## **Supporting Information**

## Sharon et al. 10.1073/pnas.1009906107



**Fig. S1.** PCR analysis for *Wolbachia*. Electrophoresis in 1% agarose of *Wolbachia*-specific 16S rRNA gene (A) and *wsp* gene PCR products (B). Lane a, Fermentas GeneRuler 1 kb DNA ladder (three shortest bands are 750 bp, 500 bp, and 250 bp); lanes b–e, male and female 20th-generation flies, reared on CMY (lanes b and c, CMY; lanes d and e, starch); lanes f–i, male and female 20th-generation flies, reared on CMY supplemented with a mixture of antibiotics (lanes f and g, CMY; lanes h and i, starch); lanes j–m, male and female 20th-generation flies, reared on CMY supplemented with their respective bacteria (infection experiment) after treatment with a mixture of antibiotics (lanes j and k, CMY; lanes I and m, starch).



Fig. S2. GC-FID chromatogram of pentane-extracted CHs of CMY male flies (n = 10). Peak annotations correspond to peak names in Table S1.



Fig. S3. GC-FID chromatogram of pentane-extracted CHs of CMY female flies (n = 9). Peak annotations correspond to peak names in Table S2.

Table S1.	CH profiles of	f untreated an	d antibiotic-treated	CMY- an	nd starch-bred	male flies
-----------	----------------	----------------	----------------------	---------	----------------	------------

PNAS PNAS

			Mean CH per three flies $\pm$ SEM, ng				
Peak name	Retention time (min)	Presumed compound*	No antibiotic treatment		Treated with antibiotics		
			CMY male $(n = 3)$	Starch male ( $n = 3$ )	CMY male $(n = 3)$	Starch male $(n = 3)$	
M1	4.36	_	16.0 ± 6.1	21.8 ± 4.2	29.5 ± 3.4	42.9 ± 10.2	
M2	7.2	—	2.6 ± 1.4	9.4 ± 2.8	1.8 ± 0.9	3.9 ± 1.5	
M3	8.12	_	6.7 ± 0.3	$7.0 \pm 0.6$	5.3 ± 0.3	7.0 ± 0.7	
IS	9.75	c-18 internal standard	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	
M4	11.46	—	2.1 ± 0.4	3.1 ± 0.3	ND	ND	
M5	11.71	—	3.3 ± 0.6	3 ± 0.3	$3.3 \pm 0.4$	3.2 ± 0.1	
M7	13.26	_	1.6 ± 1.1	3.9 ± 1.6	ND	ND	
M9	14.53	—	$2.0 \pm 2.0$	7.8 ± 2.7	ND	ND	
M10	14.89	—	27.3 ± 4.6	64.1 ± 5.3	19.3 ± 1.6	53.4 ± 3.8	
M11	16.24	9-Docosene <sup>†</sup>	7.4 ± 1.5	17.0 ± 1.1	$6.5 \pm 0.6$	16.9 ± 0.2	
M12	16.4	cis-vaccenyl acetate <sup>†</sup>	29.8 ± 18.6	154.8 ± 23.5	48.5 ± 17.0	97.1 ± 42.1	
M13	16.57		37.3 ± 7.3	55.3 ± 5.8	27.2 ± 2.1	38.1 ± 0.5	
M14	17.6	2-Methyldocosane	2.1 ± 0.4	8.7 ± 1.3	1.5 ± 0.2	4.2 ± 0.5	
M15	17.78	9-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	32.8 ± 6.3	22.4 ± 5.2	32.1 ± 7.2	48.7 ± 3.2	
M16	17.92	7-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	777.3 ± 177.1	1486.2 ± 119.7	543.6 ± 47.5	1245.0 ± 31.6	
M17	18.07	5-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	45.2 ± 9.2	67.7 ± 3.7	27.0 ± 1.0	58.3 ± 4.0	
M18	18.22	n-tricosane <sup>†</sup>	345.8 ± 53.4	385.2 ± 48.2	196.8 ± 21.3	277.9 ± 28.6	
M19	19.45	7-Tetracosene	29.3 ± 6.0	26.8 ± 3.8	16.5 ± 6.5	26.7 ± 0.5	
M20	19.6	5-Tetracosene	$2.4 \pm 0.6$	3.8 ± 0.5	1.9 ± 0.4	5.9 ± 4.4	
M21	19.8	n-tetracosane	13.3 ± 2.2	13.1 ± 2.6	7.2 ± 1.1	$6.8 \pm 0.4$	
M22	20.79	2-Methyltetracosane	12.2 ± 3.1	42.9 ± 6.1	5.9 ± 0.9	21.7 ± 1.9	
M23	20.98	9-Pentacosene <sup>†</sup>	108.0 ± 21.7	63.1 ± 16.4	85.8 ± 3.7	60.3 ± 3.4	
M24	21.11	7-Pentacosene <sup>†</sup>	437.9 ± 89.4	184.5 ± 25.1	279.3 ± 10.6	209.0 ± 14.3	
M25	21.27	5-Pntacosene <sup>†</sup>	4.8 ± 0.9	0.9 ± 0.5	3.4 ± 1.0	1.4 ± 0.1	
M26	21.38	n-pentacosane <sup>†</sup>	50.6 ± 7.9	49.8 ± 12.2	18.1 ± 5.0	25.2 ± 4.0	
M30	22.9	2-Methylpentacosane	5.5 ± 1.0	3.7 ± 1.1	ND	ND	
M32	23.67	2-Methylhexacosane <sup>†</sup>	15.4 ± 15.4	87.6 ± 31.6	12.6 ± 1.6	30.8 ± 1.3	
M33	24.03	_	3.7 ± 0.6	6.2 ± 4.6	ND	ND	
M34	24.16	7-Heptacosene	39.2 ± 10.0	9.8 ± 6.4	19.9 ± 3.3	5.1 ± 0.7	
M35	24.4	n-heptacosane <sup>†</sup>	58.7 ± 10.4	24.6 ± 6.7	13.4 ± 3.9	13.2 ± 3.2	
M38	25.83	· _	5.6 ± 1.2	1.4 ± 0.3	ND	ND	
M40	26.72	2-Methyloctacosane <sup>†</sup>	77.5 ± 16.6	70.7 ± 21.5	15.5 ± 3.9	26.0 ± 3.0	
MF20	27.02	_	3.4 ± 0.9	0.8 ± 0.4	ND	ND	
M41	27.24	n-nonacosane	46.0 ± 12.2	7.0 ± 1.1	6.8 ± 1.7	4.7 ± 1.5	
MF24	28.24	—	4.6 ± 2.3	1.1 ± 0.3	ND	ND	
M43	28.59	_	3.4 ± 1.0	1.3 ± 1.2	ND	ND	
M45	29.42	2-Methyltriacontane	35.3 ± 6.6	9.1 ± 1.3	5.5 ± 1.6	$4.9 \pm 0.8$	
M46	29.91	· _	3.7 ± 2.3	0.4 ± 0.2	ND	ND	
Total amount	:		2,347.9 ± 468.1	2,948.1 ± 335.3	1,453.4 ± 83.2	2,360.4 ± 130.4	

CHs that were less than 3 ng per sample were omitted from this table. ND, not detectable. \*Based on the GC CH profiles of *D. melanogaster* (1) and on GC-MS analyses. <sup>†</sup>Identified by GC-MS.

1. Everaerts C, Farine JP, Cobb M, Ferveur JF (2010) Drosophila cuticular hydrocarbons revisited: Mating status alters cuticular profiles. PLoS ONE 5:e9607.

## Table S2. CH profiles of untreated and antibiotic-treated CMY and starch bred female flies

	Retention time (min)	Presumed compound*	Mean CH per three flies $\pm$ SEM, ng				
Peak name			No antibiotic treatment		Treated with antibiotics		
			CMY female (n = 3)	Starch female $(n = 2)$	CMY female (n = 3)	Starch female $(n = 3)$	
F1	4.1	—	19.6 ± 4.3	9.8 ± 3.6	32.6 ± 4.0	25.9 ± 6.7	
F2	7.02	—	6.1 ± 0.7	5.4 ± 1.6	3.6 ± 1.3	4.5 ± 2.6	
F3	8.04	—	7.0 ± 1.3	4.6 ± 1.2	5.7 ± 0.6	6.7 ± 0.9	
IS	9.7	c-18 internal standard	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	$100 \pm 0.0$	
F5	11.66	_	ND	ND	3.1 ± 0.2	$3.6 \pm 0.3$	
F6	12.5	—	3.3 ± 0.5	$2.8 \pm 0.0$	ND	ND	
F8	13.58	_	0.7 ± 0.1	1.3 ± 0.5	ND	ND	
F10	14.89	n-heneicosane	17.3 ± 3.8	16.6 ± 0.9	8.5 ± 0.4	9.4 ± 0.1	
F13	16.57	n-docosene	29.8 ± 4.2	25.3 ± 1.2	15.4 ± 0.3	13.4 ± 1.7	
F14	17.56	2-Methyldocosane	16.8 ± 2.4	25.2 ± 0.3	11.1 ± 1.6	16.8 ± 1.8	
F15	17.78	9-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	8.8 ± 2.0	5.0 ± 0.4	6.7 ± 0.4	6.8 ± 0.5	
F16	17.92	7-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	134.1 ± 30.4	67.9 ± 1.6	77.3 ± 6.9	48.7 ± 2.4	
F17	18.07	5-Tricosene <sup>†</sup>	7.3 + 2.6	2.2 + 0.1	3.7 + 0.5	1.8 + 0.3	
F18	18.24	n-tricosane <sup>†</sup>	220.8 + 35.0	222.5 + 10.6	122.8 + 7.6	112.7 + 9.0	
FF6	19.16	7.11-Tetracosadiene	2.1 + 1.1	3.5 + 0.8	ND	ND	
F19	19.44	7-Tetracosene		7.5 + 1.4	9.0 + 0.6	6.4 + 0.6	
F21	19.79	n-tetracosane	$20.1 \pm 01.0$	$16.8 \pm 1.5$	$12.3 \pm 0.5$	$11.0 \pm 1.9$	
FF7	20.62	9.13-Pentacosadiene	$4.7 \pm 0.7$	$10.2 \pm 1.1$	$2.9 \pm 0.2$	$4.3 \pm 1.0$	
F22	20.75	7.11-Pentacosadiene	74.7 + 24.0	$70.0 \pm 0.4$	26.6 + 3.2	30.4 + 2.1	
F23	20.96	9-Pentacosene <sup>†</sup>	$128.1 \pm 16.0$	$114.5 \pm 17.3$	$89.0 \pm 6.3$	$70.3 \pm 4.1$	
F24	21.08	7-Pentacosene <sup>†</sup>	1113 + 232	332 + 68	$60.9 \pm 7.4$	$316 \pm 23$	
F25	21.22	5-Pentacosene <sup>†</sup>	$4.1 \pm 0.8$	$2.2 \pm 0.4$	$3.4 \pm 0.4$	$1.6 \pm 0.0$	
F26	21 34	n-pentacosane <sup>†</sup>	$516 \pm 44$	497+28	$33.0 \pm 3.3$	$34.2 \pm 3.1$	
F28	22.25	7.11-Hexacosadiene	$6.7 \pm 1.2$	$8.6 \pm 0.6$	$3.2 \pm 0.5$	$3.5 \pm 0.5$	
F30	22.23	2-Methylpentacosane	5.8 + 3.1	8.0 <u>+</u> 0.0 8.1 + 0.7	$45 \pm 0.2$	$42 \pm 0.3$	
FF12	22.01	7 11-Hentacosadiene <sup>†</sup>	$3.0 \pm 3.1$ 352 1 + 65 5	$516.8 \pm 16.7$	4.5 ± 0.2 151 9 ± 24 3	178 3 + 26 4	
F33	23.97	9-Hentacosene <sup>†</sup>	$22.4 \pm 0.5$	$367 \pm 29$	$19.4 \pm 1.9$	$20.0 \pm 2.8$	
F34	24.03	7-Hentacosene <sup>†</sup>	$57.7 \pm 3.7$	$218 \pm 54$	$445 \pm 35$	$28.0 \pm 2.0$ 28.1 + 1.0	
F35	24.05	n-heptacosane <sup>†</sup>	68 2 + 14 9	$69.6 \pm 4.1$	$\frac{1}{265 \pm 13}$	$26.1 \pm 0.7$	
F36	25.14	7 11-Nonacosadiene	$10.2 \pm 0.4$	$15.4 \pm 1.5$	$20.5 \pm 1.5$ $41 \pm 0.4$	$55 \pm 0.6$	
F38	25.64		$75 \pm 17$	$67 \pm 0.6$			
F30	25.04	_	$1.5 \pm 0.7$	$0.7 \pm 0.0$	ND	ND	
F40	25.05	2-Methyloctacosane <sup>†</sup>	$7.0 \pm 0.2$ 261 5 ± 7 5	408 5 ± 12 9	102 7 + 13 0	146 9 + 18 2	
FF10	26.54		$201.3 \pm 0.2$	$-3.4 \pm 0.5$	ND		
EE20	20.00	7 Nonacosono	$2.5 \pm 0.2$	$5.4 \pm 0.5$	36+02	13 + 10	
F/1	20.79		$7.4 \pm 0.0$	$4.1 \pm 0.0$	$9.0 \pm 0.2$	$4.5 \pm 1.9$	
EE24	20.33	II-IIOIIacosalle	$55.0 \pm 12.0$	$37.9 \pm 2.9$	9.5 ± 0.7	7.0 ± 1.7	
	27.95		$3.4 \pm 1.0$	$3.1 \pm 0.4$			
140	23.07	z-weuryn acontane	44.1 ± 11./	47.1 ± 0.0	$13.2 \pm 1.7$	11.0 ± 2.7	
FF20 E46	29.20	—	1.0 ± U.1 2 7 · 1 2	$2.2 \pm 0.1$			
140 Total amount	23.33	—	ンパ ± 1.2 1 752 0 · 250 7	3.U ± U.I 1.026 9 . 02 /	עא גרס כרכס		
rotar amount			1,/03.9 ± 208./	1,920.8 ± 82.4	937.2 ± 83.4	915.3 ± 49.2	

Cuticular hydroocarbons that were less than 3 ng per sample were omitted from this table. ND, not detectable. \*Based on the GC CH profiles of *D. melanogaster* (1) and on GC-MS analyses.

<sup>†</sup>Identified by GC-MS.

PNAS PNAS

1. Everaerts C, Farine JP, Cobb M, Ferveur JF (2010) Drosophila cuticular hydrocarbons revisited: Mating status alters cuticular profiles. PLoS ONE 5:e9607.