional on ascertainment - designated
22 i_a - is given by:

23

$$24 \quad P(i_a | t, n) = \frac{\frac{i_s}{n} P(i_s | t, n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{i}{n} P(i | t, n)} \quad (4)$$

25

26 *Accounting for Error in Age Estimation*

1 This formulation assumes that the age of the insertion is known absolutely,
 2 which is not the case. For a particular insertion, the uncertainty in its age
 3 estimate will be a function of the number of substitutions as well as the size of
 4 the element. For TE insertions with an equivalent proportion of unique
 5 substitutions, larger insertions will provide more accurate age estimates.
 6 Therefore, rather than assuming that the time of insertion is known, it is
 7 desirable to condition on the probability distribution of the insertion age. By
 8 doing so, one can determine the probability distribution of allele frequency in a
 9 sample given the size of the TE insertion as well as the number of substitutions
 10 that it has received since insertion. Using Bayes' rule and assuming substitutions
 11 occur according to a simple Poisson process, the probability distribution of time
 12 of insertion t is given by 1) the probability of s substitutions in fragment of length
 13 l , conditional on a specified t (designated t_s), multiplied by the probability of t_s ,
 14 divided by 2) the probability of s substitutions in fragment of length l , integrated
 15 over all time (t):

$$17 \quad P(t_s | s_l) = \frac{P(s_l | t_s)P(t_s)}{\int_0^{\infty} P(s_l | t)P(t) dt} \quad (5)$$

18
 19 In this case the prior probability distribution is $P(t)$ and $P(s_l | t)$ is determined
 20 using the Poisson distribution with the parameter λ :

$$22 \quad P(s | t) = \frac{(t\lambda)^s e^{-t\lambda}}{s!} \quad (6)$$

23
 24 Here, the Poisson parameter λ is the expected number of mutations per
 25 generation in a sequence of length l given a fixed mutation rate per base pair, u .
 26 We used an empirical Bayes approach in which the distribution of the number of
 27 substitutions within all TE insertions ascertained from the reference genome was

1 used to estimate the parameters of the prior distribution of time since insertion -
 2 here chosen to either be an exponential or gamma. Exponential/gamma priors
 3 were chosen based on their common and analagous use in Bayesian estimation of
 4 branch lengths (HUELSENBECK and RONQUIST 2001; YANG and RANNALA 2005;
 5 HEATH 2012).

6
 7 For TEs with zero substitutions since the time of insertion, the maximum
 8 likelihood estimate for t will approach zero, but such a TE will always be at least
 9 slightly older than this. Within a Bayesian framework, longer TE insertions with
 10 zero substitutions will be estimated to be younger than smaller insertions that
 11 also have zero substitutions since smaller insertions have less power in updating
 12 the prior. We also assume that the number of substitutions found in the TE
 13 sequence is small enough such that a correction for multiple hits is not necessary.
 14 The full probability distribution incorporating uncertainty in age estimates is:

$$16 \quad P(i | s_i, n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\int_0^{\infty} P(j | t, n) P(t | s_i) dt \right) P(i | j, n) \quad (7)$$

17
 18 where the integral term in the parentheses is probability of j ancestors (equation
 19 1) conditional on time of insertion (equation 5), integrated over all insertion
 20 times. The remaining probability (on the right hand side of equation 7) is the
 21 probability of i alleles in a sample conditional on j ancestors (equation 2). The full
 22 probability is the probability of i alleles, conditional on j ancestors, summed over
 23 all possible numbers of ancestors. Bias due to ascertainment in equation 7 can be
 24 corrected as above using equation 4.

25
 26 *Estimation of TE insertion allele frequency in D. melanogaster populations*

27 We selected 190 loci from LTR and non-LTR retrotransposon families whose
 28 sequences have been shown previously to evolve under a pseudogene-like mode
 29 of molecular evolution in *D. melanogaster* (BERGMAN and BENSASSON 2007) and

1 that also had PCR primer sequences available in the literature (GONZALEZ *et al.*
2 2008). We did not sample any DNA transposon families, since their ability to
3 transpose through a DNA intermediate violates the assumption that the number
4 of unique substitutions represents its time since integration. Families were
5 chosen on the basis of maximal coverage of loci in an alignment (not family age
6 or size). In total, we sampled 90 LTR and 100 non-LTR elements from the
7 following families (sample sizes in parentheses): *copia* (23), *burdock* (12), *blood*
8 (19), *412* (23), *17.6* (8), *micropia* (2), *rover* (2), *invader2* (1), *BS* (11), *Cr1a* (18), *Doc*
9 (42), *G4* (8), *G5* (4), *Helena* (5), *Juan* (7), *baggins* (2), *jockey2* (2) and *Doc3* (1). Age
10 estimates for each of these TE insertions were taken from Bergman and
11 Bensasson (2007) based on the unique substitution method.

12

13 TE insertion alleles were assayed by PCR in 12 inbred wildtype strains of *D.*
14 *melanogaster* from Zimbabwe (GLINKA *et al.* 2003): A131, A145, A191, A398, A337,
15 A229, A186, A384, A95, A157, A82, A84; and 12 inbred wildtype strains of *D.*
16 *melanogaster* from North Carolina, USA selected randomly from the *Drosophila*
17 Genetic Reference Panel (MACKAY *et al.* 2012): Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock
18 Center IDs 25745, 25744, 25208, 25207, 25203, 25188, 25199, 25196, 25204, 25198,
19 25200, 25201. Genomic DNA from each strain was prepared using 30 adults. PCR
20 cycling conditions were the same as described in Gonzalez *et al.* (2008) with some
21 minor modifications for annealing temperatures. Two PCR reactions (to test for
22 presence and absence of the TE, respectively) were conducted for each locus in
23 each strain and the presence/absence of TE insertions was scored according to
24 the same criteria as in Gonzalez *et al.* (2008). Loci that exhibited both presence
25 and absence bands in a given strain were scored as heterozygous (FBti0019430,
26 FBti0019165, FBti0019602, FBti0020077) and two alleles were counted as being
27 sampled at this strain instead of one (coded as POLYMORPHIC in File S1). PCRs
28 that failed 3 times in a given strain were scored as missing data (coded as NA in
29 File S1). The frequency of the TE insertion in the North American or African
30 sample was estimated as the number of presence alleles over the total number of

1 alleles sampled (corrected for heterozygous loci and missing data). Summaries of
2 the numbers of alleles sampled, observed allele frequencies, age estimates and
3 other metadata for each locus can be found in File S2. We note that these PCR
4 data have been independently shown to have greater than 92% concordance with
5 *in silico* TE insertion predictions based on whole genome shotgun sequences from
6 the same strains of *D. melanogaster* (CRIDLAND *et al.* 2013).

7

8 *Determination of probability distributions for TE insertion alleles under different models*
9 *of host demography.*

10 To account for non-equilibrium host demographic history in our analysis, we
11 allowed population sizes to vary over time based on published demographic
12 scenarios for African and North American populations (LI and STEPHAN 2006;
13 DUCHEN *et al.* 2013). For all calculations, the mutation rate of 1.45×10^{-9}
14 ⁹/bp/generation from Li and Stephan (2006) was used to facilitate the use of
15 these previously estimated demographic scenarios. For African samples,
16 demography was also modeled according to Li and Stephan (2006). This assumes
17 a current effective population size $N_e = 8.603 \times 10^6$ and time was scaled to
18 correspond to a five-fold expansion (to current effective population size) that
19 occurred 600,000 generations ago. For the case of the African samples,
20 consideration must be made to the fact that the reference genome sequence used
21 to ascertain the insertions was of North American origin and young insertion
22 alleles present in the reference genome are thus unlikely to be sampled in Africa.
23 For this reason, the analysis of the African sample should be seen mostly as a
24 comparison to illuminate the behavior of the model under a different
25 demographic scenario.

26

27 For the North American populations, a demographic scenario was modeled that
28 approximated previous estimates (LI and STEPHAN 2006; DUCHEN *et al.* 2013).
29 Under this scenario, the North American population is derived from a European
30 population, which itself is derived from the African population. In particular,

1 considering a current effective population of 1×10^7 , time was scaled to
2 correspond to a 300-generation bottleneck of 10,000 individuals that occurred
3 1,100 generations ago (Europe to North America migration), a European
4 population of 1.075×10^6 individuals, and a 3,400 generation bottleneck of 2,200
5 individuals that occurred 154,600 generations ago (Africa to Europe migration).
6 For the North American sample, we also consider a scenario of constant
7 population size of 1×10^6 individuals. This latter scenario serves to correct
8 potential biases that may arise from using a Bayesian posterior distribution for
9 time since insertion when there are changes in population size (see below). Since
10 the distribution of estimated TE ages has a large number of young TEs and also a
11 long tail of older TEs (BERGMAN and BENSASSON 2007), we considered two
12 parameters for the exponential prior distributions: $\lambda = 5.3 \times 10^{-6}$ and 1.875×10^{-7} .
13 Both of these parameters were determined by fitting the TE age distributions
14 empirically, either for only the youngest 143 elements or for the entire
15 distribution. Probability distributions were calculated using both of these priors
16 separately and final probabilities were determined as the weighted sum of the
17 posterior probabilities, weighted by the relative likelihood of the number of
18 observed substitutions for each element under these two priors. To allow for
19 admixture in North America populations from Africa (CARACRISTI and
20 SCHLOTTERER 2003; YUKILEVICH *et al.* 2010; VERSPOOR and HADDRILL 2011), we
21 replaced the proportion of putative African alleles from the sample (determined
22 by the expected level of admixture, assumed to lack the insertion) with the
23 number of alleles that would be expected in this subsample under neutrality in
24 the North American population.

25

26 All calculations were performed in *Mathematica 8* using numerical integration
27 with 40 recursive bisections when needed. A Mathematica notebook to run the
28 calculations presented here can be found in File S3. Results for the African
29 population under an exponential prior and varying population size can be found
30 in File S4. Results for the North American population under an exponential prior

1 and varying population size can be found in File S5. Results for the North
2 American population under an exponential prior and constant population size
3 can be found in File S6.

4

5 *Forward simulations of transposable element dynamics*

6 To understand how our model performs under conditions where transpositional
7 and demographic history are known, we performed two sets of simulation
8 experiments under the extreme case of a single burst of transposition. This is a
9 conservative test because we seek to determine the robustness of this method for
10 testing neutrality when insertion alleles are not at equilibrium and display
11 widely different frequencies. To model these dynamics, we considered the fate of
12 a large number of TE insertion alleles whose frequency was simulated using a
13 Wright-Fisher process. Since linkage disequilibrium is low in *D. melanogaster*
14 (MACKAY *et al.* 2012), it is reasonable to assume that insertion alleles are
15 independent.

16

17 In the first set (designated “time known”) we simulated forward-time, neutral
18 Wright-Fisher processes assuming a haploid population size of 1000 where a new
19 TE insertion allele inserted at time zero with an initial frequency 1/1000. Since
20 the majority of new neutral mutations are lost by drift, 10,000,000 replicate TE
21 insertions were simulated to ensure that TE insertion alleles were retained in
22 roughly 10,000 replicates. After a specified time in N_e generations, the simulation
23 was stopped. Individual TE insertions from replicate simulations were indexed
24 and allelic state for each locus was randomly allocated to individuals to generate
25 haploid genomes, each containing a set of unlinked TE insertions. From this
26 population of 1000 haploid individuals, a single reference individual was
27 selected and the allele frequency in a larger sample of 12 additional individuals
28 was determined for each of the approximately 10,000 TE insertions ascertained
29 from the reference. In some time known scenarios, negative selection was
30 simulated by adjusting the relative sampling probability of a TE insertion during

1 the Wright-Fisher process. Simulations with selection were performed only for
2 recent transposition bursts since most deleterious elements become eliminated
3 after a reasonable period of time has elapsed.

4

5 In the second set of simulations (designated “time unknown”), neutral Wright-
6 Fisher forward simulations were performed as before, but instead of
7 conditioning on a known number of generations, the number of substitutions
8 within each insertion was simulated under a Poisson distribution. To
9 approximate a population size on the order of one million, the 1.45×10^{-9}
10 /bp/generation mutation rate was scaled 1000 fold and simulations were
11 performed in a haploid population of 1000. In some time unknown scenarios, the
12 population size was changed during the simulation. For each time unknown
13 scenario, 190 TEs were selected from a randomly chosen single reference to
14 model our actual dataset, and the probability of observing as many or fewer in
15 the entire sample was determined for each of the 190 insertions, conditional on
16 the number of simulated mutations and also the specified demographic scenario
17 for the population size.

1 **Results**

2 *Analysis of model predictions in a sample with known time of insertion.*

3 We developed a neutral population genetic model to test the evolutionary forces
4 acting on TE insertions in natural populations that utilizes age information
5 contained in the sequence of the TE itself. To illustrate the application of our
6 model, Figure 2 shows the probability distribution of numbers of copies (from i
7 $=1$ to $i=n$) in a sample size of $n = 13$. To verify the accuracy of these predictions,
8 we conducted forward simulations to generate sample frequencies for TE
9 insertion alleles under the same scenario to account for ascertainment from a
10 single reference genome (see Methods for details). Comparison of the results of
11 these simulations to theoretical predictions under our model show strong
12 agreement (Figure 2). Under the non-equilibrium transposition rate scenario
13 simulated, completely neutral TE insertion alleles that occurred very recently in
14 the past are expected to be at low frequency (Figure 2A). Conversely, TE
15 insertions that have occurred distantly in the past are expected to be found in all
16 sampled alleles since they will have coalesced prior to the insertion event,
17 backwards in time (Figure 2D). At intermediate values of t (measured in unit of
18 N), the probability distribution of number of copies in a sample becomes nearly
19 flat (Figure 2B). As previously noted by others (FELSENSTEIN 1992; SHERRY *et al.*
20 1997), if a mutation has occurred when all but two members of a sample of size n
21 have coalesced, it is equally likely that the mutation is represented in 1 to $n-1$
22 copies in the sample. Thus, an insertion of intermediate age will have a very flat
23 probability distribution with high variance. For these reasons, there is little
24 power to detect deviations from neutrality for single TE insertions at
25 intermediate age. The power to detect general deviations from neutrality using
26 our approach therefore lies in using TE insertions of varying ages to determine
27 how well observed allele frequencies are correctly predicted by expected
28 frequencies across many loci. We also conducted simulations under a scenario of
29 negative selection acting on TE insertions that arose from a single recent burst of

1 transposition. In this scenario, TE insertions of a given age segregate at lower
2 frequencies than neutral insertion alleles as expected and show clear differences
3 in frequency from model predictions (Figure 2A). Because selection eliminates
4 most deleterious alleles quickly, we did not perform simulations of negative
5 selection for older transposition bursts (2 B-D).

6

7 *Analysis of model predictions in a sample with estimated time of insertion.*

8 In the previous section, we verified that our model makes reasonable predictions
9 when the time of insertion is known exactly. However, for insertions ascertained
10 empirically from a reference genome, the time of insertion can only be estimated.
11 To test the suitability of our model under more realistic assumptions, we used an
12 empirical Bayes approach in which the posterior probability distribution of time
13 since insertion is conditional on a simulated number of mutations and a prior
14 distribution of possible insertion times. We considered two classes of priors in
15 our model and tested their suitability using forward simulations. In one case, we
16 used a uniform prior representing the span of ages estimated from the copy with
17 the greatest number of substitutions. The uniform prior performed poorly and
18 predicted insertion alleles to be at frequencies higher than observed (results not
19 shown). We also evaluated the use of either an exponential or gamma
20 distribution of times since insertion, with the exponential being a special case of
21 the gamma. For recent bursts, where the mean number of substitutions per
22 element is zero, the exponential is more appropriate. In simulations where the
23 transpositional burst occurred at a sufficient time in the past, very few insertions
24 will have accumulated zero substitutions. In these scenarios, a gamma-
25 distributed prior is more appropriate. Simulations were performed again by
26 allowing for a single transpositional burst within each population, but now the
27 posterior time since insertion was estimated based on substitutions that were
28 simulated by a Poisson process. For each of the transpositional bursts that
29 occurred at a given time in the past, the parameters for the empirical prior
30 (exponential or gamma) were estimated based on the Poisson distribution of

1 substitutions. For constant population size simulations, we simulated four
2 transpositional bursts at different times. We also consider the case of a
3 transpositional burst that occurs at a time close to a rapid expansion in host
4 population size.

5
6 To characterize the behavior of this approach, we simulated a sampling strategy
7 similar to the one we actually used for the experimental data in this study. In
8 particular, we simulated transpositional bursts in populations from which one
9 reference individual was used to ascertain 190 TE insertions that were then
10 sampled from 12 additional individuals. For each simulated population, we used
11 our model to determine the distribution of 190 p-values for observing as many or
12 fewer copies in the sample for each insertion allele under the neutral model. If
13 our model is biased towards falsely rejecting the null hypothesis because it
14 systematically predicts lower TE frequencies than expected under the neutral
15 simulations, we would expect the distributions of p-values to be skewed toward
16 zero.

17
18 These simulation results show that under constant population size, p-values for
19 the probability of observing as many or fewer insertion alleles under our model
20 are not biased. This is seen at each of the four transposition burst times (Figure
21 3A). For extremely recent transposition burst times (Figure 3A, $t=0.002$ and 0.01)
22 there is very little variation in the distribution of p-values. This is because nearly
23 all such insertions have experienced insufficient time to either accumulate
24 mutations or be found in any other individuals besides the reference. Thus,
25 nearly all these insertions have the same p-value. Critically, even though these
26 represent very low frequency insertion alleles, the null hypothesis of neutrality is
27 not spuriously rejected.

28
29 While the behavior of our model is correct for constant host population sizes,
30 simulations revealed that it can be biased under scenarios in which there are both

1 transpositional bursts and changes in population size (Figure 3B). For example,
2 we simulated populations that experience a transpositional burst and then, $t=0.2$
3 generations later (forward in time), experience a sudden ten-fold increase in
4 population size, followed by sampling at $t=0.1$ generations (scaled to the new
5 population size) later. We then tested whether frequencies were as predicted,
6 assuming a known demographic scenario but unknown age. In this case, the
7 distribution of p-values that as many or fewer insertion alleles are observed in
8 the sample are skewed toward zero (Figure 3B). Since times of insertion are not
9 precisely known, a significant part of the mass of the posterior distribution for
10 ages is greater than 0.3 (i.e. before the transposition burst during the period prior
11 to the population expansion). During this extended time, the population size is
12 much smaller and the rate of coalescence is faster, leading to an expectation of
13 higher allele frequency under neutrality relative to observed. As an illustration of
14 this effect, consider an extreme scenario in which a recent transpositional burst
15 occurred two generations after a large and rapid increase in population size.
16 Under neutrality, the behavior of the insertions is predicted entirely by the new
17 population size. However, a Bayesian approach places a significant proportion of
18 the posterior probability for time of insertion in the era preceding the population
19 expansion. This leads to an increased expectation that the insertion alleles will be
20 at higher frequency. Under this scenario, our approach will therefore be correct
21 only to the extent that the posterior distribution of ages is similar to the actual
22 distribution of ages.

23

24 To account for this problem, one conservative approach to testing whether
25 negative selection is shaping allele frequencies is to model the current population
26 size only and ignore historical smaller population sizes. In our simulations, we
27 employed this approach by estimating the probability distribution using only the
28 current population size (Figure 3B, Constant Model). As can be seen, this
29 approach does not lead to spurious rejection of the null hypothesis and in fact is
30 highly conservative in a test for negative selection.

1

2 *Testing neutrality of TE insertions in D. melanogaster under non-equilibrium*
3 *conditions.*

4 The age distribution of the 190 TE insertions sampled in this study indicates a
5 large number of copies that have experienced either zero or few substitutions as
6 well as a significant number that are much older (Figure 4). To fit this
7 distribution of ages, we considered two different parameters for the prior
8 exponential distribution. We consider a prior lambda for the exponential based
9 on the mean number of substitutions for all TEs and also consider a separate
10 lambda estimated for the very young TEs. Final probability distributions were
11 weighted in proportion to the respective probabilities for observing the specified
12 number of mutations under each of these two priors.

13

14 Using this general modeling framework, and keeping in mind the conditions
15 under which this approach may be biased (see above), we applied our model to
16 190 TE loci in two populations of *D. melanogaster* (Figure 5). In the case of the
17 North American sample, we determined how well the expected values under our
18 model fit the data as a function of rank age of insertion estimates under a
19 scenario of varying population size that included a substantial bottleneck in the
20 migration out of Africa and also out of Europe (Figure 5A). Several observations
21 are evident. First, Pearson's r for the overall correlation between observed and
22 expected under the model is 0.85, indicating that the incorporation of age
23 information can explain a significant amount of variation in insertion frequencies
24 under neutrality. Second, the model predicts consistently higher than observed
25 allele frequencies for young (insertions with zero unique substitutions) and
26 middle-aged insertions (those with at least 1 substitution, up to 0.9% divergence).
27 At face value, this result provides evidence for selection acting against TE
28 insertion alleles limiting their increase. However, given our simulation results
29 that modeling recent population growth can lead to overestimates in expected
30 allele frequency, and given that the North American population of *D.*

1 *melanogaster* is known to have undergone recent population expansion (LI and
2 STEPHAN 2006; DUCHEN *et al.* 2013), we suggest this result should be interpreted
3 with caution (see below).

4
5 In contrast to the North American sample, fewer young alleles are segregating at
6 intermediate frequencies in African sample. This is also expected in the African
7 population because alleles take a longer time to drift to higher frequency in
8 larger populations. It is also expected since the insertion alleles were ascertained
9 from a non-African genome. Due to the larger population size and screening
10 bias, more insertions are expected to be segregating at lower frequencies in
11 Africa in contrast to North America. The results are consistent with this
12 prediction. For the most part, TE insertions appear to either be segregating at
13 either low or high frequencies in the African sample. Nevertheless, as with the
14 North American population, the correlation between observed and expected
15 allele frequencies under the model is quite high (Pearson's $r=0.94$). As such, the
16 signal for negative selection acting against TE insertions in the African sample is
17 not as strong as it is in the North American sample, although it is also evident for
18 some moderately aged TEs in the Africa sample.

19
20 Many previous studies have shown an accumulation of TEs in regions of low
21 recombination of the *D. melanogaster* genome (RIZZON *et al.* 2002; BACHTROG 2003;
22 DOLGIN and CHARLESWORTH 2008). Our PCR data are consistent with this
23 observation and our model also performs well in predicting the fixation of the
24 older class of TE insertions largely residing in regions of low recombination
25 (Figure 5). Likewise, previous work has shown that LTR elements are on average
26 younger than non-LTR elements in *D. melanogaster* (BERGMAN and BENSASSON
27 2007). Consistent with this previous finding, observed allele frequencies for non-
28 LTR insertions are typically higher than for LTR insertions in our sample (see
29 also KOFLER *et al.* 2012). Jointly, low recombination rate regions of the genome
30 (pericentromeric regions and chromosome 4) show a greater density of older

1 non-LTR insertions that are mostly fixed. However, a lack of fixation can be
2 observed for some LTR elements in low recombination regions of the genome,
3 where they would otherwise be expected to be fixed (BARTOLOME and MASIDE
4 2004). These observations further support the idea that LTR elements are young
5 in *D. melanogaster* and that young TE insertions will be at low allele frequency in
6 this species.

7

8 *Accounting for bias when testing for negative selection on TE insertions*

9 As shown in Figure 5A, by conditioning on TE age and taking into account
10 changes in population size, we observe that TE insertion alleles in North America
11 are segregating at frequencies that are lower than expected. This suggests that
12 negative selection is limiting the spread of TEs, and is consistent with the results
13 of previous analyses that assumed constant transposition rates (CHARLESWORTH
14 and LANGLEY 1989; PETROV *et al.* 2003; LOCKTON *et al.* 2008; GONZALEZ *et al.* 2009;
15 LEE and LANGLEY 2010). However, this inference is confounded by several forms
16 of bias that arise from the interplay between non-equilibrium host demographic
17 history and uncertainty in the estimate of the age of TE insertions. As discussed
18 above, when a transposition bursts occur close in time to a change in population
19 size, using a Bayesian approach to estimating time since insertion can cause our
20 model to predict frequencies higher than should be expected and lead to biases
21 in inference. Additionally, our analysis of TE dynamics in the North American
22 population in Figure 5 assumes a demographic scenario that does not account for
23 admixture between North American and African populations (CARACRISTI and
24 SCHLOTTERER 2003; YUKILEVICH *et al.* 2010; VERSPOOR and HADDRILL 2011).

25

26 To account for these issues, we took the conservative approach suggested by our
27 simulation results (Fig 3B) by modeling the population size to be constant and
28 equal to one million individuals. One million is slightly lower than the long term
29 estimated effective population size of Africa (1,150,000: (CHARLESWORTH 2009))
30 and the current European population (1,075,000: (LI and STEPHAN 2006)). Under

1 this scenario, the predicted effect of ancestral bottlenecks on allele frequencies is
2 ignored. In addition, we also attempted to account for known admixture
3 between North American and African populations that is estimated to be around
4 15% (DUCHEN *et al.* 2013). Specifically, we accounted for the possible effects of
5 immigration of alleles from Africa that lack the TE insertion in lowering the
6 observed TE frequency in North America by replacing 15% of the absence alleles
7 at a locus with the expected number that would be derived from a sample of
8 neutral alleles in North America.

9

10 Figure 6A plots the observed and expected North American frequencies under
11 this revised scenario for the demographic history in North America. As
12 anticipated, the observed and expected counts are more similar, since past
13 bottlenecks are not influencing the predicted frequencies. Under this revised
14 demographic model, Pearson's r for the overall correlation between observed
15 and expected frequencies is 0.93, indicating a neutral model that is conservative
16 can explain nearly all the variation in insertion frequencies. Under this
17 conservative test, we find little support for the conclusion that selection acts to
18 limit frequencies of the youngest TEs in our sample (i.e. those with zero
19 substitutions). Many of these TEs may have inserted quite recently and are not
20 expected to be at high frequency. Furthermore, since these TEs have zero
21 substitutions, there is little power to distinguish their age from either having just
22 transposed in the last few generations or further back in time, but not long
23 enough ago to have accumulated a substitution.

24

25 In contrast, we do still observe lower allele frequencies for middle-aged TEs than
26 expected under neutrality. As noted above, alleles of intermediate age are
27 expected to be found at wide range of sample frequencies and for these alleles
28 we do not have strong power to reject deviation from neutrality on an individual
29 element basis. In aggregate, however, we find that for middle-aged insertions,
30 the probability of observing as many or fewer copies is systematically skewed

1 toward probabilities that are lower, with 23 p-values above and 62 p-values
2 below 0.5 (Sign test: $p < 0.0001$) (Figure 6B). Thus, even when we perform a
3 conservative test of neutrality that accounts for potential bias in our method and
4 admixture in the North American population, we still find evidence for negative
5 selection acting to limit the frequency of middle-aged TE insertions in *D.*
6 *melanogaster*.

7

8 In addition to these forms of bias due to non-equilibrium host demography,
9 there are two possible sources of error by which TE insertion age (and therefore
10 expected frequency) might be overestimated in our data and lead to a false
11 signature of negative selection. One potential source of error would be caused by
12 mutations that occur during the transposition process itself. For example, an
13 error during the reverse transcription reaction would lead to a unique point
14 substitution that would be incorrectly inferred have arisen after, rather than
15 during, insertion. Studies of the *Ty1* retrotransposon in yeast indicate that this
16 rate can be as high as 2.5×10^{-5} per base pair (GABRIEL *et al.* 1996). We identified
17 154 TE insertions that were either young or middle-aged and showed evidence
18 for negative selection. At an average size of 3789 base pairs, this would mean we
19 expect about 15 of these 154 insertions have experienced such a mutation event
20 during integration, assuming the rates for *Ty1* hold for the different TE families
21 in our sample. To account for the effect of this potential source of error, we
22 removed the 15 young or middle-aged TE insertions with the lowest estimated
23 probabilities of being at their observed frequency.

24

25 A second potential source of error that would lead to over-estimation of TE age is
26 if a all but one copy of an active sub-lineage in a family are lost or absent from
27 the set of paralogous TEs sampled in the reference genome sequence. In this case,
28 the age for the remaining insertion on that sub-lineage in the family would be
29 over-estimated. To eliminate this problem, we identified ten middle age TE
30 insertions that demonstrated a bias toward substitutions in the third position

1 indicative of selective constraint on an active lineage. For these TEs, it is plausible
2 that other representatives of the same sub-lineage may be absent from the
3 reference genome sequence, leading to overestimation of time of insertion. After
4 removing these ten TEs, the number of third position substitutions in the
5 remaining set was identical to the average of 1st and 2nd position substitutions.
6 After eliminating both classes of TEs whose ages are plausibly over-estimated (25
7 in total) as well as all putative adaptive TEs (see below) from the middle-aged
8 set, we still observe a significant skew of p-values for middle age TEs in the
9 North American sample, with 15 p-values above and 39 p-values below 0.5 (Sign
10 test: $p=0.0015$). Thus even after applying demographic and age estimation
11 corrections, we still find evidence that negative selection acts against middle-
12 aged TEs in North American populations of *D. melanogaster*, despite low power
13 to detect deviations from neutrality for this age class.

14

15 *Identification of candidate adaptive TE insertions.*

16 Despite general evidence for negative selection on many TE insertions, we also
17 found evidence that several TE insertions are at higher frequency than expected
18 and could therefore represent adaptive TE insertions. Under the constant
19 population size model in the North American population, we find that the
20 previously characterized adaptive Fbti0019430 *Doc* insertion in the *CHKov1* gene
21 (PETROV *et al.* 2003; AMINETZACH *et al.* 2005) has a 0.19 probability of being as or
22 more frequent in the sample. Using this probability as a liberal inclusive
23 threshold (in light of the reduced power that occurs when we relax equilibrium
24 assumptions), we identify seven other insertions that show higher frequencies
25 than expected in North America in high recombination regions (Table 1). Within
26 the African sample, we find two TE insertions that meet this criterion. One of
27 these is a *Doc* insertion (FBti0019199) in the intergenic region between the genes
28 *Pde11* and *CG15160* that is also found at higher than expected frequency in the
29 North American sample, suggesting it is globally adaptive. Another candidate, a
30 *412* element (FBti0020082) inserted between the genes *Or67a* and *Ir67a*, resides in

1 a region that has previously been reported to show signatures of adaptive
2 evolution (CONCEICAO and AGUADE 2010). Importantly, since this method
3 conditions on age, it is capable of identifying alleles that are potentially adaptive
4 but not fixed. For example, a *BS* element (FBti0020125) in the intron of the gene
5 *CG43373* is present in only four of 12 African alleles sampled, but the probability
6 of achieving such a high frequency under neutrality is 0.06. It should be noted
7 that since the critical p-values for detecting putative adaptive insertions were
8 made assuming a constant population size, they may be biased. An examination
9 of the p-values under the model of varying population size (Table 1) indicates
10 that many of these candidate adaptive TEs may have achieved the observed
11 frequency by drift alone. Evidence for adaptation is strongest for insertions that
12 are high in both Africa and North America (FBti0020125 and FBti0019199).
13 Nonetheless, additional study is clearly required before concluding the insertions
14 besides Fbti0019430 listed in Table 1 are adaptive.

1 **Discussion**

2 Here we show that the number of substitutions that have occurred on a TE
3 sequence after its insertion in the genome can be used to test the neutrality of the
4 allele frequency of that TE in a population sample. In so doing, we remove the
5 need to assume anything about the transposition rate of TEs (at either the copy or
6 family level), and as a consequence relax the assumption of a fixed transposition
7 rate that underpins most models of TE evolution such as transposition-selection
8 balance. Our model is also able to account for aspects of host demography that
9 may confound the interpretation that TE insertion alleles have been driven to
10 high frequency by selection rather than drift. Application of our model to a
11 North American and an African sample of *D. melanogaster* shows that the age of a
12 TE allele can explain more than 80% of the variation in allele frequency under
13 complete neutrality. This demonstrates that it is important to take age structure
14 of TE insertions into account when testing models of TE evolution. We also
15 provide evidence to confirm the prevailing view that many TE insertions are
16 likely under negative selection in a North American population of *D.*
17 *melanogaster*, even though they may have been proliferating by periodic bursts of
18 activity in this species (BLUMENSTIEL *et al.* 2002; BERGMAN and BENSASSON 2007).

19

20 Furthermore, using this method we were able to identify a small number of
21 putatively adaptive TE insertions, including one (Fbti0019430) that was
22 previously identified to be a target of positive selection (PETROV *et al.* 2003;
23 AMINETZACH *et al.* 2005). However, when cross-referenced with two other studies
24 that identified potentially adaptive TEs by different methods (GONZALEZ *et al.*
25 2008; KOFLER *et al.* 2012), only Fbti0019430 was found as a candidate in all three
26 studies. This suggests that inferences of positive selection on TEs may be model
27 dependent and that a joint approach using all three methods will be useful in
28 screening for all possible sites of adaptation due to TE insertion. Further work,
29 such as examining patterns of nucleotide variation in regions flanking TE

1 insertions for signatures of selective sweeps (AMINETZACH *et al.* 2005; GONZALEZ
2 *et al.* 2008; KOFLER *et al.* 2012) and functional studies, will be necessary to show
3 that these TE insertion alleles are indeed found in positively selected regions of
4 the genome and to determine if the TE insertion is in fact the target of selection.

5

6 There are several caveats with respect to the method presented here for testing
7 departures from neutrality of TE insertion alleles. The power of our approach
8 depends jointly on the effective population size and the mutation rate of the
9 species in question. *D. melanogaster* has an effective population size of the order
10 of one million and a mutation rate of 1.45×10^{-9} mutations/bp/generation. Thus,
11 for an unconstrained 5 kb TE insertion, approximately thirty nucleotide
12 mutations are expected during the sojourn time between insertion and fixation,
13 and we should have reasonable power to detect deviations from neutrality in this
14 species. For substantially smaller populations, the time scale of mutation will be
15 less than the time scale of drift to fixation within the population and there will be
16 less power to detect deviations from neutrality with this method.

17

18 In addition, this method assumes there are not strong systematic errors in age
19 estimation of TE insertions. Such errors could arise either from poor genome
20 assembly of repeat sequences, inaccurate estimation of terminal branch lengths,
21 or gene conversion events across dispersed repeat sequences that erase age
22 information. It is unlikely that assembly quality impacts our results since TEs in
23 *D. melanogaster* have been finished to high quality (CELNIKER *et al.* 2002;
24 KAMINKER *et al.* 2002). Likewise, at least for the LTR retrotransposons used here,
25 age estimates based on terminal branch lengths are likely to be reasonably
26 accurate since they correlate with independent age estimates based on intra-
27 element LTR-LTR comparisons (BERGMAN and BENSASSON 2007). If gene
28 conversion among paralogous TE is indeed ongoing in the *D. melanogaster*
29 genome, this source of error does not appear systematic because it would lead to
30 global underestimation of true insertion age, which in turn would incorrectly

1 lead to a prediction of lower insertion frequencies than is actually observed. For
2 the demographic scenario that is most strongly supported by the population
3 genetic data presented here, allele frequencies were in fact predicted to be higher
4 than observed, opposite to the effect expected under pervasive gene conversion
5 among paralogs. However, this issue is of concern for TEs that we classify as
6 potentially adaptive, since these TEs that have experienced homogenization by
7 gene conversion might in fact be older than their estimated age and therefore
8 segregating at a high frequency as expected under neutrality.

9
10 Additional caveats relate to the use of a Bayesian approach to estimate the age of
11 TE insertions when dealing with very young TEs and when transposition bursts
12 occur close in time to host population expansions. Many young, zero-
13 substitution TE insertion alleles were in fact not found in any strains in the
14 population sample besides the reference genome. The interpretation that
15 negative selection is acting to prevent these young TEs from reaching modest
16 frequency implicitly depends on the assumption that these zero-substitution TEs
17 represent a range of ages or that other slightly older TEs within the zero-
18 substitution class have been removed from the population by selection and are
19 therefore not to be found in the reference genome. In this regard, our method still
20 shares some affinity with methods that make assumptions of transposition-
21 selection balance (CHARLESWORTH and LANGLEY 1989; PETROV *et al.* 2003), since it
22 generates an expected frequency in the population based on a theoretical
23 distribution of insertion ages, not precisely known ages. Bayesian estimation of
24 TE insertion age also can lead our model to generate incorrect predictions about
25 allele frequency when bursts of transposition occur close in time to changes in
26 host population size. In such cases, a significant part of the mass of the posterior
27 distribution for estimated allele ages can be placed before or after the actual time
28 of insertion, leading predictions of the model to be influenced by population
29 sizes not experienced by the insertion. Thus, when testing neutrality, it is

1 important to condition on a demographic scenario that is conservative with
2 respect to the manner in which neutrality may be rejected.

3

4 Despite these caveats, our work provides an advance over previous work in
5 several regards. We show that an age-based test of neutrality can be constructed
6 that takes advantage of the molecular evolutionary information intrinsic to large
7 insertion mutations like TEs. This result permits development of a new class of
8 models to test the general mode of evolution of TE insertions that relax the
9 assumption a fixed transposition rate, an assumption that is highly unlikely
10 given what is known about the biology of TEs but which currently underlies
11 models of transposition-selection balance. Such a test may be beneficial in
12 determining how selection against TEs varies among species, because it can take
13 into account differences in the histories of TE proliferation. In addition, this
14 method is capable of eliminating, without a defined age threshold, the older class
15 of TE insertions as being candidates for recent adaptation. It also discriminates
16 against detecting high frequency insertions that may appear to be young, but in
17 fact lack substantial age information. For example, one *G4* element (FBti0019755,
18 Rank #17 in Figure 5) is found at high frequency but has zero substitutions.
19 However, the age estimate for this insertion is based on only 40 bp of sequence
20 and is therefore unreliable, and thus this TE fails to meet the threshold of being
21 at an unusual frequency given its age.

22

23 Importantly, TEs are not the only form of insertion mutation that have this
24 additional age information, and thus our approach could be extended and
25 applied to other insertion alleles, such as gene duplications and other copy
26 number variants. If the number of substitutions that have occurred since
27 duplication can be estimated (for example, from silent sites or intronic regions,
28 assuming no purifying selection is acting at these positions), one may also ask
29 whether the allele frequency of new gene duplicates are consistent with
30 neutrality using the approach developed here.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 We thank Wolfgang Stephan and Nicolas Svetec for providing African strains of
3 *D. melanogaster*; Dmitri Petrov for providing PCR primer sequences; Dan Hartl,
4 John Wakeley, Brian Charlesworth, Adam Eyre-Walker, Daniel Živkovi•,
5 Matthew Ronshaugen and Maria Orive for helpful discussion during the project;
6 and Stephen Wright and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on the
7 manuscript.

1 **References**

- 2 AMINETZACH, Y. T., J. M. MACPHERSON and D. A. PETROV, 2005 Pesticide resistance via
3 transposition-mediated adaptive gene truncation in *Drosophila*. *Science* **309**: 764-
4 767.
- 5 BACHTROG, D., 2003 Accumulation of Spock and Worf, two novel non-LTR
6 retrotransposons, on the neo-Y chromosome of *Drosophila miranda*. *Mol Biol*
7 *Evol* **20**: 173-181.
- 8 BARTOLOME, C., and X. MASIDE, 2004 The lack of recombination drives the fixation of
9 transposable elements on the fourth chromosome of *Drosophila melanogaster*.
10 *Genet Res* **83**: 91-100.
- 11 BERGMAN, C. M., and D. BENSASSON, 2007 Recent LTR retrotransposon insertion
12 contrasts with waves of non-LTR insertion since speciation in *Drosophila*
13 *melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
14 *States of America* **104**: 11340-11345.
- 15 BIEMONT, C., F. LEMEUNIER, M. P. G. GUERREIRO, J. F. BROOKFIELD, C. GAUTIER *et al.*,
16 1994 Population dynamics of the copia, mdg1, mdg3, gypsy, and P transposable
17 elements in a natural population of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetical Research*
18 **63**: 197-212.
- 19 BLUMENSTIEL, J. P., D. L. HARTL and E. R. LOZOVSKY, 2002 Patterns of insertion and
20 deletion in contrasting chromatin domains. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **19**:
21 2211-2225.
- 22 CARACRISTI, G., and C. SCHLOTTERER, 2003 Genetic differentiation between American
23 and European *Drosophila melanogaster* populations could be attributed to
24 admixture of African alleles. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **20**: 792-799.
- 25 CELNIKER, S. E., D. A. WHEELER, B. KRONMILLER, J. W. CARLSON, A. HALPERN *et al.*,
26 2002 Finishing a whole-genome shotgun: release 3 of the *Drosophila*
27 *melanogaster* euchromatic genome sequence. *Genome Biol* **3**: RESEARCH0079.
- 28 CHARLESWORTH, B., 2009 Effective population size and patterns of molecular evolution
29 and variation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **10**: 195-205.
- 30 CHARLESWORTH, B., and C. H. LANGLEY, 1989 The population genetics of *Drosophila*
31 transposable elements. *Annual Review of Genetics* **23**: 251-287.
- 32 CHARLESWORTH, B., P. SNIEGOWSKI and W. STEPHAN, 1994 The evolutionary dynamics
33 of repetitive DNA in eukaryotes. *Nature* **371**: 215-220.
- 34 CONCEICAO, I. C., and M. AGUADE, 2010 Odorant receptor (Or) genes: polymorphism
35 and divergence in the *D. melanogaster* and *D. pseudoobscura* lineages. *PLoS One*
36 **5**: e13389.
- 37 CRIDLAND, J. M., S. J. MACDONALD, A. D. LONG and K. R. THORNTON, 2013 Abundance
38 and Distribution of Transposable Elements in Two *Drosophila* QTL Mapping
39 Resources. *Mol Biol Evol* **30**: 2311-2327.
- 40 DANIELS, S. B., K. R. PETERSON, L. D. STRAUSBAUGH, M. G. KIDWELL and A. CHOVNICK,
41 1990 Evidence for Horizontal Transmission of the P-Transposable Element
42 between *Drosophila* Species. *Genetics* **124**: 339-355.
- 43 DE LA CHAUX, N., and A. WAGNER, 2009 Evolutionary dynamics of the LTR
44 retrotransposons roo and rooA inferred from twelve complete *Drosophila*
45 genomes. *Bmc Evolutionary Biology* **9**.

1 DOLGIN, E. S., and B. CHARLESWORTH, 2008 The effects of recombination rate on the
2 distribution and abundance of transposable elements. *Genetics* **178**: 2169-2177.

3 DUCHEN, P., D. ZIVKOVIC, S. HUTTER, W. STEPHAN and S. LAURENT, 2013 Demographic
4 inference reveals African and European admixture in the North American
5 *Drosophila melanogaster* population. *Genetics* **193**: 291-301.

6 FELSENSTEIN, J., 1992 Estimating effective population size from samples of sequences:
7 inefficiency of pairwise and segregating sites as compared to phylogenetic
8 estimates. *Genet Res* **59**: 139-147.

9 FRANCHINI, L. F., E. W. GANKO and J. F. McDONALD, 2004 Retrotransposon-gene
10 associations are widespread among *D-melanogaster* populations. *Molecular*
11 *Biology and Evolution* **21**: 1323-1331.

12 GABRIEL, A., M. WILLEMS, E. H. MULES and J. D. BOEKE, 1996 Replication infidelity
13 during a single cycle of Ty1 retrotransposition. *Proceedings of the National*
14 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **93**: 7767-7771.

15 GLINKA, S., L. OMETTO, S. MOUSSET, W. STEPHAN and D. DE LORENZO, 2003
16 Demography and natural selection have shaped genetic variation in *Drosophila*
17 *melanogaster*: a multi-locus approach. *Genetics* **165**: 1269-1278.

18 GONZALEZ, J., K. LENKOV, M. LIPATOV, J. M. MACPHERSON and D. A. PETROV, 2008
19 High Rate of Recent Transposable Element-Induced Adaptation in *Drosophila*
20 *melanogaster*. *Plos Biology* **6**: 2109-2129.

21 GONZALEZ, J., J. M. MACPHERSON, P. W. MESSER and D. A. PETROV, 2009 Inferring the
22 Strength of Selection in *Drosophila* under Complex Demographic Models.
23 *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **26**: 513-526.

24 GRIFFITHS, R. C., and S. TAVARE, 1998 The Age of a Mutation in a general coalescent
25 tree. *Commun. Statist. - Stochastic Models* **14**: 273-295.

26 HEATH, T. A., 2012 A hierarchical Bayesian model for calibrating estimates of species
27 divergence times. *Syst Biol* **61**: 793-809.

28 HUELSENBECK, J. P., and F. RONQUIST, 2001 MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of
29 phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics* **17**: 754-755.

30 KAMINKER, J. S., C. M. BERGMAN, B. KRONMILLER, J. CARLSON, R. SVIRSKAS *et al.*, 2002
31 The Transposable Elements of the *Drosophila melanogaster* euchromatin: a
32 genomics perspective. *Genome Biology* **3**.

33 KIDWELL, M. G., 1983 Evolution of hybrid dysgenesis determinants in *Drosophila*
34 *melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
35 *States of America-Biological Sciences* **80**: 1655-1659.

36 KIMURA, M., and T. OHTA, 1973 Age of a neutral mutant persisting in a finite population.
37 *Genetics* **75**: 199-212.

38 KOFLER, R., A. J. BETANCOURT and C. SCHLOETTERER, 2012 Sequencing of Pooled DNA
39 Samples (Pool-Seq) Uncovers Complex Dynamics of Transposable Element
40 Insertions in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Plos Genetics* **8**.

41 LANDER, E. S., L. M. LINTON, B. BIRREN, C. NUSBAUM, M. C. ZODY *et al.*, 2001 Initial
42 sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature* **409**: 860-921.

43 LANGLEY, C. H., E. MONTGOMERY, R. HUDSON, N. KAPLAN and B. CHARLESWORTH,
44 1988 On the role of unequal exchange in the containment of transposable element
45 copy number. *Genetical Research* **52**: 223-235.

- 1 LEE, Y. C. G., and C. H. LANGLEY, 2010 Transposable elements in natural populations of
2 *Drosophila melanogaster*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-
3 Biological Sciences **365**: 1219-1228.
- 4 LI, H. P., and W. STEPHAN, 2006 Inferring the demographic history and rate of adaptive
5 substitution in *Drosophila*. Plos Genetics **2**: 1580-1589.
- 6 LIPATOV, M., K. LENKOV, D. A. PETROV and C. M. BERGMAN, 2005 Paucity of chimeric
7 gene-transposable element transcripts in the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome.
8 BMC Biol **3**: 24.
- 9 LOCKTON, S., J. ROSS-IBARRA and B. S. GAUT, 2008 Demography and weak selection
10 drive patterns of transposable element diversity in natural populations of
11 *Arabidopsis lyrata*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
12 United States of America **105**: 13965-13970.
- 13 LU, C., J. J. CHEN, Y. ZHANG, Q. HU, W. Q. SU *et al.*, 2012 Miniature Inverted-Repeat
14 Transposable Elements (MITEs) Have Been Accumulated through Amplification
15 Bursts and Play Important Roles in Gene Expression and Species Diversity in
16 *Oryza sativa*. Molecular Biology and Evolution **29**: 1005-1017.
- 17 MACKAY, T. F., S. RICHARDS, E. A. STONE, A. BARBADILLA, J. F. AYROLES *et al.*, 2012
18 The *Drosophila melanogaster* Genetic Reference Panel. Nature **482**: 173-178.
- 19 MOHLE, M., 1998 Coalescent results for two-sex population models. Advances in
20 Applied Probability **30**: 513-520.
- 21 MONTGOMERY, E., B. CHARLESWORTH and C. H. LANGLEY, 1987 A test for the role of
22 natural selection in the stabilization of transposable element copy number in a
23 population of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genet Res **49**: 31-41.
- 24 NEAFSEY, D. E., J. P. BLUMENSTIEL and D. L. HARTL, 2004 Different regulatory
25 mechanisms underlie similar transposable element profiles in pufferfish and
26 fruitflies. Mol Biol Evol **21**: 2310-2318.
- 27 NUZHIDIN, S. V., 1999 Sure facts, speculations, and open questions about the evolution of
28 transposable element copy number. Genetica **107**: 129-137.
- 29 NUZHIDIN, S. V., E. G. PASYUKOVA and T. F. C. MACKAY, 1996 Positive association
30 between copia transposition rate and copy number in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
31 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences **263**:
32 823-831.
- 33 PETROV, D. A., Y. T. AMINETZACH, J. C. DAVIS, D. BENSASSON and A. E. HIRSH, 2003
34 Size matters: Non-LTR retrotransposable elements and ectopic recombination in
35 *Drosophila*. Molecular Biology and Evolution **20**: 880-892.
- 36 PETROV, D. A., A. S. FISTON-LAVIER, M. LIPATOV, K. LENKOV and J. GONZALEZ, 2011
37 Population Genomics of Transposable Elements in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
38 Molecular Biology and Evolution **28**: 1633-1644.
- 39 PETROV, D. A., E. R. LOZOVSKAYA and D. L. HARTL, 1996 High intrinsic rate of DNA
40 loss in *Drosophila*. Nature **384**: 346-349.
- 41 RIZZON, C., G. MARAIS, M. GOUY and C. BIEMONT, 2002 Recombination rate and the
42 distribution of transposable elements in the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome.
43 Genome Res **12**: 400-407.
- 44 SANMIGUEL, P., B. S. GAUT, A. TIKHONOV, Y. NAKAJIMA and J. L. BENNETZEN, 1998
45 The paleontology of intergene retrotransposons of maize. Nat Genet **20**: 43-45.

1 SHERRY, S. T., H. C. HARPENDING, M. A. BATZER and M. STONEKING, 1997 Alu
2 evolution in human populations: Using the coalescent to estimate effective
3 population size. *Genetics* **147**: 1977-1982.

4 SLATKIN, M., 1996 Gene genealogies within mutant allelic classes. *Genetics* **143**: 579-
5 587.

6 SLATKIN, M., 2000 Allele age and a test for selection on rare alleles. *Philosophical*
7 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences* **355**:
8 1663-1668.

9 TAVARE, S., 1984 Line-of-descent and genealogical processes, and their applications in
10 population-genetics models. *Theoretical Population Biology* **26**: 119-164.

11 VERSPOOR, R. L., and P. R. HADDRILL, 2011 Genetic Diversity, Population Structure and
12 *Wolbachia* Infection Status in a Worldwide Sample of *Drosophila melanogaster*
13 and *D. simulans* Populations. *PLoS One* **6**.

14 YANG, H. P., and S. V. NUZHIDIN, 2003 Fitness costs of Doc expression are insufficient to
15 stabilize its copy number in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and*
16 *Evolution* **20**: 800-804.

17 YANG, Z., and B. RANNALA, 2005 Branch-length prior influences Bayesian posterior
18 probability of phylogeny. *Syst Biol* **54**: 455-470.

19 YUKILEVICH, R., T. L. TURNER, F. AOKI, S. V. NUZHIDIN and J. R. TRUE, 2010 Patterns
20 and Processes of Genome-Wide Divergence Between North American and
21 African *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **186**: 219-U374.

22
23

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Figure 1.** Method for estimating TE insertion age based on unique substitution
3 counts from insertions gathered from a single reference. A) i) Schematic of
4 evolutionary dynamics for two active sub-lineages of the same TE family,
5 depicting recent transposition events (arrows) leading to new TE insertions
6 (rectangles) and post-insertion mutation events (black tick marks inside
7 rectangles). Each horizontal line represents a single chromosomal segment in a
8 population sample. Dashed lines indicate where segments lack a TE sequence
9 relative to the reference genome. TEs located above segments are insertions not
10 present in the reference genome. In this example, TE insertion **a** has recently
11 integrated, is at low frequency in the population sample and has accumulated no
12 unique mutations. In contrast, TE insertions **b**, **c** and **d** represent older insertions
13 that are at higher frequency in the population which have accumulated unique
14 mutations. ii) Schematic depicting the procedure used to estimate the age of TE
15 insertions identified in the reference genome. A multiple alignment of all
16 paralogous copies of the TE family from the reference is generated. Variant sites
17 are identified and classified as being shared or unique, with only the number of
18 substitutions unique to each reference insertion, s , being used to estimate the age
19 since insertion. Shared substitutions are inferred to arise on active lineages and
20 excluded from the estimate of allele age. Our model contrasts age based on s with
21 TE insertion allele frequency in the population, i . Older reference insertions with
22 higher s are expected to have a greater frequency i under neutrality. B) Schematic
23 of coalescent process for a TE insertion that is ascertained from a reference
24 genome sequence. Frequency in the sample is a function of the number of
25 descendants from a single ancestor that received the insertion at time t and gave
26 rise the reference insertion allele. In this example, insertion **c** from panel A
27 inserted at the time at which the $n=7$ sample alleles have $j=3$ ancestors. All
28 descendants from the insertion contain the insertion allele ($i=3$). Since the time of
29 insertion, $s=2$ unique substitutions have accumulated on the reference insertion.

1 It is only these unique substitutions leading to the reference allele that are used
2 to estimate the age of the TE insertion. Other mutations arise independently on
3 non-reference insertion alleles, which could in principle be used to estimate the
4 time to the most recent common ancestor (TMRCA) of the insertions allele, but
5 are *not* used here.

6

7 **Figure 2.** Probability for i , number of insertion copies in the sample, under model
8 predictions and simulations. t indicates known time since insertion. Selection
9 was only simulated for the case where $t=0.1$ (A) because deleterious elements
10 become quickly eliminated from the population at later times.

11

12 **Figure 3.** Distribution of p-values for observing as many or fewer insertion
13 alleles, for 190 simulated insertion loci, where ages of each TE are estimated
14 using the model from a Poisson simulated number of substitutions. Median p-
15 value is indicated with a bold line, upper and lower quartiles with a box, range
16 with whiskers and outliers with dots. A) Effects of time since insertion, t , on
17 model based inference. A constant population size of $N_e = 1000$ was simulated
18 with varying time of insertion = t . Inference under the model used constant N_e . B)
19 Effects of varying N_e on model based inference. After a transposition burst, a
20 population of 100 was simulated for 20 generations ($t=0.2$) followed by
21 expansion to 1000 individuals for 100 generations ($t=0.1$) for a total $t=0.3$.
22 Inference under the model was performed in two ways. Under the varying
23 model, the probability of observing as many or fewer alleles was estimated,
24 conditional on the same demographic scenario that was simulated. Under the
25 constant model, the probability of observing as many or fewer alleles was
26 estimated, conditional on a constant (post-expansion) population size of 1000.

27

28 **Figure 4.** Distribution of ages (in s , unique subs/bp) of the 190 TEs used for this
29 analysis.

30

1 **Figure 5.** Observed and expected allele counts under models of varying
2 population size for North American and African populations of *D. melanogaster*.
3 In both panels, loci are ranked by age and the analysis accounts for age
4 uncertainty and ascertainment bias. A) Observed and expected allele counts in
5 the North American sample assuming the demographic scenario of a bottleneck
6 from Africa to Europe followed by a bottleneck from Europe to North America.
7 B) Observed and expected allele counts for the African demographic scenario of
8 an ancient population expansion. See methods for details of demographic
9 scenarios. Between panels, TEs from low recombination rate regions and non-
10 LTR families are indicated.

11

12 **Figure 6.** A) Observed and expected allele counts assuming a constant
13 population size for a North American population of *D. melanogaster*. In both
14 panels, loci are ranked by age, the analysis accounts for age uncertainty and
15 ascertainment bias and observed counts are also adjusted for admixture. B)
16 Probability of observing as many or fewer copies in the sample for each TE.

Tables

Table 1. Candidate adaptive TE insertions in North American and African populations of *D. melanogaster*. Shown are expected allele frequencies and the p-value of observing as many or more alleles in the sample under varying or constant demographic scenarios as described in the main text..

Flybase ID	Family/Order	Substitutions/ Length	Recombination	North America				Africa			
				Observed	Expected (Constant)	p-value (Constant)	Expected (Varying)	p-value (Varying)	Observed	Expected (Varying)	p-value (Varying)
FBri0019200	Doc/non-LTR	0/4336	high	3/13	1.5/13	0.11	4.32/13	0.48	1/13	1.05/13	1
FBri0020082	412/LTR	0/4972	high	5/10	1.3/10	0.01	3.13/10	0.26	1/6	1.02/6	1
FBri0020086	17.6/LTR	5/5814	high	6/13	1.8/13	0.02	5.87/13	0.49	1/13	1.09/13	1
FBri0020149	BS/non-LTR	1/4579	high	12/13	1.96/13	0.00	6.25/13	0.15	1/13	1.11/13	1
FBri0019354	17.6/LTR	2/5787	high	5/13	2.32/13	0.10	7.42/13	0.71	1/13	1.15/13	1
FBri0020046	Doc/non-LTR	1/2138	high	5/13	2.66/13	0.15	7.02/13	0.69	1/13	1.31/13	1
FBri0019430	Doc/non-LTR	11/4323	high	13/13	8/13	0.19	9.34/13	0.33	5/15	5.27/15	0.51
FBri0019199	Doc/non-LTR	1/2627	high	8/8	1.84/8	0.00	4.37/8	0.16	11/12	1.20/12	0.00
FBri0020125	BS/non-LTR	5/4579	high	5/12	4/12	0.34	7.40/12	0.76	5/13	1.90/13	0.06





Figure 1.






Figure 2.






Figure 4.




Figure 5.

A. 0 substitutions (young) 1 substitution - 0.9 % divergence (middle) >1% divergence (old)

