

REVIEW ARTICLE

The genus *Drosophila* is characterized by a large number of sibling species showing evolutionary significance

BASHISTH N. SINGH*

Genetics Laboratory, Department of Zoology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221 005, India

*E-mail: bashisthsingh2004@rediffmail.co, bnsingh@bhu.ac.in

Running title: Sibling species in the genus *Drosophila*

Keywords. Genus *Drosophila*; sibling species; evolutionary significance.

Abstract

Mayr (1942) defined sibling species as sympatric forms which are morphologically very similar or indistinguishable, but which possess specific biological characteristics and are reproductively isolated. Another term, cryptic species has also been used for such species. However, this concept changed later. Sibling species are as similar as twins. This category does not necessarily include phylogenetically siblings as members of a superspecies. Since the term sibling species was defined by Mayr, a large number of cases of sibling species pairs/groups have been reported and thus they are widespread in the animal kingdom. However, they seem to be more common in some groups such as

insects. In insects, they have been reported in diptera, lepidoptera, coleoptera, orthoptera, hymenoptera and others. Sibling species are widespread among the dipteran insects and as such are well studied because some species are important medically (mosquitoes), genetically (*Drosophila*) and cytologically (*Sciara* and *Chironomus*). The well studied classical pairs of sibling species in *Drosophila* are: *D. pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis* and *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. Subsequently, a number of sibling species have been added to these pairs and a large number of other sibling species pairs/groups in different species groups of the genus *Drosophila* have been reported in literature. The present review briefly summarizes the cases of sibling species pairs/groups in the genus *Drosophila* with their evolutionary significance

Introduction

A species is a basic unit of biological classification and a taxonomic rank variously defined under different species concepts. There are more than 20 species concepts (Mallet 2007; Singh 2012). Mayr (1969) described only three concepts of species: Typological, Nominalistic and Biological concepts of species. However, in the revised edition of his book (Mayr and Ashlock 1991), a new concept was added to this list i.e. Evolutionary species concept. Out of these species concepts, only one is the most widely accepted species concept i.e. Biological Species Concept (BSC) which was mostly developed by Jordan (1905), Dobzhansky (1935) and Mayr (1940), although it has certain difficulties in its applications (Singh 2012). Mayr and Ashlock (1991) have used a number of terms pertaining to species which have been defined very adequately: subspecies, biological races, superspecies, semispecies, allospecies, sibling species, cryptic species, incipient species, monotypic and polytypic species. Mayr (1942) defined sibling species as

“sympatric forms which are morphologically very similar or indistinguishable which possess specific biological characteristics and are reproductively isolated”. Biological races were identified but later were called as sibling species. By far the majority of the so called biological races of the literature are now acknowledged to be sibling species (Mayr 1963). For sibling species, the term cryptic species has also been used. Mayr and Ashlock (1991) stated that such very similar species are called cryptic or sibling species. However, later the term cryptic species has been used with different meanings: cryptic species for two or more species hidden under one species name, sibling species for two cryptic species that are each other closest relative. Sibling species (aphanic species)-this term was initially used with the same meaning as cryptic species, but later authors expressed the common phylogenetic origin (Steyskal 1972). The category of sibling species does not necessarily include species which are phylogenetically siblings for each members of superspecies. The term sibling species is arbitrarily limited to species which are as similar as are twins or quintuplets (Mayr 1942). Bickford *et al.* (2007) defined sibling species as ‘cryptic sister species’ meaning two species that are the closest relative of each other and have not been distinguished from one another taxonomically. These two terms, sibling species and cryptic species, differ from each other. It should not be confused that sibling species are incipient or recent species.

There are a large number of reports demonstrating the frequent occurrence of sibling species in animal kingdoms from protozoans to elephant. Sibling species are also known in plants (Grant 1965). These species are more frequent in invertebrates than vertebrates. Among invertebrates, sibling species are more frequent in insects. Such species are also found in sea (Knowlton 1986 1993). Sibling species are also known to occur in

prokaryotes, algae, fungi and angiosperms (Knowlton 1993). These species are well known in insects, birds, rodents, reptiles, fishes etc. However, they are very common in insects (Mayr 1963, 1970). Sibling species are widespread in insects and are well studied because these species are important genetically (*Drosophila*), medically (Mosquitoes) and cytologically (*Sciara* and *Chironomus*). Interestingly, sibling species are known to occur in Europe that forms malaria-mosquito complex (Mayr 1970). The malaria mosquito of Europe is a group of six sibling species i.e. *Anopheles maculipennis* group which have biological differences.

Dipteran species of the genus *Drosophila* have been extensively used as model systems in studies of genetics, evolution, behaviour, ecology, developmental biology, molecular biology and other branches of biology. At a global level, this genus comprises more than 1500 species with more than 150 already described in India (Singh 2015). About 500 species are known to occur in Hawaiian Islands which served as interesting materials for evolutionary studies by Carson and his coworkers (see Carson 1970, 1981, 1983; Carson and Kaneshiro 1976). Sibling species are known to occur in Hawaiian species of *Drosophila*. In this genus, most of species complexes contain groups of sibling species (Patterson and Stone 1952). The classical pair of sibling species is *D. pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis* which were initially considered as races A and B of *D. pseudoobscura*. These species differ in male genitalia (Mayr 1970). Both these species occur in USA and their evolutionary genetics is well studied by Dobzhansky (1951). Another classical pair of sibling species is *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*, cosmopolitan and domestic species (Sturtevant 1920; Coulthart and Singh 1988). Studies on sibling species have significant relevance with respect to species concepts, applied biology and speciation.

Drosophila has been extensively employed for this purpose and a number of species pairs/groups have been studied in this respect. The present review briefly summarizes the cases of sibling species pairs/groups in the genus *Drosophila* with their evolutionary significance.

In Table 1, a list of sibling species pairs/groups are provided for different species groups of *Drosophila*.

The genus *Drosophila* is divided in many species groups and sibling species are known to occur in the following species groups:

melanogaster, *obscura*, Hawaiian *Drosophila*, *willstoni*, *immigrans*, *repleta*, *mesophragmatica*, *virilis*, *melanica*, *quinaria* and *cardini*

The *melanogaster* species group

As far as the number of sibling species is concerned, this is the largest species group in the genus *Drosophila*.

- (a) *D. ananassae* and *D. pallidosa* (*ananassae* subgroup)

Futch (1966) studied speciation in South Pacific populations of *D. ananassae* and found light and dark pigmented flies from the same collection from Tutuila, American Samoa. Based on chromosomal studies and sexual isolation tests in the light and dark forms of *D. ananassae*, he suggested that the light form is a second species which is closely related to *D. ananassae* (dark cosmopolitan form). The light form was given separate name as *D. pallidosa*, described as a new species by Bock and Wheeler (1972). However, they did not find any difference in

male genitalia between them. Their separation as independent species was based on variation in the pattern of sex combs, number of teeth and sexual isolation in sympatric populations. Futch (1973) designated them as sibling species. Both these species are crossable in the laboratory and produce fully fertile hybrids. Thus there is a lack of post mating reproductive isolation. Based on this, it is concluded that they are not separate species rather they are in statu nascendi (Singh and Singh 2015).

(b) *D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, *D. mauritiana* and other species (*melanogaster* subgroup)

This group has nine sibling species: *D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, *D. mauritiana*, *D. sechellia*, *D. erecta*, *D. orena*, *D. teissieri*, *D. santomea* and *D. yakuba*. The classical pair of sibling species which has been extensively investigated for different kinds of genetical, evolutionary, behavioural and ecological studies, is *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* to which other species are added from time to time. This pair is very similar morphologically and they were confused until 1919 when Sturtevant described *D. simulans* as a separate species based on the difference of external male genitalia. Both are cosmopolitan and domestic species showing high degree of sexual isolation. Hybrids are rarely produced and when they are produced, they are sterile (Parsons 1975). The other species which are added to this classical pair of sibling species are:

1. *D. mauritiana*-endemic to the Island of Mauritius.
2. *D. sechellia*-endemic to the Seychelles archipelago.
3. *D. erecta*- endemic to Africa
4. *D. orena*-endemic to Africa
5. *D. teissieri*-endemic to Africa

6. *D. santomea*-endemic to the oceanic island of Sao Tome
7. *D. yakuba*-endemic to Africa

All the species belonging to this sibling species group have been subjected to various kinds of studies in the areas such as genetics, evolution, behaviour, ecology, molecular biology etc. (Parsons 1975; Bos and Boerema 1981; Palopoli and Wu 1994; Lohr and Roberts 2000; Lachaise et al. 2000; Coyne et al. 2002, 2004; Barbash et al. 2003; Tao et al. 2003; Moehring et al. 2006; David et al. 2007; Jeong et al. 2008; Evezylmaz and Stern 2013; Manier et al. 2013).

- (b) *D. kikkawai*, *D. leontia* and *D. bocki* (*montium* subgroup)

These three sibling species belong to the *montium* subgroup. *D. kikkawai* is wide spread in Asian and Pacific areas, and is also found in South America. The other two species are confined to the Asian areas. Karyotypic variations and cytogenetic relationships among these sibling species have been discussed by Baimai and his collaborators (Baimai 1979, 1998; Baimai et al. 1980; Baimai and Chumchong 1980).

- (c) *D. lini*, *D. ohnishii* and *D. ogumai* (*montium* subgroup)

D. lini, *D. ohnishii* and *D. ogumai* are sibling species (Li et al. 2012). *D. lini* was described as a new species by Bock and Wheeler (1972) from Taiwan and it occurs in China also. Two new species, *D. ohnishii* and *D. ogumai* were described from Myanmar (Pyinoolwin) and Myanmar (Yangon) respectively (Oguma et al. 1995; Zannat and Toda 2002). This is a cluster of three sibling species. Morphological differences among these three species do not go parallel with the degree of reproductive isolation (Zannat and Toda 2002). DNA

barcoding and molecular phylogeny supports the monophyly of the cluster of these three sibling species (Li *et al.* 2012).

(d) *D. auraria*, *D. triauraria* and other species (*montium* subgroup)

D. auraria species complex consists of five sibling species: *D. auraria*, *D. triauraria*, *D. quadraria*, *D. biauraria* and *D. subauraria*. These species have been used for evolutionary studies (Kim *et al.* 1989; Mavragani-Tsipidou *et al.* 1992; Drosoponlae and Seopnvas 1995; Jian *et al.* 2002). The distribution of these species is limited to East Asia (China, Japan, Taiwan and Korea) and *D. quadraria* is only known from Taiwan (Kim *et al.* 1989). Based on the mating pattern, it has been suggested that every species of this sibling species group has been derived directly from *D. quadraria* (Kim *et al.* 1989). Phylogeny among these species has also been discussed on the basis of cytogenetic and molecular studies (Mavragani-Tsipidou *et al.* 1992; Jian *et al.* 2002).

(f) *D. serrata*, *D. birchii* and *D. dominicana* (*montium* subgroup)

These three sibling species belong to the *serrata* species group and are reproductively isolated (Ayala 1965). However, their taxonomic position was changed later. They were placed in the *montium* subgroup of *melanogaster* species group (Bock 1980). *D. serrata* and *D. birchii* occur in Australia and New Guinea whereas *D. dominicana* occurs in Madang, New Guinea (Ayala 1965). The first two species are sympatric in certain areas. These species have been collected and studied by Dobzhansky and Mather (1961). Male genitalia are different in these species. Blows and Allan (1998) suggested that olfaction was involved in ethological isolation between *D. serrata* and *D. birchii*.

The *obscura* species group

- (a) *D. pseudoobscura*, *D. persimilis* and other species (*pseudoobscura* subgroup)

There are six sibling species in this group: *D. pseudoobscura*, *D. persimilis*, *D. bogotana*, *D. lowei*, *D. miranda* and *D. frolovae*. All these species occur in the Nearctic region of the world (Patterson and Stone 1952). The first pair of sibling species in *Drosophila* is *D. pseudoobscura* Frolova and *D. persimilis* Dobzhansky and Epling (see Patterson and Stone 1952). When originally discovered, they were called as races: *D. pseudoobscura* A and *D. pseudoobscura* B. Hybrid females are fertile but males are sterile. Later on, it was found that they show differences in male genitalia, sex comb tooth number and salivary gland chromosomes. These two races were given the status of full species: *D. pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis*. *D. pseudoobscura* has two subspecies: *D. pseudoobscura pseudoobscura* and *D. pseudoobscura bogotana*. The first one is found in western North America and the second one occurs in Bogota, Colombia (Dobzhansky et al 1963). They show incomplete reproductive isolation (Prakash 1972). *D. pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis* have been extensively used by Th Dobzhansky for his evolutionary studies (Dobzhansky, 1951). Hybrid males between them are completely sterile which is caused due to certain genes (see Dobzhansky 1951). All the species of this group have been used for various types of evolutionary studies (Crumpacker 1973; Wang and Hey 1996; Kulathinal *et al.* 2009).

- (b) *D. athabasca* and *D. azteca* (*affinis* subgroup)

These two sibling species were described by Sturtevant and Dobzhansky in 1936 from North America. *D. athabasca* has a wider geographic distribution than *D. azteca* (Miller 1958). *D. azteca* overlaps the distribution of *D. athabasca* in northern California and southern Oregon (Pascual *et al.* 2009). There are variations in taxonomic features such as male genital structures and sex comb tooth number between the two species (Solerud and Miller 1966). The size of hybrid males and females varies. Male hybrids are larger than their parents but hybrid females are of the same size as the parental species (Meer 1976). Further, all hybrids are sterile resulting from X-autosome imbalance (Patterson and Stone 1952). In this pair of sibling species, courtship and mating sounds also show variation (Chang and Miller 1978). Large random amplified polymorphic DNA variation was found within the species. However, more than half the primers used in these experiments produced greater variation between *D. athabasca* and *D. azteca* than within the species (Pascual *et al.* 2009). Pascual *et al.* (1997) used allozymes, mt DNA and RAPDs to identify these species and found that all these techniques allow the classification of any individual to a particular species.

(c) *D. bifasciata* and *D. imaii* (*obscura* subgroup)

D. bifasciata is widespread in Japan. The yellowish form of this species was originally considered as mutant form. The mutant form has some morphological differences when compared with the original form. However, both these forms show reproductive isolation and hybrid sterility. The results of reciprocal crosses vary. Hybrid males are fully sterile but females show partial fertility. In the hybrids, the failure of pairing between homologous chromosomes has been observed and both these species have been found

polymorphic for several inversions. Natural hybridization has not been observed. The mutant form has been given the status of new species *D. imaii*. Thus *D. bifasciata* and *D. imaii* are sibling species (Moriwaki *et al.* 1967).

Hawaiian *Drosophila*

(a) *D. silvestris* and *D. heedi*

D. heedi and *D. silvestris*, picture wing *Drosophila* from Hawaii are morphologically very similar, homosequential, closely related and chromosomally monomorphic. These are sibling species (or nearly sibling) and are abundant and coexist sympatrically on the Island of Hawaii. However, *D. heedi* is slightly smaller than *D. silvestris* (Kaneshiro *et al.* 1973). These species are cytologically distinguishable only by a minor heterochromatin differences at metaphase and a puff difference in the polytene chromosomes. Both these species are polyphagous.

(b) *D. disjuncta*, *D. affinisdisjuncta* and *D. bostrycha*

These three species are picture wing *Drosophila* from the Islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago (Carson and Stalker 1968; Carson and Kaneshiro 1976). *D. bostrycha* occurs on Molokai and *D. disjuncta* on Maui. *D. affinisdisjuncta* was discovered later from west Maui population. They have similar morphology and are homosequential species. Detailed cytogenetic investigations confirmed the existence of three sibling species which occur allopatrically in Molokai-Maui Islands (Hardy 1978; Ahearn and Baimai 1987). Baimai (1998) has suggested that the *D. disjuncta*-*D. affinisdisjuncta* - *D. bostrycha* complex is an

outstanding example of allopatric speciation involving karyotypic differentiation via gain of heterochromatin.

The *willistoni* species group

(a) *D. willistoni*, *D. equinoxialis*, *D. paulistorum* and other species

This group consists of six sibling species which are neotropical: *D. willistoni*, *D. paulistorum*, *D. equinoxialis*, *D. tropicalis*, *D. pavlovskiana* and *D. insularis*. All these species have overlapping geographic distribution. However, their species integrity is maintained when they are sympatric by strong reproductive isolating mechanisms (Kim and Ehrman 1999). Ayala and Powell (1972) have shown that allozyme differences can be used as species diagnostic characters. It is interesting to note that in this group subspecies as well as semispecies have been described and molecular phylogeny has also been discussed (Gleason et al. 1998). Courtship behaviour has also been used as reliable means of species identity (Ritchie and Gleason 1995). Phylogenetic relationship among these species has also been discussed on the basis of chromosomal segments (Rohde *et al.* 2006).

(b) *D. bocainensis*, *D. parabocainensis* and *D. bocanoides*

Carson (1954) found that under the taxonomic designation of *D. bocainensis*, Pavan and Da Cunha, 1947, three reproductively isolated populations exist which were called as separate species: *D. bocainensis*, *D. parabocainensis* and *D. bocanoides* from Brazil. *D. bocainensis* is the commonest and most widespread. *D. parabocainensis* is more frequent in cool climates, whereas *D. bocanoides* is found in the super humid coastal rainforests of Sao

Paulo, Brazil (Salzano 1956). It has also been shown that the degree of sexual isolation and the pattern of inversion polymorphism vary in these species (Salzano 1956).

The *immigrans* species group

D. nasuta and *D. albomicans* belong to the *nasuta* subgroup of the *immigrans* species group. *D. nasuta* was described by Lamb (1914) from Seychelles Islands and *D. albomicans* was described from Paroe, Formosa (Duda 1923). Both are considered allopatric sibling species (Wilson *et al.* 1969). Although this pair shows striking divergence in their karyotypes, neither morphological divergence nor reproductive isolation between the two have been attained. Their separate status as distinct species is due to their allopatric distribution (Ranganath 2002). Evolutionary studies have also been conducted in this pair by Chang and Ayala (1989) and Chang and Kung (2008). Hybrid lines between them have been maintained in the lab for over hundred generations which are called as cytoraces employed for the study of speciation under laboratory conditions (Ranganath 2002).

The *repleta* species group

- (a) *D. longicornis*, *D. pachua* and *D. propachua* (*mulleri* subgroup)

This is a triad of sibling species and is an example of species concept conflict (Oliveira *et al.* 2005). *D. longicornis* was described from Austin, Texas (Patterson and Wheeler 1942). It is also widely distributed in Mexico. Subsequently, two new species: *D. pachua* and *D. propachua* were collected from Pachua, Hidalgo which were studied cytologically. These species are found to be closely related with each other (Wasserman 1962). Electrophoretic

pattern of these species show that they are closely related with each other and placed in a single cluster of species (Richardson et al. 1975; Richardson and Smouse 1977). These three species are sympatric in Mexico and make up an interesting trio of species which have been called as sibling triad (Wasserman and Koepfer 1977). Hybridization among the three species leads to the production of hybrids. Males are sterile and females are fertile. This shows that gene flow among them is theoretically possible in nature (Wasserman and Koepfer 1977).

(b) *D. aldrichi* and *D. wheeleri* (*mulleri* subgroup)

This is an interesting pair of sibling species. *D. aldrichi* was described from Texas, USA (Patterson and Crow 1940) and *D. wheeleri* from Arcadia, California, USA (Patterson and Alexander 1952). Their phylogenetic relationship has been discussed on the basis of cytogenetic studies (Wasserman 1992). These species are homosequential for polytene chromosomes banding (Wasserman 1954) and male genitalia of both the species are similar which raises questions about their independent species status (Vilela 1983). However, hybrid males are sterile and thus they are reproductively isolated (post zygotic isolation) which indicates multiple species (Patterson and Alexander 1952). In *D. aldrichi*, there is incompatibility in inter populations crosses which provides evidence for the existence of cryptic species. Presence of sterility in crosses between introduced population of *D. aldrichi* in Australia and a population from Mexico suggests that they may be different species (Krebs and Barker 1994). Molecular data using nuclear and mitochondrial genes also suggest that they are distinct species. However, *D. aldrichi* is a paraphyletic assemblage of two lineages as suggested earlier on the basis of reproductive isolation (Oliveira *et al.* 2008).

(c) *D. arizonensis* and *D. mojavensis* (*mulleri* subgroup)

D. arizonensis is found in Sonoran Desert of Arizona and Mexico. *D. mojavensis* is found in California and Arizona. Both the sibling species show strong reproductive isolation (Markow 1981). Aedeagus size plays important role in this pair in mate recognition which causes reproductive isolation (Richmond 2014). Evolutionary studies involving this pair have been conducted by Zouros, Wasserman and others (Wasserman and Koepfer 1977; Vigneault and Zouros 1986; Zouros 1989). There is evidence for character displacement for sexual isolation between *D. arizonensis* and *D. mojavensis*. Further, asymmetrical male sterility in hybrids between these two species involves interactions between Y-chromosome and autosomes.

(d) *D. mercatorum* and *D. paranaensis* (*mercatorum* subgroup)

These two sibling species have been described on the basis of chromosome structure and reproductive isolation (Patterson and Wheeler 1942; Barros 1950). Both species are morphologically similar but male genitalia are different in the two species (Vilela 1983). *D. paranaensis* occurs in Brazil, Argentina and Mexico whereas *D. mercatorum* has a pair of subspecies which have interesting distribution pattern. The subspecies *mercatorum* occurs in California, Arizona, Louisiana, Hawaii, Mexico and Costa Rica. The other subspecies *pararepleta* occurs in limited areas in Brazil and eastern side of Andes (Patterson and Stone 1952; Carson 1965). It is interesting to observe that other species of the *repleta* group are associated with cacti. These two species are generalists which occur in diverse environments (Pereira *et al.* 1983).

(e) *D. serido*, *D. buzzatii*, *D. koepferae* and other species (*mulleri* subgroup)

This group consists of seven sibling species: *D. gouveai*, *D. antonietae*, *D. barborema*, *D. koepferae*, *D. serido*, *D. seriema* and *D. buzzatii*. This is a cluster of cactophilic species *D. buzzatii* which belongs to the *repleta* species group. All the species breed exclusively in decaying cactus tissue and except *D. buzzatii* (a colonizing subcosmopolitan species) are endemic to South America (Ruiz et al. 1982). All these species are morphologically similar but show variation in male genitalia. Male genital structures and chromosome inversions are diagnostic characters (Ruiz and Wasserman 1993). Evolutionary history and phylogenetic relationships among these species have been examined by employing chromosome inversions, hybridization tests, male genital morphology, allozyme and mtDNA variations (Sene et al. 1988; Tidon-Sklov and Sane 2001; Moraes et al. 2004; Samnbusetti et al. 2005; Soto et al. 2007,2010). There are two major evolutionary lineages in this cluster identified on the basis of mt DNA analysis: one consisting of *D. buzzatii* and *D. koepferae* and the other consisting of remaining species (Manfrin et al. 2001). In the first pair, there are studies on female remating, sperm competition, female receptivity and sexual selection which show interspecific variations (Hurtado and Hasson 2013).

The *mesophragmatica* species group

D. pavani and *D. gaucha*

Both species belong to the *mesophragmatica* species group. These species are morphologically similar showing differences in male genitalia. *D. gaucha* is described by Jarger and Salzano (1953) from Brazil and *D. pavani* by Brncic (1957) from Chile. These species have been used in genetical and evolutionary studies (Brncic and Koref

Santibanez 1957). In certain areas of Argentina, both these species are sympatric but no case of natural hybridization has been observed. These species are characterized by reproductive isolation and cytogenetic differences which provide evidence for evolutionary divergence between them (Brncic and Koref Santibanez 1957). These species also show behavioural differences as well as variation in coadapted gene pools (Koref Santibanez 2001; Godoy-Herrera *et al.* 2005).

The *virilis* species group

Sibling species of this species group fall into two phylads: *virilis* and *montana* (Throckmorton 1982):

- (a) The *virilis* phylad- *D. virilis*, *D. novamexicana*, *D. americana americana*, *D. americana texana*, and *D. lumnei*
- (b) The *montana* phylad- *D. montana*, *D. litoralis*, *D. borealis*, *D. flavomontanae*, *D. ezoana*, *D. kanekoi* and *D. lacticola*

In total, there are ten sibling species and two subspecies of the *virilis* species group which fall into two phylads (Kulikov *et al.* 2004). The phylogenetic relationships among these species have been elucidated from chromosomal comparisons, allozyme polymorphisms and morphological characters (Patterson and Stone 1952; Throckmorton 1982; Spicer 1993). This group is rich in karyotypic variations. *D. virilis* is currently cosmopolitan but originally it was found to be endemic to Asia (Patterson and Stone 1952). Three species occur in Europe, one in the Orient and six in North America (Throckmorton 1975). Orr and Coyne (1989) carried out a genetic study of post zygotic reproductive isolation

among these species and found that X-chromosome has largest effect on sterility of male and female hybrids. Interestingly, the shape of male mating organs varies among these species as revealed by multivariate approach (Kulikov *et al.* 2004). Molecular phylogeny and genome evolution have also been studied in this group of sibling species and the results provide evidence for extensive rearrangements relative to the genome of *D. melanogaster* (Nurminsky *et al.* 1996).

The *melanica* species group

Although Patterson (1943) split *D. melanica* into two subspecies: *D. m. melanica* and *D. m. paramelanica* on the basis of rather minor differences in morphology, different geographical distribution and high degree of reproductive isolation in laboratory. They were called as two distinct species: *D. melanica* and *D. paramelanica* based on distinct differences in male genitalia. Both species are found in North America. This sibling pair is successfully more derived from other members of this group and belongs to the third subgroup of this group (Stalker 1966; Markow and O'Grady 2005). Hybrids of both sexes between this sibling pair are fertile (Griffen 1942). Phylogenetic relationships among different members of this group have been elucidated by Stalker (1966) based on taxonomic, cytological, and genetic studies as well as geographic distribution. This group is related to the other members of *virilis-repleta* radiation (Throckmorton 1975).

The *quinaria* species group

D. palustris and *D. subpalustris* are two sibling species of this species group which is Holarctic clade containing 32 species (Markow and O'Grady 2005). Phylogenetic studies

involving these sibling species have been conducted by Jaenike and his coworkers (Jaenike 1985; Jaenike *et al.* 1983; Spicer and Jaenike 1996). This group possesses diversity of abdominal pigmentation patterns. Interestingly, the group may be undergoing adaptive radiation (Spice and Jaenike 1996). Mycophagy was the ancestral condition within this group. These two sibling species produce viable and fertile hybrids of both sexes (Bock 1984). Molecular data showing divergence time suggest that the evolution of reproductive isolation between these two species has taken less time than other species of this group (Spicer and Jaenike 1996). There are two major clades in this species group (see Markow and O'Grady 2005).

The *cardini* species group

(a) *D. parthenogenetica* and *D. procardinoides* (*cardini* subgroup)

(b) *D. neomorpha* and *D. polymorpha* (*cardini* subgroup)

(c) *D. bedichecki* and *D. cardinoides* (*cardini* subgroup)

(d) *D. nigrodummi* and *D. antillea* (*dummi* subgroup)

These four pairs of sibling species belong to the *cardini* species group (for details see Markow and O'Grady 2005). The *cardini* species group has sixteen species so far described which are placed into two subgroups: *cardini* and *dummi* (Heed and Krishnamurthy 1959; Markow and O'Grady 2005). In this group, there are four pairs of sibling species; three pairs belong to the *cardini* subgroup and one pair to the *dummi* subgroup. This species group is completely Neotropical in distribution and many members of the *dummi* subgroup are endemic to single Caribbean Islands (Markow and O'Grady 2005). These species have been extensively used for cytogenetical and

phylogenetic studies (Heed and Russell 1971; Hollocher 1998; Wilder and Hollocher 2003; Cordeiro and Toni 2014). This group is also studied because of clines in abdominal patterns found in certain members of *dummi* subgroup (Hollocher *et al.* 2000). Interestingly, the island populations showing recent divergence demonstrate rapid development of reproductive isolation and distinct patterns of abdominal pigmentation which occurred in these species (Wilder and Hollocher 2003).

Evolutionary Significance

Since this concept of sibling species was given by Mayr (1942), it has been found that such species pairs/groups are more prevalent in insects. Among insects, the occurrence of sibling species in the genus *Drosophila* is of special interest because of the fact that *Drosophila* is the best biological model which has been subjected to various kinds of studies in the areas such as genetics, evolution, behaviour, molecular biology, ecology etc and sibling species have also been studied in detail in certain species groups beginning from the classical examples such as *D. pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis* confined to North America as well as *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*, cosmopolitan and domestic species. After designating these two pairs of sibling species, a large number of sibling species pairs/groups have been described and evolutionary significance with particular reference to speciation has been discussed with convincing evidence. Basically, sibling species have importance in biology because they provide the opportunity to test the validity of morphological versus biological species concepts. These species also have practical importance in applied biology such as agricultural pest control as well as medical entomology and are of much importance in the study of cladogenesis (Mayr

1970). Although it was suggested by Mayr (1942) that these species are morphologically similar or identical, differences have been found between these species with particular reference to salivary gland chromosomes, male genitalia, sex combs and relative wing size. Closer examination also showed morphological differences among such species. Further, such species may also show variation in physiological and ecological requirements. Survey of literature shows that the term such as biological races which were used with different meaning are now called as sibling species. Further, sibling species and cryptic species were used with the same meaning but now it has been suggested that sibling species may be two cryptic species which are each other closest relative. Speciation among sibling species takes place in the same manner as in other species. Barring few cases of autopolyploidy and parthenogenesis, allopatric (geographic) speciation is the usual process by which sibling species originate (Mayr 1970). Sibling species are good species and are not in *statu nascendi* (Dobzhansky and Spassky 1959). When subjected to thorough study, they may show differences in minor morphological characters. Sibling species may be genetically very similar to each other than closely related morphologically different species. However, the level of morphological similarities in sibling species is an indication not merely of genetic similarity but also of developmental homeostasis (Mayr 1970). The genus *Drosophila* is characterized by numerous cases of sibling species, which have been subjected to genetical and evolutionary studies. As far as the known cases of sibling species are concerned, in most cases these species have full status based on taxonomic characters. However, in certain cases taxonomic differences are not found but they have been called as sibling species on the basis of sexual isolation (Futch 1973). The example of this is *ananassae-pallidosa*

pair of sibling species. In this pair, male genitalia are similar in both species. However, post zygotic reproductive isolation is absent because hybrids are fully normal and fertile. It may not be appropriate to call these species as sibling species rather they may in statu nascendi (Dobzhansky and Spassky 1959). Although the researchers traditionally pair or group species as sibling species on the basis of morphology, biogeography and anatomical studies, recent advances in DNA testing and molecular phylogeny have provided new insights to determine whether two or more species are really sibling species (Puillandre *et al.* 2012). An interesting pair of sibling species is *D. aldrichi* and *D. wheeleri* which belong to the *repleta* species group. In both these species, male genitalia are similar. These species are homosequential for polytene chromosome banding. These points raise question about their independent species level. However, their separate species level is supported by post mating reproductive isolation (hybrid male sterility) and molecular data (Oliveira *et al.* 2008).

Conclusion

Sibling species are of frequent occurrence in insects. Among insects, their occurrence in *Drosophila* is of special interest because it is an excellent biological model which has been extensively utilized in different areas of biology. In this review, about ninety species of the genus *Drosophila* are listed which belong to eleven species groups including the species found on Hawaiian Islands. Numerous sibling species pairs/groups are briefly described. Closer examinations may show variations among the species with respect to morphology, hybridization, reproductive isolation, ecology, geography, chromosomes etc although they are said to be morphologically similar and reproductively isolated by Mayr

(1942). The genus *Drosophila* is characterized by a large number of cases of sibling species which have been subjected to genetical and evolutionary studies. In most of the cases, these species have full status based on taxonomic features. However, in certain cases, taxonomic differences are lacking but they have been called sibling species on the basis of sexual isolation as *D. ananassae* and *D. pallidosa* (Futch 1973) which may be in statu nascendi (Dobzhansky and Spassky 1959). Further, DNA testing and molecular phylogeny have provided new insights to determine whether two or more sibling species are really sibling species (Oliveira et al. 2008; Puillandre et al. 2012).

Acknowledgements

Financial assistance in the form of UGC-BSR Faculty Fellowship Award to the author is gratefully acknowledged. The author thanks Dr Sanjay Anand, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Lerner Research Institute, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, USA for sending the chapter: Phylogenetic relationships of Drosophilidae from the book on *Drosophila* by Markow and O'Grady and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on the manuscript.

References

- Ahearn J. N. and Baimai V. 1987 Cytogenetic study of three closely related species of Hawaiian *Drosophila*. *Genome* **29**:47-57.
- Ayala F. J. 1965 Sibling species of the *Drosophila serrate* group. *Evolution* **19**:538-545.

- Ayala F. J. and Powell J. R. 1972 Allozymes as diagnostic characters of sibling species of *Drosophila*. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* **69**:1094-1096.
- Baimai V. 1979 A new species of the *Drosophila kikkawai* complex from Thailand (Diptera:Drosophilidae). *PAC Insects* **21**:235-240.
- Baimai V. 1998 Heterochromatin accumulation and karyotypic evolution in some dipteran insects. *Zool Stud* **37**:75-88.
- Baimai V. and Chumchong C. 1980 Karyotype variation and geographic distribution of the three sibling species of the *Drosophila kikkawai* complex. *Genetica* **54**:113-120.
- Baimai V., Kitthawee S and Chumchong C. 1980 Cytogenetic relationships of three sibling species of the *Drosophila kikkawai* complex. *Jpn J Genet* **55**:177-187.
- Barbash D. A., Siino D. F., Tarone A .M. and Roote J. 2003 A rapidly evolving MYB-related protein causes species isolation in *Drosophila*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**:5302-5307.
- Barros R. 1950 A new species of the genus '*Drosophila*' with discussion about speciation in the '*mercatorum*' subgroup. *Rev Bras Biol* **10**:266-278.
- Bickford D., Lohman D.J., Sodhi N. S., Ng P.K.L., Meier R., Winker K., Ingram K.K. and Das I. 2007 Cryptic species as a window on diversity and conservation. *Trends Ecol Evol* **22**:148-155.
- Blows M.W. and Allan R.A. 1998 Levels of mate recognition within and between two *Drosophila* species and their hybrids. *Am Nat* **152**:826-837.
- Bock I.R. 1980 Current status of the *Drosophila melanogaster* species group (Diptera). *Syst Entomol* **5**:341-356.
- Bock I. R. 1984 Interspecific hybridization in the genus *Drosophila*. *Evol Biol* **18**:41-70.

Bock I.R. and Wheeler M.R. 1972 The *Drosophila melanogaster* species group. *Univ Tex Publ* **7**:1–102.

Bos M. and Boerema A. 1981 Phenetic distance in the *Drosophila melanogaster*-subgroup species and oviposition-site preference for food components. *Genetica* **56**:175-183.

Brcic D. 1957 Las especies chilenas de Drosophilidar (Editorial Universitaria) Imprenta Stanley, Santiago, Chile.

Brcic D. and Koref Santibanez S. 1957 The *mesophragmatica* group of species of *Drosophila*. *Evolution* **11**:300-310.

Carson H.L. 1954 Interfertile sibling species in the *willistoni* group of *Drosophila*. *Evolution* **8**:148-165.

Carson H L. 1965 Chromosomal morphism in geographically widespread species of *Drosophila*. In: Barker HG, Stebbins GL (eds) The genetics of colonizing species. Academic Press, New York, pp 508-531.

Carson H.L. 1970 Chromosome tracers of the origin of species. *Science* **168**:1414-1418

Carson H.L. 1981 Chromosomes and speciation. *Chromosomes Today* **7**:150-164.

Carson H.L. 1983 Chromosomal sequences and interisland colonizations in Hawaiian *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **103**:465-482.

Carson H.L. and Kaneshiro K.Y. 1976 *Drosophila* of Hawaii: systematics and ecological genetics. *Ann Rev Ecol Syst* **7**:311-346.

Carson H.L. and Stalker H.D. 1968 Polytene chromosome relationships in Hawaiian species of *Drosophila*. I. the *D. grimshawi* subgroup. *Univ Tex Publ* **6818**:335-354.

- Chang H.Y. and Ayala F.J. 1989 On the origin of incipient reproductive isolation: the case of *Drosophila albomicans* and *D. nasuta*. *Evolution* **43**:1610-1624.
- Chang H. and Kung T. Y. 2008 Evolutionary changes on a Y-like chromosome in hybrids of *Drosophila albomicans* and *D. nasuta*. *Zool Stud* **47**:455-465.
- Chang H.C. and Miller D.D. 1978 Courtship and mating sounds in species of the *Drosophila affinis* subgroup. *Evolution* **32**:540-550.
- Cordeiro J. and Toni D. C. D. 2014 Chromosomal evolution in the *Drosophila cardini* group (Diptera: Drosophilidae): photomaps and inversion analysis. *Genetica* **142**:461-472.
- Coulthart M.B. and Singh R.S. 1988 High level of divergence of male-reproductive-tract proteins, between *Drosophila melanogaster* and its sibling, *D. simulans*. *Mol Biol Evol* **5**:182-191.
- Coyne J.A., Elwyn S., Kim S.Y. and Llopart A. 2004 Genetic studies of two species in the *Drosophila melanogaster* subgroup, *D. yakuba* and *D. santomea*. *Genet Res* **84**:11-26.
- Coyne J.A., Kim S.Y., Chang A.S., Lachaise D. and Elwyn S. 2002 Sexual isolation between two sibling species with overlapping ranges: *Drosophila santomea* and *D. yakuba*. *Evolution* **56**:2424-2434.
- Crumpacker D.W. 1973 The use of sex combs to distinguish males of the sibling species, *Drosophila pseudoobscura* and *D. lowai*. *Am Midl Nat* **90**:387-396.
- David J.R., Lemeunier F., Tsacas L. and Yassin A. 2007 The historical discovery of the nine species in the *Drosophila melanogaster* species subgroup. *Genetics* **177**:1969-1973.

Dobzhansky Th, (1935) A critique of the species concept in biology. *Philos Sci* **2**:344-355.

Dobzhansky Th. 1951 Genetics and the origin of species. Columbia University Press, New York.

Dobzhansky Th., Hunter A.S., Pavlovsky O., Spassky B. and Wallace B. 1963 Genetics of an isolated marginal population of *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Genetics* **48**:91-103.

Dobzhansky Th, Mather WB (1961) The evolutionary status of *Drosophila serrata*. *Evolution* **15**:461-467.

Dobzhansky Th. and Spassky B. 1959 *Drosophila paulistorum*, a cluster of species in statu nascendi. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **45**:419-428.

Drosopoulou E. and Scouros Z.G. 1995 The β tubulin gene family evolution in the *Drosophila montium* subgroup of the *melanogaster* species group. *J Mol Evol* **41**:293-298.

Duda O. 1923 Die orientalischen und australischen Drosophiliden-Arten des ungarischen National-Museums zu Budapest. *Ann Mus Nat Hung* **20**:24-59.

Erezyilmaz D.F. and Stern D.L. 2013 Pupariation site preference within and between *Drosophila* sibling species. *Evolution* **67**:2714-2727.

Futch D.G. 1966 A study of speciation in south Pacific populations of *Drosophila ananassae*. *Univ Tex Publ* **7215**:79-120.

Futch D.G. 1973 On the ethological differentiation of *Drosophila ananassae* and *D. pallidosa*. *Evolution* **27**:456-467.

Gleason J.M., Griffith E.C. and Powell J.R. 1998 A molecular phylogeny of the *Drosophila willistoni* group: conflict between species concepts? *Evolution* **52**:1093-1103.

- Godoy-Herrera R, Burnet B, Connolly K (2005) Hybrid disadvantage in the larval foraging behaviour of the two neotropical species of *Drosophila pavani* and *Drosophila gaucha*. *Genetica* **124**:33-40.
- Grant V. 1965 Species hybrids and spontaneous amphiploids in the *Gilia luciniata* group. *Heredity* **20**:537-550.
- Griffen A. B. 1942 Relationships in the *melanica* species group. *Univ Texas Publ* **4228**:68-73.
- Hardy D.E. 1978 A new symorphic sibling species of *Drosophila* from the island of Maui, Hawaii (Diptera). *Am Midl Nat* **99**:350-351.
- Heed W. B. and Krishnamurthy N. B. 1959 Genetic studies on the *cardini* group of *Drosophila* in the West Indies. *Univ Texas Publ* **5914**:155-179.
- Heed W. B. and Russell J. S. 1971 Phylogeny and population structure in island and continental species of the *cardini* group of *Drosophila* studied by inversion analysis. *Univ Texas Publ* **6**:91-130.
- Hollocher H. 1998 Island hopping in *Drosophila*: genetic patterns and speciation mechanisms. *Grant* **1988**:124-141.
- Hollocher H., Hatcher J. L. and Dyreson E. G. 2000 Genetic and developmental analysis of abdominal pigmentation differences across species in the *Drosophila dunnii* subgroup. *Evolution* **54**:2057-2071.
- Hurtado J. and Hasson E. 2013 Inter and intraspecific variation in female remating propensity in the cactophilic sibling species *Drosophila buzzatti* and *D. koepferae*. *J Insect Physiol* **59**:569-576.

- Jaeger C. P. and Salzano F.M. 1953 *Drosophila gaucha*, a new species from Brazil. *Rev Brazil Biol* **13**:205-208.
- Jaenike J. 1985 Parasite pressure and the evolution of amanitin tolerance in *Drosophila*. *Evolution* **39**:1295-1301.
- Jaenike J., Grimaldi D. A., Sluder A. E. and Greenleaf A. L. 1983 α - amanitin tolerance in mycophagous *Drosophila*. *Science* **221**:165-167.
- Jeong S., Rebeiz M., Andolfatto P., Werner T., True J. and Carroll S.B. 2008 The evolution of gene regulation underlies a morphological difference between two *Drosophila* sister species. *Cell* **132**:783-793.
- Jian L., Jing L., Hui-Zian C., Wen-Xia Z. and Zhuo-Hua D. 2002 Molecular phylogeny of *Drosophila auraria* species complex. *J Genet Genom* **29**:39-49.
- Jordan K. 1905 Der Gegensatz zwischen geographischer und nichtgeographischer variation. *Zeits Wiss Zool* **83**:151-210.
- Kaneshiro K.Y., Carson R.E., Clayton R.E. and Heed W.B. 1973 Niche separation in a pair of homosequential *Drosophila* species for the island of Hawaii. *Am Nat* **107**:766-774.
- Kim Y.K. and Ehrman L. 1999 Developmental isolation and subsequent adult behavior of *Drosophila paulistorum*. V. Survey of six sibling species. *Behav Genet* **29**:65-73.
- Kim B.K., Watanabe T.K. and Kitagawa O. 1989 Evolutionary genetics of the *Drosophila montium* subgroup. I. Reproductive isolation and the phylogeny. *Jpn J Genet* **64**: 177-190.
- Knowlton N. 1986 Cryptic and sibling species among the decapod Crustacea. *J Crust Biol* **6**:356-363.

- Knowlton N. 1993 Sibling species in the sea. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* **24**:189-216.
- Koref-Santibanez S. 2001 Effects of age and experience on mating activity in the sibling species *Drosophila pavani* and *D. gaucha*. *Behav Genet* **31**:287-297.
- Krebs R.A. and Barker J.S.F. 1994 Crosses between *Drosophila aldrichi* from Australia and northwest Mexico suggest that they are different species. *Dros Inf Serv* **75**:133-134.
- Kulathinal R.J., Stevison L.S. and Noor M.A.F. 2009 The Genomics of speciation in *Drosophila*: Diversity, divergence, and introgression estimated using low coverage genome sequencing. *PLoS Genetics* **5**: (7) e1000550.
- Kulikov A.M., Melnikov A.I., Gornostaev N.G., Lazebny O.E. and Mitrofanov V.G. 2004 Morphometric analysis of male mating organ in the *Drosophila virilis* species group: a multivariate approach. *J Zool Syst Evol Res* **42**:135-144.
- Lachaise D., Harry M., Solignac M., Lemeunier F., Benassi V. and Cariou M.L. 2000 Evolutionary novelties in islands: *Drosophila santomea*, a new *melanogaster* sister species from Sao Tome. *Proc R Soc Lond B* **267**:1487-1495.
- Lamb C.G. 1914 Diptera: Heteroneuridae, Ortalidae, Trypetidae, Sepsidae, Micropezidae, Drosophilidae, Geomyzidae, Milichiidae of the Seychelles. *Trans Linn Soc Lond* **16**:307-372.
- Li Y.F., Wen S.Y., Kawai K., Gao J.J., Hu Y.G., Segawa R. and Toda M.J. 2012 DNA barcoding and molecular phylogeny of *Drosophila lini* and its sibling species. *Int J Evol Biol* **2012** :329-337.
- Lohe A.R. and Roberts P.A. 2000 Evolution of DNA in heterochromatin: the *Drosophila melanogaster* sibling species subgroup as a resource. *Genetica* **109**:125-130.

- Mallet J. 2007 Species, concepts of. In :Levin, S A (ed) Encyclopedia of Biodiversity. Elsevier, Oxford, pp 1-15.
- Manfrin M.H., DeBrito R.O.A. and Sene F.M. 2001 Systematics and evolution of the *Drosophila buzzatii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae) cluster using mtDNA. *Ann Ent Soc Am* **94**:333-343.
- Manier M.K., Belote J.M., Berben K.S., Lüpold S., Ala-Honkola O., Collins W.F. and Pitnick S. 2013 Rapid diversification of sperm precedence traits and processes among three sibling *Drosophila* species. *Evolution* **67**:2348-2362.
- Markow T.A. 1981 Courtship behavior and control of reproductive isolation between *Drosophila mojavensis* and *D. arizonensis*. *Evolution* **35**:1022-1027.
- Markow T.A. and O'Grady P.M. 2005 *Drosophila*: A guide to species identification and use. Academic Press, London.
- Mavragani-Tsipidou P., Scouras Z.G., Haralampidis K., Lavrendiadou S. and Kastrisis C.D. 1992 The polytene chromosomes of *Drosophila auraria*. *Genome* **35**:318-326.
- Mayr E. 1940 Speciation phenomena in birds. *Am Nat* **74**:249-278.
- Mayr E. 1942 Systematics and the origin of species. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Mayr E. 1963 Animal species and evolution. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Mayr E. 1969 Principle of systematic zoology. Mcgraw-Hill, New York.
- Mayr E. 1970 Populations, species and evolution. Oxford University Press, London.
- Mayr E. and Ashlock P.D. 1991 Principles of systematics zoology. Mcgraw-Hill, Singapore.

- Meer B. 1976 Anomalous development and differential DNA replication in the X-chromosome of a *Drosophila* hybrid. *Chromosoma* **57**:235-260.
- Miller D.D. 1958 Geographical distribution of the American *Drosophila affinis* subgroup species. *Am Midl Nat* **60**:52-70.
- Moehring A.J., Llopart A., Elwyn S., Coyne J.A. and Mackay T.F. 2006 The genetic basis of prezygotic reproductive isolation between *Drosophila santomea* and *D. yakuba* due to preference. *Genetics* **173**:215-223.
- Moraes E.M., Spressola V.L., Prado P.R.R., Costa L.F., and Sene F.M. 2004 Divergence in wing morphology among sibling species of *Drosophila buzzatii* cluster. *J Zool Syst Evol Res* **42**:154-158.
- Moriwaki D, Kitagawa O. and Okada T. 1967 *Drosophila imaii*, a new sibling species related to *D. bifasciata*. *Evolution* **21**:109-116.
- Nurminsky D.I., Moriyama E.N., Lozovskaya E.R. and Hartl D.L. 1996 Molecular phylogeny and genome evolution in the *Drosophila virilis* species group: duplication of the alcohol dehydrogenase gene. *Mol Biol Evol* **13**:132-149.
- Oguma Y., Wen S., Tomaru M., Matsubayashi H. and Peng T. 1995 Reproductive isolation between *Drosophila lini* and its siblings. *Jpn J Genet* **70**:311-320.
- Oliveira D.C.S.G., Leonidas M., Etges W.J., O'Grady P.M., DeSalle R. 2008 Species delimitation in the *Drosophila aldrichi* subcluster (Diptera: Drosophilidae) using DNA sequences. *Zootaxa* **1725**:37-47.
- Oliveira D.C.S.G., O'Grady P.M., Etges W.J., Heed W.B. and DeSalle R. 2005 Molecular systematics and geographical distribution of the *Drosophila longicornis* species complex (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Zootaxa* **1069**:1-32.

- Orr H.A. and Coyne J.A. 1989 The genetics of postzygotic isolation in the *Drosophila virilis* group. *Genetics* **121**:527-537.
- Palopoli M.F. and Wu C.I. 1994 Genetics of hybrid sterility between *Drosophila* sibling species: a complex web of epistasis is revealed in interspecific studies. *Genetics* **138**: 329-341.
- Parsons P.A. 1975 The comparative evolutionary biology of the sibling species, *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. *Q Rev Biol* **50**:151-169.
- Pascual M., Balanya J., Latorre A. and Serra L. 1997 Diagnosis of sibling species of *Drosophila* involved in the colonization of North America by *D. subobscura*. *Mol Ecol* **6**:293-296.
- Pascual M., Balanya J., Latorre A. and Serra L. 2009 Analysis of the variability of *Drosophila azteca* and *D. athabasca* populations revealed by randomly amplified polymorphic DNA. *J Zool Syst Evol Res* **35**:159-164.
- Patterson J. T. 1943 The Drosophilidae of the Southwest. *Univ Texas Publ* **4313**:7-216.
- Patterson J. T, Alexander M. L. 1952 *Drosophila wheeleri*, a new member of the *mulleri* subgroup. *Univ Tex Publ* **5204**:129-136.
- Patterson J.T. and Crow J.F. 1940 Hybridization in the *mulleri* group of *Drosophila*. *Univ Texas Publ* **4032**:251-256.
- Patterson J.T. and Stone W.S. 1952 Evolution in the genus *Drosophila*. Macmillan Company, New York.
- Patterson J.T. and Wheeler M.R. 1942 Description of new species of the sub-genus *Hirtodrosophila* and *Drosophila*. *Univ Tax Publ* **4213**:67-109.

- Pavan C. and Da Cunha A.B. 1947 Especies Brasileiras de *Drosophila*. *BiolFacul Fil Cien e Letr Univ S Paulo* 86 *Biol Geral* 7:3-46.
- Pereira M.A.Q.R., Vilela C.R. and Sene F.M. (1983) Notes on breeding and feeding sites of some species of the *repleta* group of the genus *Drosophila* (Diptera, Drosophilida). *Ciênc Cult São Paulo* 35:1313-1319.
- Prakash S. 1972 Origin of reproductive isolation in the absence of apparent genic differentiation in a geographic isolate of *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Genetics* 72: 143-155.
- Puillandre N., Lambert A., Brouillet S. and Achaz G. 2012 ABGD, automatic barcode gap discovery for primary species delimitation. *Mol Ecol* 21:1864-1877.
- Ranganath H. A. 2002 Evolutionary biology of *Drosophila nasuta* and *D. albomicans*. *Proc Indian Nat. Sci Acad B* 68:255-272.
- Richardson R.H., Richardson M.E. and Smouse P.E. 1975 Evolution of electrophoretic mobility in the *Drosophila mulleri* complex. In: Markert CL (ed) *Isozymes IV: genetics and evolution*. Academic Press, New York, pp 533-545.
- Richardson R.H. and Smouse P.E. 1977 Patterns of molecular variation. I. Interspecific comparisons of electromorphs in the *Drosophila mulleri* complex. *Biochem Genet* 14:447-465.
- Richmond M.P. 2014 The role of aedeagus size and shape in failed mating interactions among recently diverged taxa in the *Drosophila mojavensis* species cluster. *BMC Evol Biol* 14:255-263.
- Ritchie M.G. and Gleason J.M. 1995 Rapid evolution of courtship song pattern in *Drosophila willistoni* sibling species. *J Evol Biol* 8:463-479.

- Rohde C., Garcia A.C.L., Valiati V.H., Lúcia V. and Valente S. 2006 Chromosomal evolution of sibling species of the *Drosophila willistoni* group. I. Chromosomal arm IIR (Muller's element B). *Genetica* **126**:77-88.
- Ruiz A., Fontdevila A. and Wasserman M. 1982 The evolutionary history of *Drosophila buzzatii*. III. Cytogenetic relationships between two sibling species of the *buzzatii* cluster. *Genetics* **101**:503–518.
- Ruiz A. and Wasserman M. 1993 Evolutionary cytogenetics of the *Drosophila buzzatii* species complex. *Heredity* **70**:597-603.
- Salzano F.M. 1956 Chromosomal polymorphism and sexual isolation in sibling species of the *bocainensis* subgroup of *Drosophila*. *Evolution* **10**:288-297.
- Sambucetti P., Sorensen J.G., Loeschcke V. and Norry F.M. 2005 Variation in senescence and associated traits between sympatric cactophilic sibling species of *Drosophila*. *Evol Ecol Res* **7**:915-930.
- Sene F.M., Pereira M.A.Q.R. and Vilela C.R. 1988 Contrasting patterns of differentiation inferred from traditional genetic markers in the process of speciation. *Pac Sci* **42**:81-88.
- Singh B.N. 2012 Concepts of species and modes of speciation. *Curr Sci* **103**:784-790.
- Singh B.N. 2015 Species and genetic diversity in the genus *Drosophila* inhabiting the Indian subcontinent. *Journal of Genetics* **94**:351-361.
- Singh R. and Singh B.N. 2015 Evidence for variations in the morphometric traits between two sibling species of *Drosophila*: *D. ananassae* and *D. pallidosa*. (Submitted).
- Solerud R.L. and Miller D.D. 1966 A study of key characteristics for distinguishing several *Drosophila affinis* subgroup species, with a description of a new related species. *Am Midl Nat* **75**:446-474.

- Soto I.M., Carreira V.P., Fanara J.J. and Hasson E. 2007 Evolution of male genitalia: environmental and genetic factors affect genital morphology in two *Drosophila* sibling species and their hybrids. *BMC Evol Biol* **7**:77 doi:10.1186/1471-2148-7-77.
- Soto I.M., Carreira V.P., Corio C., Soto Em. and Hasson E. 2010 Host use and developmental instability in the cactophilic sibling species *Drosophila gouveai* and *D. antonietae*. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* DOI:10.1007/s10841-010-9499-7 7458.2010.01049.
- Spicer G.S. 1993 Morphological evolution of the *Drosophila virilis* species group as assessed by rate tests for natural selection on quantitative characters. *Evolution* **47**:1240-1254.
- Spicer G. S. and Jaenike J. 1996 Phylogenetic analysis of breeding site use and α -amanitin tolerance within the *Drosophila quinaria* species group. *Evolution* **50**:2328-2337.
- Stalker H. D. 1966 The phylogenetic relationships of the species in the *Drosophila melanica* group. *Genetics* **53**:327-342.
- Steyskal G.C. 1972 The meaning of the term 'sibling species'. *Syst Zool* **21**:446.
- Sturtevant A.H. 1920 Genetic studies on *Drosophila simulans*. I. Introduction. Hybrids with *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **5**:488-500.
- Sturtevant A.H. and Dobzhansky Th. 1936 Observations on species related to *Drosophila affinis*, with descriptions of seven new forms. *Amer Nat* **70**:574-584.
- Tao Y., Zeng Z-B., Li J., Hartl D.L. and Laurie C.C. 2003 Genetic dissection of hybrid incompatibilities between *Drosophila simulans* and *D. mauritiana*. II. Mapping hybrid male sterility loci on the third chromosome. *Genetics* **164**:1399-1418.

- Throckmorton L.H. 1975 The phylogeny, ecology and geography of *Drosophila*. In: King R.C. (ed) Handbook of genetics. Plenum Press, New York, pp 421-469.
- Throckmorton L.H. 1982 The *virilis* species group. In: Ashburner M, Carson HL, Thompson JN (eds) The genetics and biology of *Drosophila*. Academic Press, London, pp 227-296.
- Tidon-Sklorz R. and Sene F.M. 2001 Two new species of the *Drosophila serido* sibling set (Diptera, Drosophilidae). *Iheringia Ser Zool Porto Alegre* **90**:141-146.
- Vigneault G, Zouros E 1986 The genetics of asymmetrical male sterility in *Drosophila mojavensis* and *D. arizonensis* hybrids: Interactions between the Y-chromosome and autosomes. *Evolution* **40**:1160-1170.
- Vilela C.R. 1983 A revision of the *Drosophila repleta* species group (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Rev Bras Econ* **27**:1-114.
- Wang R.L. and Hey J. 1996 The speciation history of *Drosophila pseudoobscura* and close relatives: inferences from DNA sequence variation at the period locus. *Genetics* **144**:1113-1126.
- Wasserman M. 1954 Cytological studies of the *repleta* group. *Univ Tex Publ* **5422**:130-152.
- Wasserman M. 1962 Cytological studies of the *repleta* group of the genus *Drosophila*. V. The *mulleri* subgroup. *Univ Tex Publ* **6205**:85-118.
- Wasserman M. 1992 Cytological evolution of the *Drosophila repleta* group. In: Krimbas C.R., Powell J.R. (eds) *Drosophila* inversion polymorphism. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 455-552.

Wasserman M. and Koepfer H.R. 1977 Phylogenetic relationships among *Drosophila longicornis*, *D. propachuca* and *D. pachuca*. A triad of sibling species. *Genetics* **87**:557-568.

Wilder J.A. and Hollocher H. 2003 Recent radiation of endemic Caribbean *Drosophila* of the *dunni* subgroup inferred from multilocus DNA sequence variation. *Evolution* **57**:2566-2579.

Wilson F.D., Wheeler M.R., Harget M. and Kambysellis M. 1969. Cytogenetic relations in the *Drosophila nasuta* subgroup of the *immigrans* group of species. *Univ Tex Publ* **6918**:207-254.

Zannat M.T. and Toda M.J. 2002 Morphological comparison among *Drosophila lini* and its two new sibling species (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Zool Sci* **19**:1377-1388.

Zouros E 1989 Advances in the genetics of reproductive isolation in *Drosophila*. *Genome* **31**:211-220.

Received 1 February 2016, in revised form 4 March 2016; accepted 11 March 2016

Unedited version published online: 16 March 2016

Table 1.List of sibling species pairs/groups in the genus *Drosophila*

Sibling species pairs/groups	Species groups
<i>D. ananassae</i> <i>D. pallidosa</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. melanogaster</i> <i>D. simulans</i> <i>D. mauritiana</i> <i>D. sechellia</i> <i>D. erecta</i> <i>D. orena</i> <i>D. teissieri</i> <i>D. santomea</i> <i>D. yakuba</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. kikkawai</i> <i>D. leontia</i> <i>D. bocki</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. lini</i> <i>D. ohnishii</i> <i>D. ogumai</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. auraria</i> <i>D. triauraria</i> <i>D. quadraria</i> <i>D. bauraria</i> <i>D. subauraria</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. serrata</i> <i>D. birchii</i> <i>D. dominicana</i>	<i>melanogaster</i>
<i>D. pseudoobscura</i> <i>D. persimilis</i> <i>D. bogotana</i> <i>D. lowei</i> <i>D. miranda</i> <i>D. frolovae</i>	<i>obscura</i>

<i>D. athabasca</i>	<i>obscura</i>
<i>D. azteca</i>	
<i>D. bifasciata</i>	<i>obscura</i>
<i>D. imaii</i>	
<i>D. heedi</i>	Hawaiian <i>Drosophila</i>
<i>D. silvestris</i>	
<i>D. disjuncta</i>	Hawaiian <i>Drosophila</i>
<i>D. affinidisjuncta</i>	
<i>D. bostrycha</i>	
<i>D. williston</i>	<i>willistoni</i>
<i>D. tropicalis tropicalis</i>	
<i>D. tropicalis cubana</i>	
<i>D. equinoxialis</i>	
<i>D. insularis</i>	
<i>D. parloviskiana</i>	
<i>D. paulistorum</i>	
<i>D. bocainensis</i>	<i>willistoni</i>
<i>D. parabocainensis</i>	
<i>D. bocainoides</i>	
<i>D. nasuta</i>	<i>immigrans</i>
<i>D. albomicans</i>	
<i>D. longicornis</i>	<i>repleta</i>
<i>D. pachua</i>	
<i>D. proopachua</i>	
<i>D. aldrichi</i>	<i>repleta</i>
<i>D. wheeleri</i>	
<i>D. arizonensis</i>	<i>repleta</i>
<i>D. mojavenis</i>	
<i>D. mercatorum</i>	<i>repleta</i>
<i>D. paranaensis</i>	
<i>D. gouveai</i>	<i>repleta</i>
<i>D. antonietae</i>	
<i>D. barborema</i>	
<i>D. koepferae</i>	
<i>D. serido</i>	

D. seriema
D. buzzatii

D. pavani
D. gaucha

mesophragmatica

D. virilis
D. novamexicana
D. americana americana
D. americana texana
D. lummei

virilis
virilis phylad

D. montana
D. litoralis
D. borealis
D. flavomontanae
D. izoana
D. kanekoi

montana phylad

D. melanica
D. paramelanica

melanica

D. palustris
D. subpalustris

quinaria

D. parthenogenetica
D. procardinoides

cardini

D. neomorpha
D. polymorpha

cardini

D. D. bedichecki
D. cardinoides

cardini

D. nigrodummi
D. antillea

cardini