



Heterologous expression and functional characterization of *Drosophila suzukii* OR69a transcript variants unveiled response to kairomones and to a candidate pheromone

Alberto Maria Cattaneo^{1,2} · Peter Witzgall¹ · Charles A. Kwadha¹ · Paul G. Becher¹ · William B. Walker III^{1,3}

Received: 8 July 2022 / Revised: 26 November 2022 / Accepted: 5 December 2022 / Published online: 14 December 2022
© The Author(s) 2022

Abstract

Drosophila suzukii is a main pest of berries on all continents. Population control relies on insecticides and a current research challenge is to develop alternative strategies. Methods based on behavior-modifying semiochemicals are widely used against other horticultural insects, and the functional characterization of chemoreceptors facilitates the identification of active compounds. Following heterologous expression of single olfactory receptors (ORs) in ab3A olfactory sensory neurons of *D. melanogaster*, we screened three transcript variants from the OR69a-locus (DsuzOR69aA, DsuzOR69aB, DsuzOR69aC), demonstrating binding to two possible kairomones (3-octanol and R-carvone) and to a possible fly-emitted volatile compound [(Z)-4-nonenal], although with different pharmacological qualities. By coupling Gas Chromatography to SSR (GC-SSR), these ligands enhanced ab3A-spiking at nanogram-aliquots in a complementary fashion among the different OR69a-variants, and we identified another possible kairomone, methyl salicylate, as the most active and specific ligand for the sole DsuzOR69aB. In testing headspaces collected from *D. suzukii* females and from the fly-associated yeast *Hanseniaspora uvarum* we did not observe activation from female headspaces but activation from yeast headspaces. In situ hybridization analysis on *D. suzukii* antennae suggests unique expression of OR69a-subunits in specific neurons, and points toward co-expression within the same neurons. The OR69a-subunits of *D. suzukii* constitute cation channels, which binding suggests kairomone specificity, even if effects coexist for a complementary binding of (Z)-4-nonenal. Methyl salicylate is the most active ligand and is specific to the sole DsuzOR69aB, inspiring future investigation to validate potentials of this compound for *D. suzukii* control strategies.

Keywords Odorant receptors · Transgenic *Drosophila* · Electrophysiology · Pharmacology

Key message

- The OR69a locus of *D. suzukii* is a target for control strategies interfering with insect behavior.
- OR69a-transcript variants bind to kairomones and to a possible pheromone.
- OR69as respond to volatiles from the yeast *H. uvarum* but not to volatiles from *D. suzukii* females.
- On the antennae, OR69as are expressed both into specific neurons and within the same neurons.
- Ligands active on OR69as are promising for semiochemical-based control strategies of *D. suzukii*.

Communicated by Nicolas Desneux.

✉ Alberto Maria Cattaneo
albertomaria.cattaneo@slu.se

¹ Department of Plant Protection Biology, Chemical Ecology Group, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Box 190, Lomma - Campus Alnarp, 234 22 Lomma, Skåne, Sweden

² Center for Integrative Genomics - Benton Lab, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Vaud, Switzerland

³ Temperate Tree Fruit and Vegetable Research Unit, USDA-ARS, Wapato, WA, USA

Introduction

The spotted wing Drosophila, *Drosophila suzukii*, is one of the main pest insects threatening berry production (Walsh et al. 2011) rapidly spread from its native Asia to Americas, Europe and Africa (Cini et al. 2012; Asplen et al. 2015; Kwadha et al. 2021). In the last decade, several ways for the control of this pest have been explored, from the use of microbiological strategies, to the selection of natural enemies, including predators and parasitoids (Wang et al. 2020a; Mazzetto et al. 2016; Knoll et al. 2017). Other methods to control this pest integrate agronomic strategies, among which, several target the increment of the reservoir of natural enemies (Anfora et al. 2017).

Despite the various methods adopted up to now to control *D. suzukii*, farmers still rely on insecticide applications (Shawer 2020). The infestation of ripening and ripe fruits is in conflict with insecticide use (Cini et al. 2012; CABI EPPPO Centre for Agricultural Bioscience International, European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 2016; Shawer 2017), urging the identification of alternative strategies to limit this pest (Eben et al. 2020). Among the first studies on *D. suzukii* behavior, it was demonstrated that chemosensory information influences reproduction of the insect (Revadi et al. 2015a). While possible frontiers in mating disruption still seem to be far, other methods based on *D. suzukii* chemical sensing demonstrated promising effects in the development of *attract and kill* control (Klick et al. 2019; Rice et al. 2017; Rehmann et al. 2021; Spitaler et al. 2022).

With the aim to identify ligands active on insect chemical sensing, in reverse chemical ecology (Leal 2005; Leal et al. 2008), molecular and pharmacological methods have already demonstrated potentials (Jones et al. 2011) and unveiled semiochemicals for integrated pest management (Jayanthi et al. 2014). Among these methods, heterologous expression *in vitro* and in *D. melanogaster* deorphanized pest chemoreceptors to ligands renowned for rather pheromone or kairomone activities (Bastin-Héline et al. 2019; Cattaneo et al. 2017a, b; Montagné et al. 2012; Grosse-Wilde et al. 2007; Gonzalez et al. 2015; Bengtsson et al. 2014; Revadi et al. 2021a, b).

Applying these methods to identify and functionally characterize receptors binding both types of semiochemicals may enhance pest control strategies targeting insect chemosensory communication. Among these receptors, we recently demonstrated in the closely related species *Drosophila melanogaster* that the OR69a-locus codes for both an OR-subunit responding only to food odorants (OR69aA) and for an OR-subunit (OR69aB) responding to both food odorants and to a novel sex pheromone: (Z)-4-undecenal. This pheromone is possibly emitted through

autoxidation of *D. melanogaster* cuticular hydrocarbon (Z,Z)-7,11-heptacosadiene (Lebreton et al. 2017). These two OR variants are co-expressed on the antennae in the same olfactory sensory neuron (OSN) type: ab9a (Robertsson et al. 2003; Couto et al. 2005; Martin et al. 2013; Münch and Galizia 2016) feeding into a circuit that mediates attraction of males and females, indicating OR69a as a promising target to interfere with behavior of other insects of the genus *Drosophila* wherein this receptor is conserved.

In this study, by means of single sensillum recording (SSR) in ab3A empty neuron system of *D. melanogaster* we identified, functionally expressed and characterized three OR69a subunits of *D. suzukii*: DsuzOR69aA, DsuzOR69aB and DsuzOR69aC. Upon deorphanization to several ligands, pharmacological studies based on ab3A-spiking suggested specificity to kairomones and to the possible fly-emitted volatile (Z)-4-nonenal. By optimizing gas chromatography coupled with single sensillum recording (GC-SSR), which has been previously adopted in our laboratories (Binyameen et al. 2014), we demonstrated complementary tuning of the three subunits to nanogram-aliquots of the selected ligands. Testing volatiles collected from the headspace of *D. suzukii* females and from the yeast *Hanseniaspora uvarum* by GC-SSR demonstrated absence of activation of any DsuzOR69a subunit by female headspace, but presence of active components from yeast headspace. *In situ* hybridization on *D. suzukii* antennae unveiled both expression of the three subunits into specific neurons and, potentially, their co-expression within the same neurons, suggesting further that OR69a-tuning to ligands may happen in a complementary fashion.

Among the active ligands, we have identified methyl salicylate, known for its ecological significance to *D. suzukii*, as a compound emitted by its hosts (Briem et al. 2016) enhancing antennal (Revadi et al. 2015b) and neuronal (Keeseey et al. 2015) electrophysiological response. The demonstrated activation by this ligand of solely the DsuzOR69aB subunit and to the highest sensitivity opens future studies of the behavioral effects of methyl salicylate to validate its potential as a semiochemical for pest control strategies.

Material and methods

Insects

Transgenic *Drosophila melanogaster*, *D. melanogaster* Zimbabwe-S-29 (Bloomington #60,741, we previously used in Lebreton et al. (2017)) and *D. suzukii* (Italian strain, Revadi et al. 2015a) were maintained on a sugar-yeast-cornmeal diet (<https://bdsc.indiana.edu/information/recipes/bloom>

Table 1 Panel of candidate ligands tested on DsuzOR69a subunits

Compound class	Compound	CAS	Molecular weight (g/mol)	Vapor pressure (mmHg @ 25 °C)	DsuzOR69aA		DsuzOR69aB		DsuzOR69aC	
					Average	SD	Average	SD	Average	SD
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl-3-hydroxy butyrate	5405-41-4	132.1592	0.3620	0.78	9.95	103.00	21.54	15.00	7.70
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl acetate	141-78-6	88.1062	111.7160	2.22	10.20	64.67	32.81	6.90	9.15
Fatty acid ester	Isoamyl acetate	123-92-2	130.1870	5.6000	11.33	11.41	98.56	22.59	17.90	5.24 *
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl-(E)-2-methylpent-3 enoate	1617-23-8	142.1980	1.6000	8.11	7.32 *	82.11	42.32	12.10	4.33
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl hexanoate	123-66-0	144.2139	1.6650	14.33	9.09 *	71.11	37.02	29.20	3.46 *
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl-3-hydroxyhexanoate	2305-25-1	160.2131	0.0060	23.44	7.14 *	79.00	42.51	26.50	8.66 *
Fatty acid ester	(Z)-3-hexenyl-acetate	3681-71-8	142.1980	1.2190	22.89	9.09 *	99.11	19.15	30.50	6.28 *
Fatty acid ester	Ethyl lactate	97-64-3	118.1323	1.1630	7.89	12.64	70.67	34.28	27.50	8.53 *
Aromatic ester	Methyl salicylate	119-36-8	152.1494	0.0343	0.56	5.87	132.00	29.22 *	9.70	4.90
Unsaturated aldehyde	Decanal	112-31-2	156.2686	0.2070	9.33	5.44 *	78.78	23.83	14.60	5.64
Unsaturated aldehyde	Undecanal	112-44-7	170.2955	0.0830	5.22	12.43	65.56	39.52	9.30	6.18
Monosaturated aldehyde	(Z)-3-nonenal	31,823-43-5	140.2257	0.3960	6.22	8.50	88.89	40.37	16.00	4.16 *
Monosaturated aldehyde	(Z)-4-nonenal	2277-15-8	140.2257	0.3980	12.89	8.62 *	123.44	29.40 *	24.30	6.09 *
Monosaturated aldehyde	(E)-4-decenal	65,405-70-1	154.2527	0.1190	18.00	4.81 *	95.00	34.83	19.20	4.96 *
Polysaturated aldehyde	(E,E)-2,4-decadienal	25,152-84-5	152.2367	0.0300	2.22	8.31	90.00	44.38	22.10	6.62 *
Monosaturated aldehyde	(E)-4-undecenal	68,820-35-9	168.2796	0.0450	1.56	9.11	71.56	39.62	10.90	6.14
Monosaturated aldehyde	(Z)-4-undecenal	68,820-32-6	168.2796	0.0450	3.78	6.05	64.00	19.68	10.80	5.75
Monosaturated aldehyde	(Z)-6-undecenal	60,671-73-0	168.2796	0.0454	8.78	6.91 *	80.22	39.12	12.70	5.50
Terpenoid aldehyde	Citral	5392-40-5	152.2367	0.2000	0.89	4.41	85.67	35.84	17.90	5.59 *
Monoterpenoid aldehyde	β -ciclocitral	432-25-7	152.2370	0.1760	0.44	4.40	98.25	34.25	16.11	8.80
Monoterpenoid ester	Geranyl acetate	105-87-3	196.2898	0.0260	2.11	3.41	30.78	13.49	2.40	2.50
Monoterpenoid ether	1,8-cineol	470-82-6	154.2527	1.9000	4.89	5.86	83.33	43.08	8.50	7.47
Monoterpenoid ether	Limonene oxide	203,719-54-4	152.2367	0.5150	17.56	4.83 *	93.11	36.22	9.20	6.32
Monoterpene ether	Linalool oxide	60,047-17-8	170.2519	0.0210	36.00	18.84 *	62.44	29.39	1.60	3.86
Monoterpene	α -pinene	80-56-8	136.2375	4.7500	7.22	11.66	94.11	38.08	9.40	7.41
Monoterpene	β -pinene	18,172-67-3	136.2375	2.3990	3.67	11.08	74.00	46.09	10.50	6.95

Table 1 (continued)

Compound class	Compound	CAS	Molecular weight (g/mol)	Vapor pressure (mmHg @ 25 °C)	DsuzOR69aA		DsuzOR69aB		DsuzOR69aC	
					Average	SD	Average	SD	Average	SD
Sesquiterpene	Valencene	4630-07-3	204.3563	0.0110	7.00	6.85 *	70.11	50.34	9.60	8.10
Monoterpene	β -myrcene	123-35-3	136.2375	2.2900	1.78	4.78	60.67	38.84	6.00	4.69
Monoterpene	D-limonene	5989-27-5	136.2375	0.1980	0.56	6.87	78.22	43.73	10.30	7.10
Monoterpene	L-limonene	5989-54-8	136.2375	1.5410	8.22	5.85 *	85.33	40.97	8.90	6.97
Terpene alcohol	R-linalool	126-91-0	154.2527	0.0910	73.67	35.69 *	66.56	34.13	18.30	12.54 *
Terpene alcohol	S-linalool	78-70-6	154.2527	0.0160	115.56	39.84 *	67.78	29.02	15.80	5.45 *
Monoterpene alcohol	R- α -terpineol	7785-53-7	154.2527	0.0280	99.67	37.30 *	101.11	32.06	11.60	7.29
Monoterpene alcohol	S- α -terpineol	7785-53-7	154.2527	0.0280	51.33	18.91 *	73.44	28.06	9.20	6.63
Monoterpene alcohol	Citronellol	106-22-9	156.2686	0.0200	4.67	6.77	59.44	23.86	9.70	6.07
Monoterpene alcohol	Geraniol	106-24-1	154.2527	0.0210	4.89	5.65	65.67	16.64	3.60	4.67
Monounsaturated alcohol	(Z)-3-hexenol	928-96-1	100.1608	1.0390	14.33	11.18 *	107.78	25.00	18.00	6.57 *
Monounsaturated alcohol	(E)-2-hexenol	928-95-0	100.1608	0.8730	6.11	11.29	122.22	23.86 *	28.00	8.62 *
Aromatic alcohol	4-methylphenol	106-44-5	108.1400	0.1100	-0.67	2.98	110.89	24.67	1.30	5.95
Aliphatic alcohol	3-octanol	589-98-0	130.2307	0.5120	62.33	38.33 *	109.89	20.84 *	67.40	34.30 *
Aliphatic alcohol	Decanol	112-30-1	158.2845	0.0085	2.33	6.99	61.56	20.68	10.90	6.37
Polysaturated aliphatic alcohol	Farnesol	4602-84-0	222.3714	0.0004	1.00	7.89	61.56	45.13	4.80	6.96
Monoterpeneoid chetone	R-carvone	99-49-0	150.2208	0.1600	21.67	8.79 *	134.44	24.31 *	42.80	9.90 *
Monoterpeneoid chetone	S-carvone	99-49-0	150.2208	0.1600	9.33	6.34 *	117.78	14.42 *	18.40	3.20 *
Aliphatic Chetone	2-heptanone	110-43-0	114.1878	4.7320	23.11	17.39 *	85.44	29.78	16.30	7.92 *
Lactone	δ -decalactone	780-86-2	170.2519	0.0020	2.44	7.14	78.11	38.80	8.90	6.82
Lactone	γ - δ -dodecalactone	713-95-1	198.3057	0.0020	1.00	6.94	77.78	47.15	9.10	6.37
Alkene	(E,E)- α -farnesene	502-61-4	204.3563	0.0100	0.89	6.51	68.44	34.51	2.80	5.69
Solvent	Hexane	110-54-3	86.1776	151.0000	-1.22	5.09 -	68.44	33.66 -	6.00	6.48 -

Compound classes, CAS numbers and physiochemical properties are reported, including averages and standard deviation of the response to each ligand, based on number of replicates: DsuzOR69aA, N=9; DsuzOR69aB, N=9; DsuzOR69aC, N=10. Asterisks denote significance (Mann Whitney U-test, $p < 0.01$, two tails)

[food.html](#)) at room temperature (25 ± 2 °C) and a relative humidity of $50 \pm 5\%$ under 12:12 light: dark photoperiod. For volatile collection, newly emerging flies were collected after every 4 h from the onset of photophase. Virgin female flies were kept separately in fresh food vials.

Cloning and heterologous expression of DsuzOR69a(s) in *Drosophila* empty neuron system

OR69aA, OR69aB and OR69aC receptors were cloned from antennae of *D. suzukii*, upon their identification in antennal transcriptome that will be part of a different report that is currently under review (Walker et al. 2022). Briefly, cDNA was generated from RNA extracts of antennae of 100 males and females using standard procedures. The complete ORFs encoding DsuzOR69aA, DsuzOR69aB and DsuzOR69aC were amplified by PCR combining forward-specific CDS-primers (DsuzOR69aA: 5'-ATGCAGTTGCACGACTATATGAGGTATA-3'; DsuzOR69aB: 5'-ATGCAGCTGGAGGACTTTATGTTCTATC-3'; DsuzOR69aC: 5'-ATGGAA TTTCATGAGTATTTGAGTATT-3') with a common reverse primer (DsuzOR69aABC: 5'-TTATTTTCAGGGAACGCACGCAGGTAAAC-3', Online Resource 1), starting from antennal cDNA as a template, retro-transcribed by RT-for-PCR kit (Invitrogen, Life technologies, Grand Island, NY, USA). Purified PCR products were then cloned into the PCR8/GW/TOPO plasmid (Invitrogen). The integrity and the orientation of the insert was confirmed by Sanger sequencing 3730xl (Eurofins Genomics, Ebersberg—Germany). Cassettes with inserts were then transferred from their PCR8/GW/TOPO plasmids to the destination vector (pUASg-HA.attB, constructed by E. Furger and J. Bischof, kindly provided by the Basler group, Zürich), using the Gateway LR Clonase II kit (Invitrogen). Integrity and orientation of inserts was checked further by Sanger sequencing.

Transformant lines for *pUAS-DsuzOR6aA* and *pUAS-DsuzOR6aC* were generated by Best Gene (Chino Hills, CA, USA) injecting into Best Gene Strain #24,749 with genotype M{3xP3-RFP.attP}ZH-86Fb and insertion locus on the third chromosome. The transformant line *pUAS-DsuzOR69aB* was generated by injecting into the Best Gene Strain #32,233 with genotype y1 w*P{CaryIP}su(Hw)attP8 and insertion locus on the X chromosome. To drive expression of DsuzOR69as in the A neuron of ab3 basiconic sensilla (ab3A OSNs), crossings were performed with balancer lines in accordance with procedures already published from our labs (Gonzalez et al. 2016). For *pUAS-DsuzOR69aA*- and *aC*-lines the final crossing was performed with *w;Δhalo/CyO;pOr22a-Gal4* mutant line (Dobritsa et al. 2003; Hallem et al. 2004). For *pUAS-DsuzOR69aB*, after crossing


with *w;Δhalo/CyO;pOr22a-Gal4* generating *pOR22a-Gal4* insertion in homozygosis on the third chromosome, the final crossing was performed with *w;Δhalo/CyO; +* lines. In any case, *Δhalo* homozygous were selected based on the straight wings phenotype. The final strains tested by SSR and GC-SSR were the following genotypes: **DsuzOR69aA** line, *w;Δhalo;pUAS-DsuzOR69aA/pOR22a-Gal4*; **DsuzOR69aB** line, *w, pUAS-DsuzOR69aB/w;Δhalo;pOR22a-Gal4/+*; **DsuzOR69aC** line, *w;Δhalo;pUAS-DsuzOR69aC/pOR22a-Gal4*. Insects were reared in our facilities at room temperature (19 – 22 °C) under a 16:8-h light:dark photoperiod as described in Lebreton et al. (2017).

Volatile collection from flies

Twenty virgin female *D. melanogaster* (4- to 6-day-old) and *D. suzukii* (2-, 4-, and 5-day-old) were exposed to baked standard glass rearing vial (24.5 × 95 mm, borosilicate glass; Fisher Scientific Sweden) for 24 h. Flies were removed and the vials were rinsed with hexane (200 μL) under ultrasonic water bath for 3 min. Collections were transferred to 1.5 mL GC-MS vials with insert and concentrated to about 5 μL under a fume hood.

Single sensillum recordings

DsuzOR69as expressed in the A neuron of ab3 basiconic sensilla were tested through single sensillum recordings (SSR). Three to 8-day-old flies were immobilized in 100 μL pipette tips with only the top half of the head protruding. The right antenna of each insect was gently pushed with a glass capillary against a piece of glass. This piece of glass and the pipette tip were fixed with dental wax on a microscope slide. Electrolytically sharpened tungsten electrodes (Harvard Apparatus Ltd, Edenbridge, United Kingdom) were used to penetrate the insect's body: the reference electrode was manually inserted in the right eye of the fly, while the recording electrode was maneuvered with a DC-3 K micromanipulator equipped with a PM-10 piezo translator (Märzhäuser Wetzler GmbH, Wetzler, Germany) and inserted in ab3-sensilla. Signals coming from the olfactory sensory neurons were amplified 10 times with a probe (INR-02, Syntech, Hilversum, the Netherlands), digitally converted through an IDAC-4-USB (Syntech) interface, and visualized and analyzed with the software Autospike v. 3.4 (Syntech). To carry the odorant stimulus, to prevent antennal dryness and to minimize the influence of background odors from the environment, a constant humidified flow of 2.5 L/min charcoal-filtered air was delivered through a glass tube and directed to the preparation. To confirm expression of *DsuzOR69a*-transgenes,



basic spiking of ab3-neurons were compared with parental flies $\Delta halo$ -homozygous ($w;\Delta halo;pOr22a-Gal4$ and $w;\Delta halo;+$ mutants). A panel of 48 odorants (Table 1) was chosen based on a previously reported investigation

of compounds emitted from fruit, yeast and insects tested on the *D. melanogaster* orthologues (Lebreton et al. 2017).

Based on the database of odorant responses (<http://neuro.uni-konstanz.de/DoOR/content/DoOR.php>; Münch

Fig. 1 Functional expression of OR69a subunits and identification of candidate ligands. **a** Intron/exon comparison among the *DsuzOR69a* locus (above) and transcript variants (below) (Online Resource 1) generated using the online Exon–Intron Graphic Maker version 4 (<http://wormweb.org/exonintron>) as we previously reported for other insect transmembrane proteins (Cattaneo et al. 2016). Gray rectangles: 5'- and 3'-UTRs; white rectangles: unspliced region (depending on the transcript variant); colored rectangles: transcript variant-specific exons; black rectangles: common exons; lines: introns; scale bar: 100 bp. Alignment of *DsuzOR69a*-polypeptide sequences displaying both homologies and substantial differences among translated exons is provided as supplementary data (Online Resource 9). **b** Extracted part of the maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree of *DsuzORs* representing OR69a sequences of *D. sukukii* and *D. melanogaster*. **c** Comparison of basic firing rates of ab3A and ab3B neurons recorded from ab3 sensilla for pUAS-lines (above) and mutant flies (*w;Δhalo;pOr22a-Gal4*; *w;Δhalo*; +below). Red bar: 2-heptanone test-stimulus on *Δhalo* mutant flies reporting ab3A-burst phenotype (Dobritsa et al. 2003). Right: schematic representation of the ab3A-condition in the various cases, among the transgenic *DsuzOR69aA*, *DsuzOR69aB* and *DsuzOR79aC* flies and *Δhalo* homozygous (empty neurons). Note: empty neuron *Δhalo* flies do not express any OR in ab3A-neurons, apart from the co-receptor; this graphic representation emphasized this evidence by showing the neuron as *empty* with absence of ab3A-spike. **d** Box-plot of normalized ab3A spiking from transgenic *D. melanogaster* expressing OR69a subunits, tested with the compound library reported in Table 1. Asterisks indicate compounds enhancing significant difference in spike frequency ($\Delta\text{spikes}/0.5\text{ s}$) when compared with the solvent (Mann Whitney *U* test: $p < 0.01$; two tails, $N = [8–10]$). Colors of asterisks is based on OR69a-subunits: blue, *DsuzOR69aA*, green: *DsuzOR69aB*, red, *DsuzOR69aC*

and Galizia 2011; Galizia et al. 2010), the panel included also 2-heptanone (CAS 110-43-0) and 3-octanol (CAS: 589-98-0) as positive controls to validate recordings from ab3 sensilla by testing activation of *D. melanogaster* ab3B. To discriminate ab3 from ab2 sensilla, the ab2A activator ethyl acetate (CAS: 141-78-6) was included as a negative control. To test absence in the ab3A neuron of the wild-type expression of OR22-subunits, ethyl hexanoate (CAS 123-66-0) was included as an additional negative control.

To screen the panel, odorants were diluted in hexane (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA) at 1.0 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$. Stimuli were prepared applying 10.0 μL of each dilution on grade 1–20 mm circles filter paper (GE Healthcare Life Science, Little Chalfont, United Kingdom), previously inserted into glass Pasteur pipettes (VWR, Milan, Italy), for a total amount of 10.0 μg of compound per stimulus. To minimize possible effects from the solvent, pipettes were let at least 10 min after preparation under the fume hood for solvent evaporation. Puffing provided additional 2.5 mL air through the pipette for 0.5 s, by inserting the pipette within a side hole of the glass tube directing the humidified air-flow to the antennae. To characterize the intensity of the response, spike frequency was calculated as in Lebreton et al. (2017) by subtracting ab3A spikes counted for 0.5 s before the stimulus from the number of spikes counted for 0.5 s after the stimulus, with the aim to calculate spike frequency in

terms of $\Delta\text{spikes}/0.5\text{ s}$. For most of the compounds tested on *DsuzOR69aB*-transgenic insects, it was impossible to distinguish ab3A from ab3B spiking. For this reason, responses were quantified by counting all spikes recorded from an individual sensillum as conducted in Silbering et al. (2011) because of the given difficulties in reliably distinguishing spikes from individual neurons (Yao et al. 2005). Responses to compounds of the panel were compared for 9–10 replicates, using a single insect as a replicate. To validate significant differences in spike counting, spike frequency of each compound were compared with respective spike frequencies enhanced by the solvent (hexane) by Mann–Whitney *U*-test ($p < 0.01$; two tails) as done in our previous studies (Cattaneo et al. 2017a, b). For box-plot analysis (Fig. 1d), $\Delta\text{spikes}/0.5\text{ s}$ of each recording was normalized to the spike average of its specific insect replicate.

SSR method was adopted to perform dose–response experiments, selecting specific compounds of the panel giving significant ab3A-spiking for all the tested *DsuzOR69a* subunits: 3-octanol, R-carvone and (*Z*)-4-nonenal (Fig. 1d). The choice to use the more active R-carvone for dose–response analysis was determined by the comparison of the overall effects for R- and S-carvones on the three subunits, that were always more responsive to R-carvone (Online Resource 2). Compounds were diluted in hexane within a range between 0.1 and 10 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$, in order to test aliquots between 1 and 150 μg by applying at most 15 μL of the dilution on the filter paper. For each dose, ab3A spiking for 0.5 s was doubled to calculate spike frequency in $\Delta\text{spikes}/\text{s}$. Spike frequencies were normalized to the effect from their respective saturating doses after correction for differences in vapor pressure (Bengtsson et al. 1990). To this normalization, 3-octanol molecular weight and vapor pressure parameters were chosen for adjustment (Table 1), as 3-octanol is the most volatile among the three ligands, adopting approaches we previously described (Cattaneo et al. 2017a, b; Gonzalez et al. 2015; Bengtsson et al. 2014). By an additional method, ab3A-spiking were normalized to the effect from saturating doses of 3-octanol, following similar protocols adopted for normalization of the effect to the effect enhanced by common ligands (Cattaneo et al. 2017a, b). Normalized data were analyzed by Sigma Plot 13.0 (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA, USA). Responses to selected compounds were compared for 3–5 replicates, considering a replicate as a single insect. Saturating doses were chosen comparing doses enhancing highest averages in ab3A spiking and taking the minimal dose among them as the saturating (Online Resource 2).

GC-SSR

GC-SSR was performed interfacing GC-equipment available in our labs with a SSR rig. Samples were injected on a 7890

GC-systems (Agilent technologies Inc., Santa Clara, CA, USA) provided with a 30 m × 0.32 mm fused silica capillary column (Agilent Technologies Inc.), coated with HP-5, $df=0.25\ \mu\text{m}$, programmed from 30 °C (hold 3 min) at 8 °C/min to 250 °C (hold 5 min) (software: GC-SSR-1—Agilent. OpenLab, Agilent Technologies). The split of out-let from GC-column was a 1:1 ratio between the flame ionization detector and the mounted antenna, according to instrument settings. A humidified flow of 3.5–4.0 L/min charcoal-filtered air was directed into a 90-degree-angled glass tube provided with a hole on the angle where part of the column exiting from the transfer line accessed. To optimized the method, we adjusted glass-tubing length to 17 cm and tested ab3 sensilla of white-eyed non-transformed insects expressing OR22a (Best Gene, genotype $w; +; +$) until we demonstrated effects by testing doses of ethyl hexanoate proximal to 1.0 ng (Online Resource 3), which was considered as the sensitivity limit of the method. Recording was set for up to 35 min upon preliminary observation of retention times for the injected compounds.

By GC-SSR we tested insects expressing DsuzOR69a subunits for 0.1–10.0 ng aliquots of synthetic ligands (depending on the experiment) reporting evident SSR-effects (3-octanol, (Z)-4-nonenal, methyl salicylate, R-carvone). Synthetic ligands were diluted in hexane between 0.0001 and 0.010 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{L}$ depending on experimental conditions and 2.0 μL were injected into the gas-chromatographer. Parallel experiments were conducted testing *D. sukuzii* virgin female volatile collection from 2-, 4- and 5-day-old live insects and headspace collections from *H. uvarum* already available in our labs. To test headspace collections by GC-SSR, aliquots of 4.0 μL were injected into the gas-chromatograph.

To perform statistical analysis, spikes were counted within 5 s from the emission of their respective GC-peaks. For headspace collections, spikes were counted from the beginning of the ab3A-effect. Numbers were subtracted to spikes from 5 s anticipating the effect and divided by 5 to calculate $\Delta\text{spikes/s}$.

Fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH)

FISH was performed by using single own-synthesized DIG- and FLUO-probes starting from linearized pCR8-TOPO-vectors containing DsuzOR-coding sequences. In brief: 1.5 μg of pCR8-TOPO DNA containing DsuzOR69aA/B/C, -DsuzOrco (positive control) and -DsuzIR60b (negative control) were linearized with HpaI (DsuzOR69as) or BbsI (DsuzOrco, DsuzIR60b) following recommended protocols (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA, USA) to be purified in RNase-free water and checked on agarose gel electrophoresis to verify the linearization of the plasmids. One third of the purified volume ($\sim 0.5\ \mu\text{g}$) was amplified with T7-RNA polymerase (Promega, Madison, WI, USA) integrating

DIG- or FLUO-labeled ribonucleotides (BMB Cat. #1 277 073, Roche, Basel, Switzerland) following recommended protocols (<https://www.rockefeller.edu/research/uploads/www.rockefeller.edu/sites/8/2018/10/FISHProtocolKSVRevised.pdf>). *D. sukuzii* antennae were collected from male and female adult insects of our rearing facility (FORMAS Swedish Research Council—project numbers 2011-390 and 2015-1221). RNA FISH on whole mount antennal were done essentially as described (Saina and Benton 2013) staining with a single probe for each experiment. Imaging was performed on a Zeiss confocal microscope LSM710 using a 40× immersion objective; settings were adjusted based on single antennae: DIG-labeled probes staining specific neurons were visualized setting Cy5-laser between 4 and 10% and calibrating gain in a range of 700–900. Staining was compared with male and female FISH-negative control probes prepared using IR60b, an Ionotropic Receptor which expression, based on our transcriptomic analysis, was demonstrated absent in the antennae of both males and females and that will be part of a different report (Walker et al. 2022). A FLUO-labeled RNA-probe for DsuzOrco was used to stain antennae as a positive control and visualized using 488-laser at 4%, gain 700–900. Neuronal counting was performed using the cell-counter tool of Image J (Fiji, <https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>). To identify differences between males and females, neuron numbers were compared with Mann–Whitney *U*-test and Two-samples test ($\alpha = 0.05$). After counting, region of interest (ROI) associated with neurons from different samples of DsuzOR69a-stained antennae were compared with ImageJ. In all cases, positions of neurons respected the same distribution along the antenna and partially overlapped among the different staining for DsuzOR69a-transcripts; a stylized antenna was generated using PowerPoint 2016.

Results

Functional expression of DsuzOR69a subunits in ab3A neurons of *D. melanogaster*

Transcriptomic analysis and comparison with genomic data that will be part of a different project (Walker et al. 2022) unveiled splicing of five DsuzOR69a transcripts expressed in *D. sukuzii* antenna, here we named *DsuzOR69aA*, *DsuzOR69aB*, *DsuzOR69aC*, *DsuzOR69aD* and *DsuzOR69aE* (Fig. 1a, b; sequences available in the Online Resource 1). As described in the methods, to couple the Gal4-UAS transgene expression system (Brand and Perrimon 1993) we crossed pOR22a-Gal4 lines with transgenic lines carrying pUAS-DsuzOR69a-constructs, in order to target the heterologous expression of DsuzOR69a-subunits in ab3A neurons of *D. melanogaster* (Gonzalez et al. 2016). Spiking

Table 2 Dose–response characteristics parameters for DsuzOR69a subunits


Subunit	Normalization	Parameters	3-octanol	R-carvone	(Z)-4 nonenal
DsuzOR69aA	Adjusted to vapor pressure	EC50 (μg)	7.733 ± 1.909	1.529 ± 0.203	8.465 ± 3.601
		Hill coeff	0.8866 ± 0.1736	1.138 ± 0.1749	1.157 ± 0.5571
		Fmax	1.107 ± 0.082	0.9807 ± 0.02537	1.038 ± 0.1472
	Saturation to 3-octanol	EC50 (μg)	7.733 ± 1.909	1.555 ± 0.2932	8.281 ± 2.775
		Hill coeff	0.8866 ± 0.1736	1.327 ± 0.3112	1.211 ± 0.4912
		Fmax	1.107 ± 0.082	0.4804 ± 0.01756	0.8592 ± 0.0966
Saturation (μg)		50.0	25.0	50.0	
DsuzOR69aB	Adjusted to vapor pressure	EC50 (μg)	7.495 ± 2.480	1.788 ± 0.4933	2.901 ± 0.5136
		Hill coeff	1.032 ± 0.3818	1.359 ± 0.409	1.074 ± 0.1681
		Fmax	0.9795 ± 0.1075	0.9319 ± 0.04635	1.038 ± 0.03855
	Saturation to 3-octanol	EC50 (μg)	7.495 ± 2.480	2.223 ± 0.6643	2.996 ± 0.7922
		Hill coeff	1.032 ± 0.3818	1.341 ± 0.3775	1.198 ± 0.2865
		Fmax	0.9795 ± 0.1075	1.045 ± 0.05696	1.088 ± 0.0583
Saturation (μg)		100.0	25.0	25.0	
DsuzOR69aC	Adjusted to vapor pressure	EC50 (μg)	6.681 ± 0.5721	2.444 ± 0.8927	10.14 ± 3.085
		Hill coeff	1.588 ± 0.2437	1.606 ± 0.6518	1.312 ± 0.4962
		Fmax	0.9862 ± 0.02832	0.9591 ± 0.09517	0.9851 ± 0.1059
	Saturation to 3-octanol	EC50 (μg)	6.681 ± 0.5721	2.471 ± 0.8861	9.993 ± 3.047
		Hill coeff	1.588 ± 0.2437	1.624 ± 0.6498	1.318 ± 0.5061
		Fmax	0.9862 ± 0.02832	0.5908 ± 0.05757	0.9868 ± 0.1062
Saturation (μg)		100.0	10.0	100.0	
Adjustment to vapor pressure coefficient			3.691192323	1.385163792	

Comparison of pharmacological parameters for 3-octanol, R-carvone and (Z)-4-nonenal ligands among DsuzOR69a subunits, characterizing hill-3 parameters plots of dose responses [potency (EC50), Hill coefficient, maximal normalized $\Delta\text{spikes/second}$ -frequencies (Fmax)]. Two normalization methods were adopted: adjustment to 3-octanol vapor pressure and normalization to ab3A spiking from saturating doses; normalization to ab3A spiking from saturating doses of 3-octanol (Fig. 2, Online Resource 2)

is absent among Δhalo homozygous ($w;\Delta\text{halo};p\text{OR22a-Gal4}$ and $w;\Delta\text{halo};+$, Fig. 1c), which are commonly defined as *empty neuron flies* characterized by a synthetic deficiency removing a fragment of ~ 100 kb in cytogenetic region of OR22A (Dobritsa et al. 2003). Recovering different rates of ab3A spiking in the progenies generated from crossings of parental $w;\Delta\text{halo}/CyO;p\text{UAS-OR69aA(aC)}$ lines with $w;\Delta\text{halo}/CyO;p\text{OR22a-Gal4}$ mutants and parental $w;p\text{UAS-OR69aB};\Delta\text{halo}/CyO;p\text{OR22a-Gal4}$ lines with $w;\Delta\text{halo}/CyO;+$ mutants confirmed the expression of OR69a-transgenes. As further evidence of difference from the Δhalo homozygous, OR69a-progenies did not display ab3A-burst phenotypes described by Dobritsa et al. (2003) (Fig. 1c). This phenotype is a prerogative of Δhalo , characterized by a basic, but limited, ab3A-spiking, which is absent in the newly designed version of the “empty neuron” heterologous expression system (Chahda et al. 2019, Dr. Chih-Ying Su personal communication). Interestingly, ab3A neurons expressing DsuzOR69aB subunits reported a relatively more frequent firing rate. When tested, every stimulus, including the solvent, elicited a generally strong and phasic spiking-effect. However, only few among the compounds of

the panel generated a tonic response, such as a long-lasting rate of ab3A firing after the stimulus, and they demonstrated significant difference in ab3A spiking when compared with the solvent (Online Resource 2).

In contrast to DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC progenies, for which response to ethyl hexanoate was significant (Fig. 1d, Online Resource 4), DsuzOR69aB flies demonstrated non-significant ab3A-spiking to this ligand. To demonstrate that this effect was not related to the expression of the *D. melanogaster* wild-type OR22a subunit in the tested OR69a-flies, being that ethyl hexanoate is among the OR22a-activators (Dobritsa et al. 2003; Münch and Galizia 2011; Galizia et al. 2010), responses to this ligand were compared to a negative control from a collection of white-eyed non-transformed insects (Best Gene, genotype $w; +; +$ —see Methods). Evidence of a phasic and delayed ab3A-effect for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC was apparent, contrary to the tonic effect associated with ab3A activation of wild-type OR22a (Online Resource 4), suggesting transgenic expression of a different OR-subunit into the empty ab3A neurons.



SSR investigation on DsuzOR69a subunits

DsuzOR69a-subunits were heterologously expressed by generating ab3A-strains of *D. melanogaster* (Fig. 1c). Analyzing

responses due to expression of different DsuzOR69a subunits, several compounds demonstrated significant ab3A-spiking when compared with the solvent (Fig. 1d, Table 1). Some of the compounds in particular reported activation

Fig. 2 Dose–response characteristics of DsuzOR69a-subunits to selected ligands. Effects of 3-octanol, R-carvone and (Z)-4-nonenal on DsuzOR69a-subunits. The ab3A neurons expressing OR69as generated spiking in response to application of the compounds. The effects were concentration dependent and reversible. **a** Left: graphs of concentration dependences of the compounds expressed as a function of normalized spike frequency $[(\Delta\text{spikes/s})/\text{spikes}]$ versus μg -doses. Responses were individually adjusted to 3-octanol vapor pressure and normalized to their saturating concentrations (Table 2, Online Resource 2). Error bars represent standard error of mean. Data were fit with the Hill equation (solid lines). Right: summary plots based on normalization upon adjustment to vapor pressure and normalization to saturating doses of 3-octanol; different colors depicts different compounds (3-octanol, blue; R-carvone, yellow; (Z)-4-nonenal, Magenta haze). **b** Spike trains of ab3A generated by 10.0 μg dose of the specific stimuli; black bar: stimulus

for only one subunit, among which, ethyl-2-methylpent-3-enoate, decanal, (Z)-6-undecenal, limonene oxide, linalool oxide, L-limonene, valencene, S- and R- α -terpineol demonstrated significant difference in ab3A-spiking from the solvent only for DsuzOR69aA; methyl salicylate only for DsuzOR69aB; isoamyl acetate, ethyl lactate, (Z)-3-nonenal, (E,E)-2,4-decadienal and citral only for DsuzOR69aC.

On DsuzOR69aA, SSR analysis demonstrated strongest activation for the kairomonal monoterpene alcohols R-linalool, S-linalool, R- α -terpineol and S- α -terpineol and for the aliphatic alcohol 3-octanol, which elicited a significant effect when compared with the solvent. DsuzOR69aB demonstrated an overall high spiking frequency with a generally strong and phasic effect to multiple ligands. However, when compared with the solvent, significant spiking was associated only to the monoterpene ketones R-carvone and S-carvone, to the aliphatic alcohol 3-octanol, to the monounsaturated alcohol (E)-2-hexenol, to the unsaturated aldehyde (Z)-4-nonenal and to the monoterpenoid ester methyl salicylate, which induced the strongest responses together with R-carvone (Online Resource 2). Testing DsuzOR69aC, SSR analysis unveiled 3-octanol and (R)-carvone to be the most responsive ligands, while several among the other ligands induced a significant effect when compared with the solvent.

In parallel, within the whole panel we tested, some compounds demonstrated significant ab3A-spiking for all the tested Dsuz-subunits: 3-octanol, R/S-carvones and (Z)-4-nonenal. Based on this finding, compounds were used to test dose–response.

Dose–response characteristics of DsuzOR69a subunits

Testing dose response relationship by SSR, 3-octanol yielded the following pharmacological parameters: DsuzOR69aA, $EC50_{3\text{-octanol}} = 7.733 \pm 1.909 \mu\text{g}$, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{3\text{-octanol}} = 0.8866 \pm 0.1736$; DsuzOR69aB, $EC50_{3\text{-octanol}} = 7.495 \pm 2.480 \mu\text{g}$, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{3\text{-octanol}} = 1.032$

± 0.3818 ; DsuzOR69aC, $EC50_{3\text{-octanol}} = 6.681 \pm 0.5721 \mu\text{g}$, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{3\text{-octanol}} = 1.588 \pm 0.2437$ (Table 2).

After correction for differences in vapor pressure, our results suggested all DsuzOR69a subunits to be more sensitive to R-carvone. Indeed, based on $EC50$ s, both normalization methods (normalization to the 3-octanol induced spiking or to the maximal effect after adjusting for vapor pressure) associate R-carvone to lower values than other ligands (DsuzOR69aA, $EC50_{R\text{-carvone}} = [1.529 \pm 0.203; 1.555 \pm 0.2932] \mu\text{g}$; DsuzOR69aB, $EC50_{R\text{-carvone}} = [1.788 \pm 0.4933; 2.223 \pm 0.6643] \mu\text{g}$; DsuzOR69aC, $EC50_{R\text{-carvone}} = [2.444 \pm 0.8927; 2.471 \pm 0.8861] \mu\text{g}$; Table 2) with overall similar Hill-coefficients (DsuzOR69aA, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{R\text{-carvone}} = [1.327 \pm 0.3112; 1.138 \pm 0.1749]$; DsuzOR69aB, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{R\text{-carvone}} = [1.341 \pm 0.3775; 1.359 \pm 0.409]$; DsuzOR69aC, Hill $\text{coeff.}_{R\text{-carvone}} = [1.606 \pm 0.6518; 1.624 \pm 0.6498]$ Table 2). In addition, for all DsuzOR69a subunits, saturation of the response to R-carvone was always reached at lower concentrations when compared to the other ligands (DsuzOR69aA: 25.0 μg ; DsuzOR69aB: 25.0 μg ; DsuzOR69aC: 10.0 μg ; Table 2).

However, normalizing to 3-octanol induced ab3A-spiking we observed relatively low-efficacy of R-carvone on DsuzOR69aA ($F_{\text{max}R\text{-carvone}} = 0.4804 \pm 0.01756$) and on DsuzOR69aC ($F_{\text{max}R\text{-carvone}} = 0.5908 \pm 0.05757$) compared with the 3-octanol induced effect (DsuzOR69aA, $F_{\text{max}3\text{-octanol}} = 1.107 \pm 0.082$; DsuzOR69aC, $F_{\text{max}3\text{-octanol}} = 0.9862 \pm 0.02832$), which suggested possible partial agonism for R-carvone to these DsuzOR69a subunits (Table 2, Fig. 2a). This seems to be the case in particular for DsuzOR69aC, since doses above 50.0 μg of R-carvone associated for any replicate a visible reduction in ab3A-spiking (Online Resource 2). In contrast, when tested on DsuzOR69aB ($F_{\text{max}R\text{-carvone}} = 1.045 \pm 0.05696$) R-carvone displayed even higher efficacy than 3-octanol ($F_{\text{max}3\text{-octanol}} = 0.9795 \pm 0.1075$).

Testing dose response relationship by SSR for (Z)-4-nonenal yielded the following pharmacological parameters: DsuzOR69aA, $EC50_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [8.281 \pm 2.775; 8.465 \pm 3.601] \mu\text{g}$; Hill $\text{coeff.}_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [1.211 \pm 0.4912; 1.157 \pm 0.5571]$; DsuzOR69aB, $EC50_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [2.901 \pm 0.5136; 2.996 \pm 0.7922] \mu\text{g}$; Hill $\text{coeff.}_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [1.074 \pm 0.1681; 1.198 \pm 0.2865]$; DsuzOR69aC, $EC50_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [9.993 \pm 3.047 \mu\text{g}; 10.14 \pm 3.085] \mu\text{g}$; Hill $\text{coeff.}_{(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [1.312 \pm 0.4962; 1.318 \pm 0.5061]$. For all DsuzOR69a subunits, (Z)-4-nonenal demonstrated high efficacy, similar to 3-octanol (DsuzOR69aA, $F_{\text{max}(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [0.8592 \pm 0.0966; 1.038 \pm 0.1472]$; DsuzOR69aB, $F_{\text{max}(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [1.038 \pm 0.03855; 1.088 \pm 0.0583]$; DsuzOR69aC, $F_{\text{max}(Z)\text{-4-nonenal}} = [0.9851 \pm 0.1059; 0.9868 \pm 0.1062]$). Interestingly, for DsuzOR69aB, (Z)-4-nonenal reported very similar

pharmacological parameters and a matching summary plot of the approximated Hill equation with R-carvone (Fig. 2a).

GC-SSR analysis of active ligands and headspace collections

A subset of synthetic odorants reporting evident SSR-effects were chosen for further analysis by GC-SSR. Apart from 3-octanol, (Z)-4-nonenal, and R-carvone, already used for dose response (Fig. 2), we included methyl salicylate, given its specificity for DsuzOR69aB (Fig. 1). Before conducting any experiment, the GC-SSR equipment was assembled and its sensitivity was calibrated by testing decreasing ethyl hexanoate dosages down to 1.0 ng of recording from ab3A neurons of a chromosome 2 wild-type strain of *D. melanogaster* (Best Gene genotype w; +; +—Online Resource 3). DsuzOR69aA subunit tested to synthetic ligands by GC-SSR demonstrated significant ab3A firing for 10.0 ng 3-octanol (two-tailed paired *T*-test [$\alpha=0.05$]: $p=0.0062870$; $N=6$) and 10.0 ng R-carvone ($p=0.0034273$; $N=5$). DsuzOR69aB for 10.0 ng (Z)-4-nonenal ($p=0.0005518$; $N=4$), 5.0 ng methyl salicylate ($p=0.0147026$; $N=4$) and 10.0 ng R-carvone ($p=0.0004892$; $N=5$), while DsuzOR69aC for 10.0 ng 3-octanol ($p=0.0106037$; $N=7$) (Fig. 3a, Online Resource 5: Raw Data File 3).

In accordance with the SSR analysis (Fig. 1d), GC-SSR confirmed activation to methyl salicylate for only DsuzOR69aB and not for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC subunits. Injection of doses lower than 5.0 ng demonstrated evident firing of the ab3A neurons of DsuzOR69aB flies, capable of enhancing ab3A firing down to doses of 1.0 nanogram, contrary to the other compounds we have tested (Fig. 3b, c).

GC-SSR confirmed ab3A firing for R-carvone for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aB, but not for DsuzOR69aC, where although for some replicates it appeared to be active (Online Resource 5) it did not return a significant difference from the hexane when analyzed by *T*-test. Significant effect of (Z)-4-nonenal was demonstrated for only DsuzOR69aB, while a significant effect of 3-octanol was demonstrated for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC.

Analyzing headspaces collected from 2- to 5-day-old *D. suzukii* females did not result in any effect on DsuzOR69a subunits (Fig. 4). Interestingly, parallel experiments conducted with headspaces of *Hanseniaspora uvarum* that were already available in our labs and on use for different projects (Mori et al. 2017; Kleman et al. 2022) revealed activation of DsuzOR69a subunits in proximity of compounds released at different retention times (Fig. 5, Online Resource 5).

Expression analysis of DsuzOR69a-subunits by fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH)

Quantification of the number and distribution of neuronal cells in *D. suzukii* antennae labeled with DsuzOR69a RNA probes indicated that there is no apparent difference between male and female [DsuzOR69aA – $N_{\text{male}} = 11$, $N_{\text{female}} = 10$; Mann–Whitney-*U*-test (MWU: $\alpha=0.05$): $p=0.9681$, $U=55$; Two-sample *T*-test (two-tailed, $\alpha=0.05$): $p=0.690287$; DsuzOR69aB – $N_{\text{male}} = 11$; $N_{\text{female}} = 10$; MWU: $p=0.09102$, $U=30.5$; *T*-test: $p=0.107922$; DsuzOR69aC – $N_{\text{male}} = 13$; $N_{\text{female}} = 9$; MWU: $p=0.89656$, $U=56$; *T*-test: $p=0.528551$] (Online Resource 6, Fig. 6). However, for DsuzOR69aB we observed a slight lower intensity in the staining of female neurons, for which counted number, in some cases, appeared to be lower. Distribution of neuronal cells labeled with DsuzOR69a RNA probes resulted in both cells stained with unique probes and cells stained with more than one probe (Fig. 6c).

Discussion

In this work, we isolated, heterologously expressed and functionally characterized three out of five OR-subunits translated from alternative mRNA transcript variants of the *D. suzukii* OR69a locus. Starting with an SSR-screening of candidate ligands based on orthologues of *D. melanogaster* (Lebreton et al. 2017), specific compounds were selected to study ligand-binding characteristics by performing dose–response experiments and to confirm their identity as ligands of these subunits by measuring their effects at the nanogram-level by an optimized GC-SSR. To our knowledge, this is among the first contributions where the use of the GC-SSR method helps the functional characterization of insect ORs expressed in empty neurons of *D. melanogaster* (Ebrahim et al. 2015).

Based on the screening of synthetic ligands (Fig. 1d, Table 1), 3-octanol, (Z)-4-nonenal, R-carvone and S-carvone displayed significant activation of all the DsuzOR69a subunits we have tested. Interestingly, the unsaturated (Z)-4-nonenal was the sole aldehyde tested from the panel that we have identified to be active on all tested DsuzOR69as. To compare pharmacological features among these agonists, we performed a comparative dose–response analysis.

Based on the pharmacological parameters elaborated from normalized dose–response effects, different dosages of the selected agonists affect activation of the different DsuzOR69a-subunits (Fig. 2a). Among R-carvone, 3-octanol and (Z)-4-nonenal, DsuzOR69a subunits demonstrated that they are in general more sensitive to R-carvone (Table 2). However, R-carvone seems to be only a partial agonist for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC, given the




Fig. 3 GC-SSR of DsuzOR69a-subunits tested to synthetic ligands. **a** Spike frequency plot (SSR = 80 Hz, Bin-width = 8.0 s, Filter = 2 Taps; above) associated with ab3A firing for transgenic *D. melanogaster* expressing DsuzOR69aA ($N = [4-6]$), -aB ($N = [5-7]$) and aC ($N = [5-7]$) subunits, tested to a blend of synthetic ligands at 10.0 ng, except for methyl salicylate, 5.0 ng (GC 5.0 mV; Time: sec; below) released at their respective retention times in the following order: 3-octanol, (Z)-4-nonenal, methyl salicylate and R-carvone, respectively. Note: apparent effect to (Z)-4-nonenal and methyl salicylate for DsuzOR69aA was not statistically relevant when compared to spiking enhanced from the solvent (Online Resource 5). Below: box-plot

reduced amplitude of the curve from the approximated Hill equation when normalized to the 3-octanol effect and compared with 3-octanol and (Z)-4-nonenal (Fig. 2). Conversely, R-carvone demonstrated stronger agonism for DsuzOR69aB. Interestingly, for this subunit, R-carvone shared very similar pharmacological parameters with (Z)-4-nonenal (Table 2, Fig. 2), while (Z)-4-nonenal was always associated with

generated upon analysis of spike counting for the effects elicited by the synthetic ligands: blue, DsuzOR69aA; green, DsuzOR69aB; red, DsuzOR69aC; asterisks denote significant effects (Online Resource 5). **b** Spike frequency associated with ab3A firing for a transgenic *D. melanogaster* fly expressing DsuzOR69aB, tested to a blend of the synthetic ligands mentioned above at doses of 1.0 ng. **c** Spike frequency plot associated to ab3A firing (frequency settings: see A) for four different transgenic *D. melanogaster* flies expressing DsuzOR69aB tested to methyl salicylate at different doses (10 ng; 5.0 ng; 1.0 ng; 0.1 ng)

among the highest F_{max} , as a possible indication of a real DsuzOR69aB agonism (Cattaneo et al. 2017b).

To investigate further on the activation of DsuzOR69a subunits by these agonists, we coupled SSR with the gas-chromatographic equipment (see methods) to perform GC-SSR analysis testing compounds at nanogram-amounts (Fig. 3) upon calibrating the equipment by adjusting glass




Fig. 4 GC-SSR screening of DsuzOR69a-subunits tested to headspaces collected from *D. suzukii* females. Spike frequency plot (SSR=80 Hz, Bin-width=8.0 s, Filter=2 Taps; above) associated with ab3A firing for transgenic *D. melanogaster* expressing DsuzOR69aA, -aB and aC subunits ($N=3$ per subunit), screened to a collection of headspaces from *D. suzukii* female insects of different ages: 2-day-old, top; 4-day-old, middle; 5-day-old, bottom; GC 5.0 mV; Time: s

tubing and airflow until effects were recordable at the lowest possible nanogram doses (Online Resource 3). Although when we tested synthetic ligands by GC-SSR we did not conduct a similar pharmacological investigation as in Fig. 2, recordable effects at nanogram-aliquots of DsuzOR69a-agonists further indicated evidence of their real binding and activation of the receptor. In GC-SSR experiments we included also methyl salicylate given the evidence from our SSR-screening demonstrating activation to this ligand by only the DsuzOR69aB subunit, where together with R-carvone, it is one of the two most active ligands (Fig. 1d, Online Resource 2).

Contrary to SSR (Figs. 1d, 2) no effects were recorded by testing 10.0 ng 3-octanol on DsuzOR69aB by GC-SSR (Fig. 3a). Not surprisingly, dose–response for DsuzOR69aB demonstrated the lowest efficacy for this compound when compared with R-carvone and (Z)-4-nonenal (Fig. 2a), as further evidence of its possible partial agonism (Cattaneo et al. 2017b; Auerbach 2016; Barlow et al. 1967). While these results may indicate that doses of 10 ng were not sufficient to enhance a minimal activation of DsuzOR69aB for 3-octanol, they support that the GC-SSR method is more reliable than the SSR method in the deorphanization of ORs to their agonists. Indeed, upon puffing identical doses of different ligands for detection by SSR, spiking may be biased by their different volatility (Bengtsson et al. 1990), by the loss of calibration during serial puffing, by the type of solvent, or by possible contaminants (Andersson et al. 2012). We expect these effects to be by-passed or at least reduced at minimum when compounds are released from the gas-chromatographer and directly provided to the antenna.

Instead, analyzing DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC, 10.0 ng of 3-octanol were sufficient to enhance activation. Results from an SSR-comparison on OR69a subunits from several species of the genus *Drosophila*, which will be part of a different publication (Gonzalez et al. 2022), demonstrated similar response spectrum to the ligands tested between the OR69aCs of *D. simulans* and *D. suzukii*, which included 3-octanol and R-carvone, that were also active on the OR69aAs of these *Drosophilas*. Possibly, the existence of an additional subunit such as OR69aC may increase the repertoire of ligands sensed by OR69aA and OR69aB. Indeed, while there is only one structural domain difference in the exon organization of DsuzOR69aA, aB and aC (Fig. 1a, Online Resource 1), it may be the case that the

presence of a specific unique domain has a substantial effect on ligand-binding that was demonstrated by evidence of different tuning to the ligands we tested. Similarly, although observed for the different class of IRs odorant receptors, different spectrums of ligand activation have been demonstrated among *Drosophila* neurons housing in ac2 and ac3 sensilla expressing different IR75-chemosensory subunits (Silbering et al. 2011) that are translated from three splice-forms (IR75c, IR75b, IR75a) transcribed from the same locus (IR75cba, Mika et al. 2021). Future studies testing DsuzOR69aD and DsuzOR69aE subunits, as additional transcript variants from the DsuzOR69a-locus, will validate if this hypothesis holds true.

In analyzing the effect to R-carvone by GC-SSR we observed activation for both DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aB subunits. Taken with dose–response experiments, our results may suggest this ligand as real agonists for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aB. In analyzing the effect to (Z)-4-nonenal by GC-SSR we observed activation for the sole DsuzOR69aB subunits. Pharmacological features and plotting of the approximated Hill equations for (Z)-4-nonenal and R-carvone were proximal to identity (Table 2, Fig. 2a), further suggesting (Z)-4-nonenal as a real agonist for DsuzOR69aB.

GC-SSR analysis demonstrated methyl salicylate to be active solely on the DsuzOR69aB subunit. Interestingly, the response to this ligand provides the highest spiking frequency among the other ligands tested and it is active up to doses lower than 1.0 ng (Fig. 3b, c). Methyl salicylate is the most active ligand we have found for DsuzOR69aB and, possibly, the main agonist for cation channels constituted with this transmembrane protein. Activation of DsuzOR69aB to methyl salicylate to 1.0 ng, but not lower aliquots, is in accordance of the optimization limit of our GC-SSR method, where doses of 1.0 ng represented the lowest detectable quantities by our assembled equipment (Fig. 3b, c and Online Resource 3). The ecological role of methyl salicylate is renowned among several plant mechanisms: from systemic acquired resistance to plant–plant interactions, as well as plant–insect interactions, including attraction of pollinators, repellency for phytophagous insects or attraction of their parasitoids (Ren et al. 2020). Since long ago, methyl salicylate has been reported among the bouquet of several floral scents (Knudsen et al. 1993) and it can also be found in the headspace of fruits from strawberries (Keeseey et al. 2015), *Rubus* species and cherries (Revadi et al. 2015b), that are among the renowned hosts of *D. suzukii*. Previous investigations demonstrated significant antennal responses to methyl salicylate by GC-EAD when *D. suzukii* were tested with headspaces emitted by strawberries fruits and leaves, even from fruits when this volatile was emitted in small quantities (Keeseey et al. 2015). A more recent investigation characterized methyl salicylate among the main volatiles

emitted by intact berries of mistletoe (*Viscum album* subsp. *laxum*), representing a food source for winter and spring seasons for *D. suzukii* (Briem et al. 2016). Interestingly, this study reports higher attraction and ovipositional behavior for mated *D. suzukii* when berries are artificially wounded and emitting significantly reduced levels of methyl salicylate. Furthermore, other studies reported methyl salicylate among the most toxic compounds for *D. suzukii*, demonstrating among the lowest LD50s when fumigant toxicity experiments were conducted on males and females (Kim et al. 2016). All together, these data suggest methyl salicylate is deserving of investigations to verify its potential semiochemical properties toward the control of *D. suzukii*, in particular, to test repellency to this compound, taking evidences of the enhanced oviposition from its reduced emission from hosts (Briem et al. 2016). To this hypothesis, activation of OR69aB in *D. suzukii* by a repellent would represent quite an evolutionary shift from *D. melanogaster*, for which the orthologue was demonstrated in our previous investigation to be tuned by the (Z)-4-undecenal pheromone reported to mediate attraction (Lebreton et al. 2017). To validate this hypothesis, taking advantage of the ongoing development of CRISPR-cas9 technologies for *D. suzukii* (Ni et al. 2021) future behavioral experiments may compare sensing to methyl salicylate between wild-type flies and CRISPR-knock out lines generated by inducing frame-shift editing within the start codon of the OR69aB-exon (Fig. 1a, Online Resource 1).

Our SSR-screening of DsuzOR69as is in accordance with the previous studies (Lebreton et al. 2017) and with evidence from an SSR-comparison of OR69a subunits from several species of the genus *Drosophila* (Gonzalez et al. 2022). This study in preparation will demonstrate OR69aAs being mostly responsive to monoterpene alcohols and ethers, including linalool oxide and R- α -terpineol, representing the most shared ligands among the various orthologues. OR69aBs, instead, are mostly responsive to R- and S-carvones, that in our study we reported to be active on all the *D. suzukii* subunits we tested (Fig. 1d).

However, among our SSR analysis, we did not identify any significant activation for DsuzOR69as to (Z)-4-undecenal, which is instead active on the orthologues of *D. melanogaster*. Indeed, in Lebreton et al. (2017) we demonstrated the existence of (Z)-4-undecenal in headspaces collected from *D. melanogaster*. The existence in *D. melanogaster* of (Z,Z)-7,11-heptacosadiene [(Z,Z)-7,11-HD] as the most abundant cuticular hydrocarbon (Antony et al. 1985), and experimental evidences of its autoxidation to the emission of aldehydes led us to hypothesize that (Z)-4-undecenal is the result of the (Z,Z)-7,11-HD autoxidation. OR69a subunits binding for both (Z)-4-undecenal and other odorants suggested a role of this receptor of *D. melanogaster* as a sensor for both pheromones and kairomones. In accordance,

in the same investigation we reported chemical analysis on *D. melanogaster* and headspaces indicating small traces of (Z)-4-nonenal, associated with the presence of the (Z,Z)-5,9-HD isomer in limited quantities on the cuticular of these *Drosophila* (Coyne 1996; Billeter et al. 2009; Dallerac et al. 2000). Interestingly, (Z,Z)-5,9-HD is more abundant on the cuticle of the *D. melanogaster* subspecies Zimbabwe (Dallerac et al. 2000; Yukilevich and True 2008; Grillet et al. 2012), and more recent investigations supported the autoxidation hypothesis demonstrating the emission of (Z)-4-nonenal from the Zimbabwe *D. melanogaster* (Frey et al. 2020).

Based on the most recent publications, there is no evidence in *D. suzukii* of the presence of cuticular hydrocarbons, whose autoxidation may result in the emission of (Z)-4-nonenal (Snellings et al. 2018; Wang Y. et al. 2020b), however, the specific effect of this ligand on DsuzOR69aB is compelling. In theory, if (Z)-4-nonenal would be emitted by *D. suzukii*, by the use of the GC-SSR method we optimized we would have recorded activation of DsuzOR69as upon testing respective headspaces collected from the female insects. However, volatile collection from 2- to 5-day-old *D. suzukii* females did not result in any effect on DsuzOR69as (Fig. 4). In any case, we cannot state whether (Z)-4-nonenal is emitted or not by *D. suzukii*. Indeed, apart from the possible absence of aldehyde ligands in the headspaces we have collected, final quantities of collected aldehydes may range below the detectable sensitivity of our equipment (< 1.0 ng, Online Resource 3, Fig. 3c), or may have difficulties to be released by our GC-equipment given their polar incompatibility with the HP-5 column we have utilized. These various scenario seems to be more reliable considering additional trials we performed by expressing OR69a orthologues of the *D. melanogaster* subspecies Zimbabwe (Online Resource 7). Testing headspaces from female insects, expecting to contain (Z)-4-nonenal (Dallerac et al. 2000; Yukilevich and True 2008; Grillet et al. 2012; Frey et al. 2020), we did not record any effect for OR69aB. To shed more light on this aspect, additional experiments may be conducted by testing samples of Zimbabwe by GC-SSR using a different GC-column from HP-5 and adopting a different pheromone collection protocol (Frey et al. 2020). On the other hand, activation of DsuzOR69aB to (Z)-4-nonenal, not expected to be emitted by *D. suzukii*, but identified in the emissions of *D. melanogaster* (Lebreton et al. 2017) and of its subspecies Zimbabwe (Frey et al. 2020), may suggest some sort of mechanisms of inter-specific communication among different insects of the genus *Drosophila*. For example, complex mechanisms exist at the base of inter-specific discrimination among insects within this genus (Wood and Ringo 1980) that are based on the different composition of cuticular hydrocarbons (Serrato-Capuchina et al. 2020). Although speculative, the detection of aldehyde pheromones by OR69a receptors






Fig. 5 GC-SSR screening of DsuzOR69a-subunits tested to headspaces collected from *Hanseniaspora uvarum*. **a** Spike frequency plot (SSR=80 Hz, Bin-width=8.0 s, Filter=2 Taps; above) associated with ab3A firing for transgenic *D. melanogaster* expressing DsuzOR69aA, -aB and aC subunits, tested with headspaces collected from *H. uvarum* (GC 5.0 mV; Time: s; $N=[3-5]$) already available in our labs, that will be part of additional projects. Asterisks with letters (A1–C1) denote significant ab3A spiking per second (Online Resource 5); magnification of spike frequency plots in

proximity to active retention times is reported in Online Resource 8. **b** Box-plot generated upon analysis of spike counting for the effects elicited by the retention times indicated in A and Online Resource 8; asterisks denote significant effects (Online Resource 5). Blue, DsuzOR69aA (two-tailed paired *T*-test [$\alpha=0.05$], $N=3$: RT 14.953 [A1], $p=0.0373320$); green, DsuzOR69aB ($N=5$: RT 4.769–4.800 [B1], $p=0.030327506$; RT 7.221 [B2], $p=0.02227182$; RT 8.562 [B3], $p=0.014788452$; RT 11.677 [B4], $p=0.019825885$); red, DsuzOR69aC ($N=4$: RT 14.953 [C1], $p=0.015551882$)



C




Fig. 6 Fluorescent in situ hybridization of DsuzOR69a subunits. **a** left: male (♂) and female (♀) antennae comparing bright field, Cy5 and merged channels for DsuzOR69aA ($N_{\text{male}} = 11$, $N_{\text{female}} = 10$), aB ($N_{\text{male}} = 11$, $N_{\text{female}} = 10$) and aC ($N_{\text{male}} = 13$, $N_{\text{female}} = 9$). Right: box-plots generated upon analysis of neuronal counting. Note: no significant differences in terms of the number of neurons were validated for the staining for each different transcript. **b** left: positive control DsuzOrco using a fluorescent probe stained with Fluo (laser: 488), comparing bright field, 488 and merged channels. Below, right: negative control DsuzIR60b using a fluorescent probe stained with DIG (laser: Cy5), comparing bright field and Cy5. **c** schematic representation of neuronal distribution on *D. suzukii* antenna: blue, DsuzOR69aA, green: DsuzOR69aB, red, DsuzOR69aC

upon their emission through autoxidation of cuticular hydrocarbons may be at the base of these inter-specific communication mechanisms. Not surprisingly, we have already demonstrated the existence of similar chemosensory systems in other insects where conserved pheromone receptors detect the main sex odors from other species (Cattaneo et al. 2017a, b) and the same kairomones from their hosts (Cattaneo 2022). To verify possible emission of (Z)-4-nonenal from *D. suzukii* and its involvement in DsuzOR69a-based chemosensory communication, additional goals will be aimed at characterization of the rate of emission between males or females at different ages, virgin or mated, proposing (when possible) a similar approach used by Snellings et al. (2018) Taking another possible scenario, (Z)-4-nonenal may be emitted by hosts of *D. suzukii* or may derive from different sources involved in the ecological relations with this insect, deserving future studies to validate alternative origins of the ligand. Indeed, a similar context exists for the *D. melanogaster* OR69a-ligand (Z)-4-undecenal identified in Clementine essential peel oil (Chisholm et al. 2003).

Apart from binding (Z)-4-nonenal, with an expected role as pheromone, evidences of the DsuzOR69as in binding kairomones may come from additional GC-SSR data demonstrating activation of the three DsuzOR69a subunits in proximity of GC-peaks of injected headspace collections from *H. uvarum* (Fig. 5, Online Resource 8). *H. uvarum* is one of the main yeast symbionts of berries, it is renowned for its ecological relations with *D. suzukii* and interferes with the behavior of the insect (Rehermann et al. 2021; Spitaler et al. 2022; Mori et al. 2017; Jones et al. 2021; Lewis and Hamby 2019; Hamby et al. 2012). Although the compounds from *H. uvarum* headspace with activity on the DsuzOr69a-subunits were not identified, by invoking responses, it demonstrates involvements of DsuzOR69as in binding compounds emitted by this yeast, and it further remarks the ecological relations between this microorganism and the *D. suzukii* insect. In the frame of upcoming projects, GC-MS efforts will characterize the active ligands we have identified in *H. uvarum* headspace collections.

In analyzing expression of DsuzOR69a subunits in antennal sensory neurons of *D. suzukii*, we did not notice

a significant difference between males and females, neither in the neuronal number nor in their overall distribution (Fig. 6). Our fluorescent data seems to converge on two scenarios, demonstrating that single OR69a transcript variants may rather be identified in different neurons, as well as co-existent within the same neurons. The latter scenario seem to be coherent with expectations up to now reported for *D. melanogaster* suggesting co-existence of both OR69aA and OR69aB transcript variants within the same ab9a neurons (Lebreton et al. 2017; Robertsson et al. 2003; Couto et al. 2005; Martin et al. 2013; Münch et al. 2016). However, the study of Couto et al. (2005) demonstrated that the two OR69a subunits may be expressed through different promoters, which cannot exclude their possibility to be present among different sub-populations of neurons. For this reasons, co-expression of OR69a-subunits remains an open and current research question. To our knowledge, this represents the first in situ hybridization study conducted on *D. suzukii* neurons. Our results may represent the starting point for future projects performing deeper in situ hybridization by combining different probes all in once, to validate convergence of OR-subunits within the same OSNs, to consider if their chimeric cation channel may deserve to be tested by SSR. Indeed, in Lebreton et al. (2017) co-expression of OR69aA and OR69aB in the same empty neurons did not report neither qualitative nor quantitative differences in neuronal activity. However, the existence of five antennal OR69a variants in *D. suzukii* (Fig. 1a, b), which exons are more similar to each other than to exons from any other OR of this insect (Online Resource 9; Walker et al. 2022) may suggest different functional dynamics deserving better investigation in future research.

Apart from the heterologous expression, the identification in the antennae of *D. suzukii* of neurons expressing DsuzOR69a-subunits may add to the recent electrophysiological studies conducted in vivo on this insect (Keeseey et al. 2019): a more deepened GC-SSR analysis will investigate on these neurons the effects of the same active ligands we have identified in the course of our investigation.

Conclusions

For the first time, we have heterologously expressed and functionally characterized some chemosensory receptors of *D. suzukii*. By means of the empty neuron of *D. melanogaster*, we functionally characterized three OR69a subunits of *D. suzukii*. By SSR-screening and GC-SSR analysis, we identified ligands eliciting activation of DsuzOR69a-subunits to nanogram quantities, that based on our optimized method, suggested these compounds as real agonists of OR69a-based receptors. In terms of basic spike frequency, activation to single ligands, dose response characteristics

and the overall effects to minimal dosages, DsuzOR69aB seems to be the most active OR69a subunit characterized up to now, although both DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC are functional and tuned to a wide panel of ligands, some of which are active at nanogram doses. Among the active ligands, methyl salicylate represents the strongest agonist, specific solely for the DsuzOR69aB. GC-SSR suggested other ligands, like (Z)-4-nonenal, specific solely for DsuzOR69aB, R-carvone, common agonists for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aB, and 3-octanol as an agonist for DsuzOR69aA and DsuzOR69aC. Future projects may investigate the behavioral role of these ligands.

Although our results taken together may suggest the DsuzOR69a locus transcribing sensors for kairomones, activation of DsuzOR69aB to (Z)-4-nonenal warrants further efforts to validate its possible binding of pheromones, that more possibly, must be searched among the aldehydes emitted through autoxidation of *Drosophila*'s cuticular hydrocarbons. Future studies on the other two subunits translated from the DsuzOR69a-locus, DsuzOR69aD and DsuzOR69aE, will validate whether they may constitute receptors for kairomones or pheromones, to better understand the ecological role in *D. suzukii* of OR69a receptors.

Author Contributions Statement

AMC conceived and designed the experiments, generated transgenic fly-lines and performed SSR, dose–response, GC-SSR, data and statistical analysis and FISH studies. WBWIII performed genomic, transcriptomic and phylogenetic analysis that led to the identification and characterization of DsuzOR69a transcript variants that he isolated and cloned to generate transgenic *Drosophila*. PW designed the bouquet of candidate ligands that have been tested on OR69a subunits, prepared diluted aliquots tested by SSR and provided headspace collections from *H. uvarum*. CK and PGB generated headspace samples collected from *D. suzukii* and *D. melanogaster* flies. WBWIII and AMC supervised the research. PW provided financial support. AMC wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by AMC. The first draft of the manuscript was written by AMC and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-022-01585-2>.

Acknowledgments The authors acknowledge Prof Richard Benton, Center for Integrative Genomics—University of Lausanne for covering running costs for FISH experiments, for laboratory and equipment

availability, and for stimulating discussions and personal communications. The authors acknowledge Dr. Francisco Gonzalez (Chemtica Internacional, S.A., Costa Rica), Dr. Mattias Larsson and Dr. Teun Dekker (Department of Plant Protection Biology, Swedish University of Agriculture Science) for general technical assistance in SSR data analysis and Dr. Sebastian Larsson Herrera (Horticulture unit, Chemical Ecology) for technical assistance in the statistical analysis for Fig. 1d. Mention of trade names or commercial products in this article is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the United States Department of Agriculture. USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Funding Open access funding provided by Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. SSR studies were performed in the frame of the Crafoordska Stiftelsen project number 20180954, title: “Control of apple pests with fruit and yeast odorants.” Running costs for SSR experiments were covered by the research unit Chemical Ecology—Horticulture (Department of Plant Protection Biology, SLU-Alnarp). Costs for FISH experiments were covered by the Benton Lab—Centre for Integrative Genomics—University of Lausanne (Lausanne, CH-1015 Switzerland). GC-SSR studies, FISH experiments, data analysis and manuscript preparation were undertaken in the course of the FORMAS Swedish research council project number 2018–00891, title “Control of fruit pests by targeting larval chemical sensing.”

Data availability All data and material generated during this study are included within the article as online resources (supplementary figures and raw data files). More data can be provided contacting the corresponding author at albertomaria.cattaneo@slu.se.

Declarations

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Consent to publish Not applicable.

Consent to participate Not applicable.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Andersson MN, Schlyter F, Hill SR, Dekker T (2012) What reaches the antenna? How to calibrate odor flux and ligand-receptor affinities. *Chem Senses* 37(5):403–420. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjs009>
- Anfora G, Rota-Stabelli O, Tait G, Gottardello A, Grassi A, Ioriatti C et al (2017) *Drosophila suzukii*, una specie aliena dannosa alle colture di piccoli frutti in Trentino: ricerca in corso e linee guida

- per il controllo. Pubblicazione realizzata nell'ambito del progetto LExEM. 2017; www.fmach.it/content/download/140413/.../Booklet+Drosophila+Lexem_FINAL.pdf.
- Antony C, Davis ITL, Carlson DA, Pechine M, Jallon JM (1985) Compared behavioral responses of male *Drosophila melanogaster* (Canton S) to natural and synthetic aphrodisiacs. *J Chem Ecol* 11:No.12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01012116>.
- Asplen MK, Anfora G, Biondi A, Choi D-S, Chu D, Daane KM et al (2015) Invasion biology of spotted wing drosophila (*Drosophila suzukii*): a global perspective and future priorities. *J Pest Sci* 88:469–494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-015-0681-z>
- Auerbach A (2016) Dose–response analysis when there is a correlation between affinity and efficacy. *Mol Pharmacol* 89(2):297–302. <https://doi.org/10.1124/mol.115.102509>
- Barlow RB, Scott NC, Stephenson RP (1967) The affinity and efficacy of onium salts on the frog rectus abdominis. *Br J Pharmacol Chemother* 31:188–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-5381.1967.tb01989.x>
- Bastin-Héline L, de Fouchier A, Cao S, Koutroumpa F, Caballero-Vidal G, Robakiewicz S et al (2019) A novel lineage of candidate pheromone receptors for sex communication in moths. *eLife* 8:e49826. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.49826>.
- Bengtsson M, Liljefors T, Hansson BS, Löfstedt C, Copaja SV (1990) Structure-activity relationships for chain-shortened analogs of (Z)-5-decenyl acetate, a pheromone component of the turnip moth, *Agrotis segetum*. *J Chem Ecol* 16:667–684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01016478>
- Bengtsson JM, Gonzalez F, Cattaneo AM, Montagné N, Walker WB, Bengtsson M et al (2014) A predicted sex pheromone receptor of codling moth *Cydia pomonella* detects the plant volatile pear ester. *Front Ecol Evol* 2:Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2014.00033>.
- Billeter J-C, Atallah J, Krupp JJ, Millar JG, Levine JD (2009) Specialized cells tag sexual and species identity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature* 461:987–991. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08495>
- Binyameen M, Anderson P, Ignell R, Birgersson G, Razaq M, Shad SA et al (2014) Identification of plant semiochemicals and characterization of new olfactory sensory neuron types in a polyphagous pest moth *Spodoptera littoralis*. *Chem Senses* 39(8):719–733. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bju046>
- Brand AH, Perrimon N (1993) Targeted gene expression as a means of altering cell fates and generating dominant phenotypes. *Development* 118(2):401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.118.2.401>
- Briem F, Eben A, Gross J, Vogt H (2016) An invader supported by a parasite: mistletoe berries as a host for food and reproduction of Spotted Wing *Drosophila* in early spring 2016. *J Pest Sci* 89:749–759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-016-0739-6>
- CABI EPPPO Centre for Agricultural Bioscience International, European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (2016) Distribution maps of plant pests, map 766 (1st revision). <https://www.cabi.org/isc/abstract/20163203811>. Accessed 19 April 2020.
- Cattaneo AM, Bengtsson JM, Montagné N, Jacquin-Joly E, Rota-Stabelli O, Salvagnin U et al (2016) TRPA5, an ankyrin subfamily insect TRP channel, is expressed in antennae of *Cydia pomonella* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae) in multiple splice variants. *J Insect Sci* 16(1):83. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jisesa/iew072>
- Cattaneo AM, Gonzalez F, Bengtsson JM, Corey EA, Jacquin-Joly E, Montagné N et al (2017a) Candidate pheromone receptors of codling moth *Cydia pomonella* respond to pheromones and kairomones. *Sci Rep* 7:41105. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep41105>
- Cattaneo AM, Bobkov YV, Corey EA, Borgonovo G, Bassoli A (2017b) *Perilla* derived compounds mediate human TRPA1 channel activity. *Med Aromat Plants (Los Angel)* 6:1. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2167-0412.1000283>
- Cattaneo AM (2022) Candidate pheromone receptors of the codling moth and the apple clearwing moth binding kairomones. Pheromones—annual meeting shared among the divisions of Chemical Ecology of SLU-Alnarp and Lund University, 26–27 October 2022, Ångavallen (Sweden). Researchgate link: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365438109_Candidate_pheromone_receptors_of_the_codling_moth_and_the_apple_clearwing_moth_binding_kairomones
- Chahda JS, Soni N, Sun JS, Ebrahim SAM, Weiss BL, Carlson JR (2019) The molecular and cellular basis of olfactory response to tsetse fly attractants. *PLoS Genet* 15(3):e1008005. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1008005>
- Chisholm MG, Jell JA, and Cass Jr DM (2003) Characterization of the major odorants found in the peel oil of *Citrus reticulata* Blanco cv. Clementine using gas chromatography–olfactometry. *Flav Fragr J* 18(4):275–281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ffj.1188>.
- Cini A, Ioriatti C, Anfora G (2012) A review of the invasion of *Drosophila suzukii* in Europe and a draft research agenda for integrated pest management. *Bull Insect* 65(1):149–160. <https://www.cabi.org/ISC/abstract/20123199066>.
- Couto A, Alenius M, Dickson BJ (2005) Molecular, anatomical, and functional organization of the *Drosophila* olfactory system. *Curr Biol* 15(17):1535–1547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.07.034>
- Coyne JA (1996) Genetics of differences in pheromonal hydrocarbons between *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. *Genetics* 143:353–364. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/143.1.353>
- Dallerac R, Labeur C, Jallon JM, Knipple DC, Roelofs WL, Wicker-Thomas C (2000) A $\Delta 9$ desaturase gene with a different substrate specificity is responsible for the cuticular diene hydrocarbon polymorphism in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 97:9449–9454. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.150243997>
- Dobritsa AA, van der Goes van Naters W, War CG, Steinbrecht RA, Carlson JR (2003) Integrating the molecular and cellular basis of odor coding in the *Drosophila* antenna. *Neuron* 37(5):827–841. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273\(03\)00094-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00094-1)
- Eben A, Sporer F, Vogt H, Wetterauer P, Wink M (2020) Search for alternative control strategies of *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae): laboratory assays using volatile natural plant compounds. *Insects* 11(11):811. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects11110811>
- Ebrahim SAM, Dweck HKM, Stökl J, Hofferberth JE, Trona F, Weniger K et al (2015) *Drosophila* avoids parasitoids by sensing their semiochemicals via a dedicated olfactory circuit. *PLoS Biol* 13(12):e1002318. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002318>
- Frey T, Kwadha CA, Wallin EA, Holgersson E, Hedenström E, Bohman B (2020) The human odorant receptor OR10A6 is tuned to the pheromone of the commensal fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.07.414714>
- Galizia CG, Münch D, Strauch M, Nissler A, Ma S (2010) Integrating heterogeneous odor response data into a common response model: A DoOR to the complete olfactome. *Chem Senses* 35(7):551–563. <https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjq042>
- Gonzalez F, Witzgall P, Walker WB III (2016) Protocol for heterologous expression of insect odourant receptors in *Drosophila*. *Front Ecol Evol* 4:24. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2016.00024>
- Gonzalez F, Bengtsson JM, Walker III WB, Sousa MFR, Cattaneo AM, Montagné N et al (2015) A conserved odorant receptor detects the same substituted indan compounds in a tortricid and a noctuid moth. *Front Ecol Evol* 3:article 131. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2015.00131>.
- Gonzalez F, Walker III WB, Bengtsson M, Witzgall P, Gonzalez G (2022) Functional phylogeny of the *Drosophila* olfactory receptor Or69a. In preparation.

- Grillet M, Everaerts C, Houot B, Ritchie MG, Cobb M, Ferveur JF (2012) Incipient speciation in *Drosophila melanogaster* involves chemical signals. *Sci Rep* 2:224. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00224>
- Grosse-Wilde E, Gohl T, Bouche E, Breer H, Krieger J (2007) Candidate pheromone receptors provide the basis for the response of distinct antennal neurons to pheromonal compounds. *Eur J Neurosci* 25(8):2364–2373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2007.05512.x>
- Guindon S, Dufayard JF, Lefort V, Anisimova M, Hordijk W, Gascuel O (2010) New algorithms and methods to estimate maximum-likelihood phylogenies: assessing the performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst Biol* 59(3):307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syq010>. See Online resource 9 caption
- Hall TA (1999) BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. *Nucl Acids Symp Ser* 41:95–98. See Online resource 9 caption
- Hallam EA, Ho MG, Carlson JR (2004) The molecular basis of odor coding in the *Drosophila* antennae. *Cell* 117(7):965–979. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2004.05.012>
- Hamby KA, Hernández A, Boundy-Mills K, Zalom FG (2012) Associations of yeasts with spotted-wing *Drosophila* (*Drosophila suzukii*; Diptera: Drosophilidae) in cherries and raspberries *Appl Environ Microbiol* 78(14):4869–4873. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00841-12>
- Hickner PV, Rivaldi CL, Johnson CM, Siddappaji M, Raster GJ, Syed Z (2016) The making of a pest: Insights from the evolution of chemosensory receptor families in a pestiferous and invasive fly, *Drosophila suzukii*. *BMC Genomics* 17:648. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-2983-9>. See Online resource 9 caption
- Jayanthi P D K, Kempraj V, Aurade RM, Roy TK, Shivashankara K S and Verghese A (2014) Computational reverse chemical ecology: virtual screening and predicting behaviorally active semiochemicals for *Bactrocera dorsalis*. *BMC Genomics* 15:209. <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2164/15/209>
- Jones PL, Pask GM, Rinker DC, Zwiebel LJ (2011) Functional agonism of insect odorant receptor ion channels. *PNAS* 108(21):8821–8825. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1102425108>
- Jones R, Fountain MT, Günther CS, Eady PE and Goddard MR (2021) Separate and combined *Hanseniaspora uvarum* and *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* metabolic volatiles are attractive to *Drosophila suzukii* in the laboratory and field. *Sci Rep* 11:1201. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-79691-3>
- Katoh K, Rozewicki J, Yamada KD (2019) MAFFT online service: multiple sequence alignment, interactive sequence choice and visualization. *Brief Bioinform* 20:1160–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbx108>. See Online resource 9 caption
- Keeseey IW, Knaden M, Hansson BS (2015) Olfactory specialization in *Drosophila suzukii* supports an ecological shift in host preference from rotten to fresh fruit. *J Chem Ecol* 41(2):121–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10886-015-0544-3>
- Keeseey I, Zhang J, Depetris-Chauvin A, Obiero GF, Knaden M, Hansson BS (2019) Evolution of a pest: towards the complete neuroethology of *Drosophila suzukii* and the subgenus *Sophophora*. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/717322>
- Kim J, Jang M, Shin E, Kim J, Lee SH, Chung L, Park CG (2016) Fumigant and contact toxicity of 22 wooden essential oils and their major components against *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Pest Biochem Physiol* 133:35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pestbp.2016.03.007>
- Kleman I, Rehmann G, Kwadha CA, Witzgall P, Becher PG (2022) *Hanseniaspora uvarum* attracts *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae) with high specificity. *J Econ Entomol* 115:999–1007
- Klick J, Rodriguez-Saona CR, Cumplido JH, Holdcraft RJ, Urrutia WH, da Silva RO et al (2019) Testing a novel attract-and-kill strategy for *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae) management. *J Ins Sci* 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jisesa/iey132>
- Knoll V, Ellenbroek T, Romeis J, Collatza J (2017) Seasonal and regional presence of hymenopteran parasitoids of *Drosophila* in Switzerland and their ability to parasitize the invasive *Drosophila suzukii*. *Sci Rep* 7:40697. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep40697>
- Knudsen JT, Tollsten L, Bergström LG (1993) Floral scents—a checklist of volatile compounds isolated by head-space techniques. *Phytochem* 33:253–280. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422\(93\)85502-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422(93)85502-I)
- Kwadha CA, Okwaro LA, Kleman I, Rehmann G, Revadi S, Ndlela S et al (2021) Detection of the spotted wing drosophila, *Drosophila suzukii*, in continental sub-Saharan Africa. *J Pest Sci* 94:251–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-021-01330-1>
- Leal WS (2005) Pheromone reception. *Topics Curr Chem* 240:1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b98314>
- Leal WS, Barbosa RMR, Xu W, Ishida Y, Syed Z, Latte N et al (2008) Reverse and conventional chemical ecology approaches for the development of oviposition attractants for *Culex* mosquitoes. *PLoS One* 3(8):e3045. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ponr.0003045>
- Lebreton S, Borrero-Echeverry F, Gonzalez F, Solum M, Wallin EA, Hedenström E et al (2017) A *Drosophila* female pheromone elicits species-specific long-range attraction via an olfactory channel with dual specificity for sex and food. *BMC Biol* 15:88. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-017-0427-x>
- Lefort V, Longueville JE, Gascuel O (2017) SMS: smart model selection in PhyML. *Mol Biol Evol* 34(9):2422–2424. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msx149>. See Online resource 9 caption
- Lewis MT and Hamby KA (2019) Differential impacts of yeasts on feeding behavior and development in larval *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera:Drosophilidae) *Sci Rep* 9:Article number 13370. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-48863-1>
- Martin F, Boto T, Gomez-Diaz C, Alcorta E (2013) Elements of olfactory reception in adult *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Anatomic Rec* 296:1477–1488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.22747>
- Mazzetto F, Marchetti E, Amiresmaeli N, Sacco D, Francati S, Jucker C et al (2016) *Drosophila* parasitoids in northern Italy and their potential to attack the exotic pest *Drosophila suzukii*. *J Pest Sci* 89:837–850. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-016-0746-7>
- Mika K, Cruchet S, Chai PC, Prieto-Godino LL, Auer TO, Pradervand S, et al. (2021) Olfactory receptor-dependent receptor repression in *Drosophila*. *Sci. Adv* 7(32). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe3745>
- Montagné N, Cheretemps T, Brigaud I, François A, François MC, de Fouchier A et al (2012) Functional characterization of a sex pheromone receptor in the pest moth *Spodoptera littoralis* by heterologous expression in *Drosophila*. *Eur J Neurosci* 36(5):2588–2596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08183.x>
- Mori B, Whitener AB, Leinweber Y, Revadi S, Beers EH, Witzgall P et al (2017) Enhanced yeast feeding following mating facilitates control of the invasive fruit pest *Drosophila suzukii*. *J Appl Ecol* 54:170–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12688>
- Münch D, Galizia CG (2011) DoOR: The database of odorant responses. *ChemoSense* 13. ISSN 1442-9098.
- Münch D, Galizia CG (2016) DoOR 2.0—Comprehensive mapping of *Drosophila melanogaster* odorant responses. *Sci Rep* 6:Article number 21841. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep21841>
- Ni X, Lu W, Qiao X, Huang J (2021) Genome editing efficiency of four *Drosophila suzukii* endogenous U6 promoters. *Ins Mol Biol* 30(4):420–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imb.12707>
- Ramasamy S, Ometto L, Crava CM, Revadi S, Kaur R, Horner DS, Pisani D, Dekker T, Anfora G, Rota-Stabelli O (2016) The evolution of olfactory gene families in *Drosophila* and the genetic basis of chemical-ecological adaptation in *Drosophila suzukii*.

- Genome Biol Evol 8:2297–2311. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evw160>. See Online resource 9 caption
- Rehermann G, Spitaler U, Sahle K, Cossu CS, Delle Donne L, Bianchi F et al (2021) Behavioral manipulation of *Drosophila suzukii* for pest control: high attraction to yeast enhances insecticide efficacy when applied on leaves. *Pest Manag Sci* 78:896–904. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6699>
- Ren Y, McGillen MR, Daële V, Casas J, Mellouki A (2020) The fate of methyl salicylate in the environment and its role as signal in multitrophic interactions. *Sci Tot Envir* 749:141406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141406>
- Revadi S, Lebreton S, Witzgall P, Anfora G, Dekker T, Becher PG (2015a) Sexual behavior of *Drosophila suzukii*. *Insects* 6(1):183–196. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects6010183>
- Revadi S, Vitagliano S, Stacconi MVR, Ramasamy S, Mansurian S, Carlin S et al (2015b) Olfactory responses of *Drosophila suzukii* females to host plant volatiles. *Physiol Entomol* 40:54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phen.12088>
- Revadi SV, Giannuzzi VA, Rossi V, Hunger GM, Conchou L, Rondoni G et al (2021a) Larval stage specific expression of an odorant receptor correlates with differential olfactory behaviors in *Spodoptera littoralis* caterpillars. *BMC Biol* 19:231. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-021-01159-1>
- Revadi SV, Giannuzzi VA, Vetukuri RR, Walker WB, Becher PG (2021b) Larval response to frass and guaiacol—detection of an attractant produced by bacteria from *Spodoptera littoralis* frass. *J Pest Sci* 94:1105–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-021-01352-9>
- Rice KB, Short BD, Leskey TC (2017) Development of an attract-and-kill strategy for *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae): evaluation of attracticidal spheres under laboratory and field conditions. *J Econ Entomol* 110(2):535–542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/tow319>
- Robertsson HM, Warr CG, Carlson JR (2003) Molecular evolution of the insect chemoreceptor gene superfamily in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PNAS* 100(suppl 2):14537–14542. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2335847100>
- Saina M, Benton R (2013). Visualizing olfactory receptor expression and localization in *Drosophila*. In: Crasto C (ed) *Olfactory receptors 2013. methods in molecular biology (Methods and Protocols)*, vol 1003. Humana Press, Totowa. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-62703-377-0_16.
- Serrato-Capuchina A, Schwochert TD, Zhang S, Roy B, Peede D, Koppelman C et al (2020) Pure species discriminate against hybrids in the *Drosophila melanogaster* species subgroup. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.22.214924>
- Shawer R (2017) Impact of traditional pesticides and new controlled release formulations on *Drosophila suzukii*. PhD thesis, Università degli Studi di Padova. <http://paduaresearch.cab.unipd.it/10284/>.
- Shawer R (2020) Chemical Control of *Drosophila suzukii*. In: Garcia FRM (ed) *Drosophila suzukii* Management. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62692-1_7.
- Silbering AF, Rytz R, Grosjean Y, Abuin L, Ramdya P, Jefferis GSXE, Benton R (2011) Complementary function and integrated wiring of the evolutionarily distinct *Drosophila* olfactory subsystems. *J Neurosci* 31(38):13357–13375. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2360-11.2011>
- Snellings Y, Herrera B, Wildemann B, Beelen M, Zwarts L, Wenseleers T, Callaerts P (2018) The role of cuticular hydrocarbons in mate recognition in *Drosophila suzukii*. *Sci Rep* 8:Article number 4996. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-23189-6>.
- Spitaler U, Cossu CS, Donne LD, Bianchi F, Rehermann G, Eisenstecken D et al (2022) Field and greenhouse application of an attract-and-kill formulation based on the yeast *Hanseniaspora uvarum* and the insecticide spinosad to Control *Drosophila suzukii* in grapes. *Pest Manag Sci* 78:1287–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6748>
- Walker III WB, Mori BA, Cattaneo AM, Gonzalez F, Witzgall P, Becher PG (2022) Comparative transcriptomic assessment of the chemosensory receptor repertoire of *Drosophila suzukii* adult and larval olfactory organs. *Comp Biochem and Physiol Part D Genom Proteomics*. Accepted, in press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbd.2022.101049>
- Walsh J, Bolda MP, Goodhue RE, Dreves AJ, Lee J, Bruck DJ et al (2011) *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae): invasive pest of ripening soft fruit expanding its geographic range and damage potential. *Int Pest Manag* 2(1):G1–G7. <https://doi.org/10.1603/IPM10010>
- Wang Y, Farine J-P, Yang Y, Yang J, Tang W, Gehring N et al (2020b) Transcriptional control of quality differences in the lipid-based cuticle barrier in *Drosophila suzukii* and *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Front Genet*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2020.00887>
- Wang X, Lee JC, Daane KM, Buffington ML, Hoelmer KA (2020a) Biological control of *Drosophila suzukii*. *CAB reviews: perspectives in agriculture, veterinary science. Nutrition Natural Resour* 15:No. 054. <https://doi.org/10.1079/PAVSNR202015054>.
- Wood D, Ringo JM (1980) Male mating discrimination in *Drosophila melanogaster*, *D. simulans* and their hybrids. *Evolution* 34(2):320–329. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2407395>
- Yao CA, Ignell R, Carlson JR (2005) Chemosensory coding by neurons in the coeloconic sensilla of the *Drosophila* antenna. *J Neurosci* 25:8359–8367. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2432-05.2005>
- Yukilevich R, True JR (2008) African morphology, behavior and pheromones underlie incipient sexual isolation between US and Caribbean *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 62:2807–2828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00427.x>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.