
Rapidly Evolving Genes and Genetic Systems

EDITED BY

Rama S. Singh

McMaster University, Canada

Jianping Xu

McMaster University, Canada

and

Rob J. Kulathinal

Temple University, USA

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Rapidly Evolving Genes and Genetic Systems. First Edition. Edited by Rama S. Singh, Jianping Xu, and Rob J. Kulathinal. © 2012 Oxford University Press. Published 2012 by Oxford University Press.

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2012

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2012

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012937854

ISBN 978-0-19-964227-4 (hbk)

978-0-19-964228-1 (pbk)

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Contents

Foreword	xiv
<i>Richard Lewontin</i>	
Preface	xvi
List of Contributors	xvii
1 Introduction	1
<i>Rama S. Singh, Jianping Xu, and Rob J. Kulathinal</i>	
1.1 A gradualist history	1
1.2 Mechanisms of rapid and episodic change	2
1.2.1 Unconstrained neutral space	2
1.2.2 Horizontal gene transfer	3
1.2.3 Developmental macromutations	3
1.2.4 Evolution by gene regulation	3
1.2.5 Coevolutionary forces	4
1.2.6 Sexual selection and sexual arms races	4
1.2.7 Population demography and genetic revolutions	5
1.2.8 Adaptive radiation	5
1.3 Punctuated equilibrium within a microevolution framework	5
1.4 Tempo, mode, and the genomic landscape	6
1.5 'Rapidly evolving genes and genetic systems': a brief overview	7
1.6 Future prospects	8
Part I From Theory to Experiment	
2 Theoretical perspectives on rapid evolutionary change	13
<i>Sarah P. Otto</i>	
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 When is strong selection strong?	13
2.3 Does strong selection differ in kind from weak selection?	16
2.4 Concluding thoughts	20
3 Recombination reshuffles the genotypic deck, thus accelerating the rate of evolution	23
<i>Mihai Albu, Amir R. Kermany, and Donal A. Hickey</i>	
3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 Simulating selection on multilocus genotypes	24
3.3 Discussion	27
3.4 Conclusions	29

4 Heterogeneity in neutral divergence across genomic regions induced by sex-specific hybrid incompatibility	31
<i>Seiji Kumagai and Marcy K. Uyenoyama</i>	
4.1 Introduction	31
4.1.1 Detecting incompatibility factors	31
4.1.2 Within-species polymorphisms for incompatibility factors with sex-limited transmission	31
4.2 Genealogical migration rate	32
4.2.1 Definition	32
4.2.2 Non-sex-specific incompatibility	33
4.2.3 Sex-specific incompatibility	33
4.3 Applications	33
4.3.1 Mitochondrial introgression	33
4.3.2 Interpreting region-specific F_{ST}	35
4.4 Conclusions	37
5 Rapid evolution in experimental populations of major life forms	40
<i>Jianping Xu</i>	
5.1 Introduction	40
5.2 Features of experimental evolution	41
5.3 Types of experimental evolution	42
5.3.1 Directional selection	42
5.3.2 Adaptation	42
5.3.3 Mutation accumulation	42
5.4 Rapid change and divergence among mutation accumulation population lines	43
5.4.1 Microbial growth rate	43
5.4.2 Other microbial traits	45
5.4.3 Plants and animals	45
5.5 Adaptation and directional selection experiments	47
5.5.1 Adaptation of <i>E. coli</i> populations	47
5.5.2 Adaptation of viral populations	47
5.5.3 Adaptation and directional selection in fruit flies	48
5.5.4 Adaptation in yeast	48
5.5.5 Directional selection in mammals	48
5.5.6 Correlated changes between traits	49
5.5.7 Acquisition of novel phenotypes	49
5.6 Genomic analysis of experimental evolution populations	50
5.7 Conclusions and perspectives	50
Part II Rapidly Evolving Genetic Elements	
6 Rapid evolution of low complexity sequences and single amino acid repeats across eukaryotes	55
<i>Wilfried Haerty and G. Brian Golding</i>	
6.1 Introduction	55
6.2 Rapid evolution of low complexity sequences	55
6.2.1 Mutational processes	56

6.3	Rapid divergence of LCRs and their impact on surrounding sequences	57
6.3.1	LCRs as indicators of regions of lowered purifying selective pressures	57
6.3.2	Mutagenic effect of LCRs	58
6.4	Low complexity sequences under selection	59
6.4.1	Deleterious effects of LCR size variation	59
6.4.2	DNA composition	59
6.4.3	LCR distribution	60
6.4.4	Phenotypic effects of LCR size variation	60
6.4.5	Selection for low information content	61
6.5	Perspectives	61
7	Fast rates of evolution in bacteria due to horizontal gene transfer	64
	<i>Weilong Hao</i>	
7.1	Introduction	64
7.2	Quantifying horizontal gene transfer	65
7.3	Understanding the variation of gene gain and loss	66
7.4	Horizontal gene transfer in duplicated genes	67
7.5	Pseudogenization of horizontally transferred genes	67
7.6	Mobile sequences and gene movement	68
7.7	Gene exchange goes fine-scale	69
7.8	Conclusions	69
8	Rapid evolution of animal mitochondrial DNA	73
	<i>Xuhua Xia</i>	
8.1	Introduction	73
8.2	Mitochondrial replication, strand bias, and evolutionary rates	74
8.3	The change in genetic code and evolutionary rate	77
8.4	The change in tRNA genes and evolutionary rate	79
8.5	Conclusions	81
9	Rapid evolution of centromeres and centromeric/kinetochore proteins	83
	<i>Kevin C. Roach, Benjamin D. Ross, and Harmit S. Malik</i>	
9.1	Centromeres in 'the fast lane'	83
9.2	Rapidly evolving centromeric histones	83
9.3	Bewildering centromeric DNA complexity and evolution	85
9.4	The 'centromere paradox': conflict, not coevolution	87
9.5	Support for the centromere drive model	89
9.6	Taxonomic differences in susceptibility to centromere drive	89
9.7	Rapid evolution of other centromeric proteins	90
9.8	Centromere drive and postzygotic isolation between species	91
9.9	Future directions	91
10	Rapid evolution via chimeric genes	94
	<i>Rebekah L. Rogers and Daniel L. Hartl</i>	
10.1	Introduction	94
10.2	Mechanisms of formation	94
10.3	Selection	96

10.4	Genomic stability	96
10.5	Function	97
10.6	Non-coding DNA	98
10.7	Future directions	99
11	Evolutionary interactions between sex chromosomes and autosomes	101
	<i>Manyuan Long, Maria D. Vibranovski, and Yong E. Zhang</i>	
11.1	Introduction	101
11.2	Gene traffic between sex chromosome and autosomes	102
11.2.1	Gene traffic in <i>Drosophila</i>	102
11.2.2	Gene traffic in mammals	103
11.2.3	The cause and consequence of gene traffic	104
11.3	The generality of gene traffic out of the X in the genus <i>Drosophila</i>	105
11.3.1	Gene traffic in Drosophilidae and RNA-based and DNA-based duplication	105
11.3.2	Independent tests of gene traffic	105
11.4	Mechanisms underlying gene traffic out of the X: the detection of meiotic sex chromosome inactivation	107
11.4.1	Evolutionary genetic models	107
11.4.2	Molecular mechanistic models	107
11.5	The X-recruitment of young male-biased genes and gene traffic out of the X chromosome	108
11.5.1	Age-dependence in <i>Drosophila</i>	109
11.5.2	Age-dependence in mammals	110
11.5.3	The slow enrichment of X-linked female genes	110
11.6	Concluding remarks	111
12	Evolutionary signatures in non-coding DNA	115
	<i>Dara G. Torgerson and Ryan D. Hernandez</i>	
12.1	Introduction	115
12.2	Challenges to studying the evolution of non-coding DNA	116
12.2.1	Identifying functional non-coding DNA	116
12.2.2	Estimating the neutral evolutionary rate	117
12.2.3	Limitations of identifying rapid evolution in non-coding DNA	117
12.3	Patterns of evolution in non-coding DNA	117
12.3.1	Selection in conserved non-coding sequences?	118
12.3.2	Detecting selection in promoters and TFBSs	120
12.3.3	Emerging trends in microRNA binding sites	121
12.3.4	Coding versus non-coding	121
12.4	Future prospects	122
	Part III Sex- and Reproduction-Related Genetic Systems	
13	Evolution of sperm–egg interaction	127
	<i>Melody R. Palmer and Willie J. Swanson</i>	
13.1	Introduction	127
13.2	Evolution at each step of sperm–egg interaction	127

13.3 Causes of rapid evolution	130
13.4 Methods to identify interacting proteins	132
13.5 Conclusions	132
14 Rates of sea urchin bindin evolution	136
<i>H. A. Lessios and Kirk S. Zigler</i>	
14.1 Introduction	136
14.2 Function and structure of bindin	136
14.3 Rate of bindin evolution	137
14.4 Possible reasons for different evolutionary rates in bindin	139
14.5 Conclusions and future prospects	141
15 Evolution of <i>Drosophila</i> seminal proteins and their networks	144
<i>Alex Wong and Mariana F. Wolfner</i>	
15.1 Introduction	144
15.2 <i>Drosophila</i> seminal fluid as a model system for rapidly evolving proteins	144
15.3 Extensive variation in rates of SFP evolution	147
15.4 Selection on a network?	149
15.5 Conclusions	150
16 Evolutionary genomics of the sperm proteome	153
<i>Timothy L. Karr and Steve Dorus</i>	
16.1 Introduction	153
16.2 Characterization of the <i>Drosophila</i> sperm proteome	154
16.3 Molecular evolution of the <i>Drosophila</i> sperm proteome	154
16.4 Evolution of novel <i>Drosophila</i> sperm components	155
16.4.1 Novel genes in the sperm proteome	156
16.4.2 Expansion and diversification of S-LAP gene family	157
16.5 The mouse sperm proteome: intensified selection on sperm membrane and acrosome genes	157
16.6 Rapid evolution of immunity-related genes in mammalian sperm	160
16.7 Sexual selection and compartmentalized adaptation in reproductive genetic systems	161
16.8 Future perspectives	162
17 Fast evolution of reproductive genes: when is selection sexual?	165
<i>Alberto Civetta</i>	
17.1 Introduction	165
17.2 What has been the role of selection during the evolution of male reproductive genes?	167
17.3 When is selection sexual? The phylogenetic approach	168
17.4 Testing sexual selection in the era of genomes	168
17.5 The need for association studies and functional assays	171
17.6 Conclusions	172

18 Rapid morphological, behavioral, and ecological evolution in <i>Drosophila</i>: comparisons between the endemic Hawaiian <i>Drosophila</i> and the cactophilic <i>repleta</i> species group	176
<i>Patrick M. O'Grady and Therese Ann Markow</i>	
18.1 Introduction	176
18.1.1 Ecological adaptations	177
18.1.2 Morphological adaptations	177
18.1.3 Behavioral adaptations	178
18.2 Hawaiian <i>Drosophila</i> radiation	179
18.2.1 Phylogenetic relationships	179
18.2.2 Sexual adaptations to morphology and behavior	179
18.2.3 Ecological adaptations to morphology and behavior	179
18.3 Cactophilic <i>Drosophila</i> radiation in the New World	180
18.3.1 Phylogenetic relationships	180
18.3.2 Rapid evolution of ecological adaptations	180
18.3.3 Rapid evolution of behavioral traits	182
18.4 Conclusions: adaptive radiation versus adaptive infiltration	183
19 Ancient yet fast: rapid evolution of mating genes and mating systems in fungi	187
<i>Timothy Y. James</i>	
19.1 Introduction	187
19.2 Incompatibility systems in fungi	189
19.3 Fungal reproductive proteins show evidence for positive and balancing selection	190
19.4 Evidence for rapid evolution of fungal incompatibility genes and systems	193
19.4.1 Sequence evolution	194
19.4.2 Mating systems and loci	194
19.5 Evidence for ancient alleles and mating systems	196
19.6 Conclusions	198
Part IV Pathogens and their Hosts	
20 Rapid evolution of innate immune response genes	203
<i>Brian P. Lazzaro and Andrew G. Clark</i>	
20.1 The evolution of immunity	203
20.2 Orthology and gene family evolution in antimicrobial immunity	204
20.3 Molecular evolution of the antimicrobial immune system	205
20.4 The evolution of defense against viruses and transposable elements	206
20.5 Concluding remarks	208
21 Rapid evolution of the plague pathogen	211
<i>Ruifu Yang, Yujun Cui, and Dongsheng Zhou</i>	
21.1 Introduction	211
21.2 Plasmid acquisition in <i>Y. pestis</i>	212
21.3 The impact of phages on genome structure	213

21.4	Prophages in the <i>Y. pestis</i> genome	213
21.5	CRISPRs diversity and the battle between phage and <i>Y. pestis</i>	214
21.6	Gene acquisition, loss, and inactivation	216
21.7	Rearrangements and copy number variants	217
21.8	Neutral versus adaptive evolution	219
21.9	Conclusions	220
22	Evolution of human erythrocyte-specific genes involved in malaria susceptibility	223
	<i>Wen-Ya Ko, Felicia Gomez, and Sarah A. Tishkoff</i>	
22.1	Introduction	223
22.2	Adaptive evolution in erythrocyte-specific genes	224
22.2.1	Genetic variants causing erythrocytic structural, regulatory, or enzymatic deficiency: candidates for heterozygote advantage	224
22.2.2	Positive selection on erythrocyte-surface receptors	226
22.3	Evolutionary response of the human genome to malaria infection	227
22.3.1	Maintenance of deleterious mutations due to selective pressure of malaria	227
22.3.2	Effects of population substructure on genetic variation in malaria-endemic human populations	230
22.3.3	Effects of gene conversion between homologous sequences on genetic variation at loci associated with malarial susceptibility	232
22.4	Future perspectives	232
	Part V From Gene Expression to Development to Speciation	
23	The rapid evolution of gene expression	237
	<i>Carlo G. Artieri</i>	
23.1	Introduction	237
23.2	One genome harbors many transcriptomes	238
23.3	Transcriptome divergence is complex	239
23.4	Factors affecting the rate of evolution of gene expression	240
23.4.1	Spatial heterogeneity	240
23.4.2	Temporal heterogeneity	241
23.5	Beyond comparisons of expression levels	242
23.6	Open questions and future directions	243
24	Rate variation in the evolution of development: a phylogenetic perspective	246
	<i>Artyom Kopp</i>	
24.1	Introduction	246
24.2	Examples of rate variation in the evolution of development	247
24.2.1	Same clade, different pathways: evolution of vulval development in rhabditid nematodes	247
24.2.2	Same pathway, different clades: evolution of sex combs and pigmentation in <i>Drosophila</i>	248

24.2.3	Same clade, same pathway, different genes: evolution of embryonic development and sex determination in insects	251
24.3	Technical and conceptual challenges to quantifying the evolution of development	252
24.4	Future directions: the promise of phylogenetic approaches to the evolution of development	253
25	Natural hybridization as a catalyst of rapid evolutionary change	256
	<i>Michael L. Arnold, Jennafer A.P. Hamlin, Amanda N. Brothers, and Evangeline S. Ballerini</i>	
25.1	Introduction	256
25.2	Adaptive trait introgression: when strange is really good	256
25.2.1	Adaptive trait transfer in <i>Canis</i> : wolves in dogs' clothing	257
25.2.2	Adaptive trait origin in <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> : hybrids make the best wine	258
25.3	Hybrid speciation: when opposites attract	259
25.3.1	Homoploid hybrid speciation: hybrid butterflies (quickly) change their spots	259
25.3.2	Allopolyploid speciation: <i>Tragopogon</i> hybrid polyploids form again, and again, and again . . . in less than 100 years . . .	260
25.4	Natural hybridization and adaptive radiations: hybrid speciation on steroids	261
25.4.1	Hybridization and adaptive radiations of Lake Malawi cichlids: from hybrid swarm to 800 species, in one lake?!	261
25.4.2	Hybridization and adaptive radiations in Alpine lake whitefish: Swiss fish diversify after the last big thaw	262
25.4.3	Hybridization and adaptive radiations in Hawaiian silverswords: allopolyploids in an island paradise	263
25.5	Conclusions and future prospects	264
26	Rapid evolution of pollinator-mediated plant reproductive isolation	266
	<i>Annika M. Moe, Wendy L. Clement, and George D. Weiblen</i>	
26.1	Plant–insect diversification	266
26.2	Pollination and reproductive isolation	266
26.3	<i>Ficus</i> versus <i>Castilleja</i>	267
26.4	A pollinator-mediated model for fig speciation	269
26.5	Future directions: plant–pollinator interactions and rapid evolution	271
27	Sexual system genomics and speciation	274
	<i>Rob J. Kulathinal and Rama S. Singh</i>	
27.1	In the beginning: Darwin and Wallace on sexual selection and speciation	274
27.2	The Modern Synthesis and the development of speciation theory	275
27.3	A new paradigm: the genomics of sexual systems and the origin of species	276
27.3.1	Functional genomics: organization into sexual and non-sexual systems	277
27.3.2	Higher variation among reproductive systems	277

27.3.3 Strength of sexual selection	278
27.3.4 Sexual systems interaction, coevolution, and rapid change	279
27.3.5 Rapid breakdown of sexual systems in species hybrids	280
27.4 Towards a post-genomics synthesis of speciation	280
27.5 Future prospects: sex as a major force in evolution	281
Index	285

CHAPTER 14

Rates of sea urchin bindin evolution**H. A. Lessios and Kirk S. Zigler****14.1 Introduction**

Reproduction at the level of gametic interactions involves activation and attraction of the sperm by egg compounds, induction of the acrosome reaction by the egg jelly, adhesion of the sperm to the egg, and fusion of the two membranes in order to permit the transmission of genetic material. All of these interactions are mediated by molecules. Some of these molecules, such as sea urchin speract, carry out their functions indiscriminately, even if sperm and egg belong to distantly related taxa (Vieira and Miller 2006). Others function in a species-specific or even genotype-specific manner. Selectivity between sperm gamete recognition molecules and their egg receptors is particularly important in organisms with external fertilization, because in the absence of copulation, there are few other opportunities for exercising mate choice. Consequently, such molecules are exposed to the action of selection more directly than molecules with the same function in organisms with internal fertilization. The DNA that codes for gamete recognition molecules often, but not always, evolves rapidly, displaying ratios of amino acid replacement to synonymous substitutions larger than unity, a signature of positive (diversifying) selection (Swanson and Vacquier 2002a, b; Vacquier and Swanson 2011). As a rule, such positive selection is targeted at certain regions of each molecule, presumably involved in gamete selectivity, whereas the rest of the sequence may evolve conservatively under purifying selection, because it performs basic functions essential for fertilization.

The first gamete recognition protein to be characterized was sea urchin bindin (Vacquier and Moy 1977). Bindin DNA was subsequently amplified and sequenced in *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* by

Gao et al. (1986), and then studied with regards to its intra- and interspecific polymorphism with special attention given to detecting positive selection in its exons. These topics have been extensively reviewed (Vacquier et al. 1995; Swanson and Vacquier 2002a, b; Lessios 2007, 2011; Zigler 2008; Palumbi 2009; Vacquier and Swanson 2011). In this chapter, we explore what bindin sequences from various sea urchin species reveal about the rate of evolution of this molecule. Does bindin really evolve in the fast lane?

14.2 Function and structure of bindin

Sea urchin bindin is a protein that coats the acrosome process of sperm after the acrosomal reaction occurs. It interacts with the egg bindin receptor, EBR1, a glycoprotein (Kamei and Glabe 2003), to attach the sperm to the egg's vitelline layer and to fuse membranes of the gametes. The full-length precursor of bindin is cleaved after translation to form the mature molecule. Among the sea urchin species that have been studied to date, the length of mature bindin ranges from 193–418 amino acids (Zigler and Lessios 2003a). The single sea star in which bindin has been characterized was found to contain 793 amino acids (Patino et al. 2009). In both sea urchins and sea stars, there is a single intron separating two exons. Bindins of 11 species of sea urchins from six orders contain a conserved region in the second exon that codes for approximately 55 amino acids. Eighteen amino acids in this conserved region, thought to be involved in membrane fusion (Rocha et al. 2008), have not changed since the extant orders of Echinoidea split from each other, 250 million years ago (mya). Only one amino acid in this region has changed between sea stars and sea urchins in the 500 million years (my)

that the two echinoderm classes have been evolving independently (Patino et al. 2009; Vacquier and Swanson 2011). The reputation of bindin as a fast-evolving protein is owed to two regions flanking the conserved core, which in some genera have accumulated many point mutations and insertions–deletions. These are the regions that most likely confer fertilization species-specificity (Lopez et al. 1993). The protein moiety of EBR1, which contains 3713–4595 amino acids, has only been sequenced in two species of *Strongylocentrotus* (Kamei and Glabe 2003).

14.3 Rate of bindin evolution

Bindin has been sequenced in 11 genera of sea urchins, but intragenetic variation, which permits insights in the evolution of the molecule, has been studied in only seven: *Echinometra* (Metz and Palumbi 1996; McCartney and Lessios 2004), *Strongylocentrotus* (Biermann 1998), *Arbacia* (Metz et al. 1998a), *Tripneustes* (Zigler and Lessios 2003b), *Heliocidaris* (Zigler et al. 2003), *Lytechinus* (Zigler and Lessios 2004), and *Paracentrotus* (Calderon et al. 2009, 2010). Selection on bindin in all of these genera has been studied as the ratio of amino acid replacement to silent substitutions ($\omega = d_N/d_S$). By this criterion, there is evidence of positive selection ($\omega > 1$) in *Echinometra*, *Strongylocentrotus*, *Heliocidaris*, and *Paracentrotus*, but not in *Arbacia*, *Tripneustes*, and *Lytechinus*. In addition to being an indication of selection at the nucleotide level, the ω ratio would also be a good measure of relative rates of adaptive evolution if silent sites evolved at the same rate in all genera. This, however, is not the case in bindin. Bindins with higher rates of nonsynonymous substitution also have higher rates of synonymous substitution (Zigler and Lessios 2003b). This correlation has also been observed in other molecules such as alcohol dehydrogenase, ATP synthetase, cyclophilin 1, or enolase (e.g. Dunn et al. 2001), and there are a number of hypotheses as to its cause. While it is typically thought to arise from some form of codon bias, codon usage in sea urchin bindin is very equitable (Zigler and Lessios 2003a). Thus, due to different codon biases, comparing ω ratios between bindins of different genera may lead to erroneous conclusions regarding evolutionary

rates. To compare the absolute rate of evolution between genera we need to determine the number of nonsynonymous substitutions per nonsynonymous site that accumulate per unit time. Such a calculation requires evidence of dates of divergence. In this chapter, we will use the interspecific divergence of cytochrome oxidase I (COI) as a proxy for the time since speciation. Calibrated by the rise of the Isthmus of Panama, approximately 3 mya, COI of sea urchins diverges at an average rate of 3.6 % per my (Lessios 2008).

Gauged by divergence in COI, average rates of adaptive divergence of bindin within a genus vary between 2.80×10^{-3} nonsynonymous substitutions per nonsynonymous site per my (d_Nmy^{-1}) in *Arbacia* and $22.4 \times 10^{-3} d_Nmy^{-1}$ in *Strongylocentrotus* (Table 14.1). As one might expect, genera in which bindin evolves under positive selection, show amino acid divergence rates almost four times higher than genera in which bindin appears to be under purifying selection: the average substitution rate in *Strongylocentrotus*, *Echinometra*, and *Heliocidaris* is $20.4 \times 10^{-3} d_Nmy^{-1}$ whereas in *Arbacia*, *Tripneustes*, *Lytechinus*, *Pseudoboletia*, and *Diadema*, it is $5.96 \times 10^{-3} d_Nmy^{-1}$. The question we would like to answer is how these rates of adaptive evolution compare with those of other proteins, both of those that have been deemed to evolve rapidly in other taxa, and those that carry out other functions in sea urchins.

Fig. 14. 1 presents a comparison of the rates of adaptive evolution of bindin to seven other classes of reproductive proteins from five groups of organisms. These are all proteins that are generally considered as fast-evolving. Because COI in different taxa evolves at different rates, it is necessary to apply taxon-specific calibrations to calculate divergence rates. To estimate absolute rates of protein evolution, we have assumed that COI evolves at an average rate of 3.6% per my in sea urchins (Lessios 2008), 2.7% per MY in gastropods (Lessios 2008), 2.3% per my in insects (Papadopoulou et al. 2010), and 1.6% per my in hominids (Kumar et al. 2005). Estimated in this manner, the evolutionary rates of bindins in different genera of sea urchins, even those found to be under selection, are slower than that of reproductive proteins of gastropods or insects. They are more comparable to those of

Table 14.1 Pairwise divergence in bindin and in cytochrome oxidase I (COI) of selected species of sea urchin genera in which bindin variation has been studied. **K2P**: Kimura two-parameter distance; **d_N**: amino acid substitutions per non-synonymous site; **d_S**: synonymous substitutions per synonymous site; **MY**: million years. Estimated rates of divergence of bindin are based on the assumption that COI in sea urchins diverges at a rate of 0.036 per site per my.

Genus	Species	Species	Bindin d _N	COI d _S	Bindin d _N / K2P	Bindin d _S / COI K2P	Bindin d _N / COI K2P	MY	Reference
Arbacia	<i>lixula</i>	<i>punctulata</i>	0.007	0.069	0.090	0.072	0.764	0.0026	Metz et al. 1998a
Arbacia	<i>lixula</i>	<i>stellata=incisa</i>	0.007	0.096	0.134	0.053	0.716	0.0019	
Arbacia	<i>lixula</i>	<i>dufresnei</i>	0.016	0.071	0.124	0.129	0.570	0.0046	
Arbacia	<i>punctulata</i>	<i>stellata=incisa</i>	0.003	0.088	0.139	0.022	0.635	0.0008	
Arbacia	<i>punctulata</i>	<i>dufresnei</i>	0.011	0.059	0.124	0.085	0.477	0.0031	
Arbacia	<i>stellata=incisa</i>	<i>dufresnei</i>	0.013	0.071	0.119	0.105	0.597	0.0038	
Helicidaris	<i>erythrogramma</i>	<i>tuberculata</i>	0.069	0.149	0.147	0.469	1.014	0.0169	Zigler et al. 2003
Tripeustes	<i>ventricosus</i>	<i>gratilla+depressus</i>	0.016	0.026	0.087	0.187	0.293	0.0067	Zigler and Lessios 2003
Echinometra	<i>oblonga</i>	<i>mathaei</i>	0.021	0.054	0.023	0.905	2.328	0.0326	Metz and Palumbi 1996
Echinometra	<i>oblonga</i>	<i>type A</i>	0.024	0.076	0.032	0.757	2.371	0.0273	
Echinometra	<i>mathaei</i>	<i>type A</i>	0.028	0.051	0.024	1.169	2.107	0.0421	
Echinometra	<i>lucunter</i>	<i>viridis</i>	0.022	0.047	0.050	0.440	0.940	0.0158	McCartney and Lessios 2004
Echinometra	<i>lucunter</i>	<i>vanbrunti</i>	0.026	0.046	0.102	0.255	0.451	0.0092	
Echinometra	<i>viridis</i>	<i>vanbrunti</i>	0.014	0.083	0.126	0.111	0.659	0.0040	
Lytechinus	<i>pictus</i>	<i>variegatus</i>	0.013	0.105	0.135	0.096	0.778	0.0035	Zigler and Lessios 2004
Lytechinus	<i>variegatus</i>	<i>williamsi</i>	0.006	0.022	0.017	0.353	1.294	0.0127	
Lytechinus	<i>semituberculatus</i>	<i>pictus</i>	0.025	0.073	0.114	0.219	0.640	0.0079	
Lytechinus	<i>euerces</i>	<i>Sphaerechinus granularis</i>	0.019	0.100	0.089	0.213	1.124	0.0077	
Pseudoboletia	<i>indiana</i>	<i>maculata</i>	0.006	0.024	0.073	0.082	0.329	0.0030	Zigler et al. (in press)
Strongylocentrotus	<i>purpuratus</i>	<i>pallidus</i>	0.021	0.062	0.072	0.287	0.863	0.0103	Biermann 1998
Strongylocentrotus	<i>purpuratus</i>	<i>droebachiensis</i>	0.031	0.086	0.075	0.418	1.148	0.0150	
Strongylocentrotus	<i>purpuratus</i>	<i>H. pulcherrimus</i>	0.073	0.158	0.104	0.704	1.514	0.0253	
Strongylocentrotus	<i>pallidus</i>	<i>droebachiensis</i>	0.025	0.036	0.035	0.715	1.011	0.0257	
Strongylocentrotus	<i>pallidus</i>	<i>H. pulcherrimus</i>	0.066	0.119	0.070	0.941	1.696	0.0339	
Strongylocentrotus	<i>droebachiensis</i>	<i>H. pulcherrimus</i>	0.063	0.139	0.094	0.672	1.481	0.0242	




Figure 14.1 Bindin evolution relative to known fast-evolving reproductive proteins from other taxa. Non-synonymous substitutions per non-synonymous site (d_N) per million years, between congeneric species (except in hominids, in which they are within the same family) in sea urchin bindin (B) (data from references in Table 14.1), abalone lysin (HL) and 18 kD protein (H18) (data from Metz et al. 1998b), *Tegula* lysin (TL), and the mature region of TMAP protein (TMAP) (data from Hellberg and Vacquier 1999; Hellberg et al. 2000), *Drosophila* Acp26Aa and Acp36DE (Acps) (data from Tsaur and Wu 1997), hominid protamine 1 and 2 (P), ZP2, ZP3 and oviductal glycoprotein (ZP/OGP) (data from Wyckoff et al. 2000).

protamines, zona pellucida proteins, and oviductal glycoprotein in hominids. Adjustments to the assumed rate of COI evolution, or even an assumption of a universal COI clock, would not change this conclusion. Thus, by the standard of other fast-evolving reproductive proteins from other invertebrates, bindin evolves only at moderate rates.

How do rates of bindin evolution compare to rates of evolution among other sea urchin proteins? To answer this question, we compared all protein coding DNA sequences of *Lytechinus variegatus* in GenBank to their closest matches in the *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* complete genome. With the exception of *S. purpuratus*, more genes have been sequenced from *Lytechinus variegatus* than any other species of sea urchin. *Lytechinus* and *Strongylocentrotus* diverged approximately 60 mya. Sequences were available for 90 *L. variegatus* genes. The protein sequence of each gene was compared between the two species via protein-protein BLAST to GenBank's 'non-redundant (nr) protein sequences' database. The closest match to a *S. purpuratus* protein was noted, and the two protein sequences were aligned using Clustal in MEGA (v. 4.0). We then used MEGA to calculate the p-distance between the aligned protein sequences. We identified matches for 85 of the 90 *Lytechinus* genes. The five genes that did not have a match

may be: (1) missing from the annotated *Strongylocentrotus* genome; (2) lost in the *Strongylocentrotus* lineage; or (3) mis-annotated in their original *Lytechinus* entry. The set of genes that we compared contained proteins with various functions, including many involved in reproduction, and also in development, cytoskeleton formation, cell attachment, and stress responses. After ranking the divergences of the 85 proteins, that of bindin was the sixth largest, with a p-distance of 0.326 for the full-length molecule and 0.314 for the mature portion. Of the five proteins with divergence values higher than bindin, vitellogenin and SFE-1 also carry out functions related to reproduction, whereas the other three were involved in development. Considering the inevitable bias of proteins available for comparison, the conclusion from this comparison is that bindin evolves at moderately fast rates in relation to other sea urchin proteins.

14.4 Possible reasons for different evolutionary rates in bindin

Why does bindin in four sea urchin genera evolve more rapidly under strong positive selection, than in three other genera in which it is subject to purifying selection? In the absence of data regarding variation in its egg receptor, the answer can only be speculative. Possible reasons for this lack of pattern have been thoroughly reviewed (Lessios 2007, 2011; Zigler 2008; Palumbi 2009). Here we present a summary of the hypotheses that have been proposed so far.

One possibility is that positive selection of bindin arises from the need for species recognition when two closely related species are in danger of hybridizing with each other. We will call this the 'reinforcement hypothesis.' This name does not imply that speciation by reinforcement has actually taken place, but rather that bindin alleles resembling those of a sympatric species—and thus allowing gamete wastage in inferior hybrids—have been selected against. A broad-brush picture of comparisons between genera is consistent with this hypothesis. When bindin rates of divergence of species that are entirely allopatric with respect to congeners are compared to those of species that may have a higher probability of hybridization, those of the for-

mer are clustered around lower values than those of the latter (Fig. 14.2). Genera with many sympatric species, such as *Strongylocentrotus*, and *Echinometra* tend to have the highest rates of interspecific bindin divergence. Not all the data, however, are consistent with the reinforcement hypothesis. Contrary to what is expected from selection for species recognition, bindin is polymorphic and shows the signature of positive selection not just between species but also between alleles of the same species (Metz and Palumbi 1996; Lessios 2007, 2011). A pattern of character displacement is present in one species of Pacific *Echinometra* (Geyer and Palumbi 2003) in partial geographic overlap with its sister species but not in an Atlantic species of the same genus that also needs to contend with the challenge of a sister species existing over part of its range (Geyer and Lessios 2009). Given the present evidence, the hypothesis that reinforcement in sympatry accelerates bindin divergence is as likely as the hypothesis that divergence in bindin, due to other causes, allows for sympatric coexistence.

Another possibility for the differences in rates of bindin evolution could be that they are cor-




Figure 14.2 Comparison of interspecific rates of bindin divergence between genera. Amino acid replacement substitutions (d_N) per replacement site in bindin divided by Kimura-two-parameter distance in cytochrome oxidase I (COI K2P) in allopatric and sympatric species of eight genera of sea urchins. A species is considered as 'allopatric' if its range does not overlap with that of another member of the same genus. Genera in which bindin has been shown to be under selection are marked in the legend with S.

related to the relative age of species in different sea urchin genera. If, as Civetta and Singh (1998) have suggested, episodes of divergence in reproductive molecules are concentrated at the time of speciation, and if selection on these molecules is subsequently relaxed, younger species would show higher rates of bindin differentiation than older ones. This hypothesis is not supported by the data. Sea urchins tend to conform to 'Jordan's rule' (Jordan 1905). Young sister species tend to be distributed on either side of a geographic barrier, and only older species become sympatric with the passage of time (Lessios 2010). Thus, allopatric species are, in general, younger than sympatric ones, and if bindin divergence were accelerated during speciation then slowed down, they should show more differences in this molecule per unit time than sympatric ones. The opposite is true (Fig. 14.2).

The most credible hypothesis to date for differences in the rates of bindin evolution is that they are caused by differences in the intensity of sexual selection and sexual conflict. Using variation in bindin genotypes of females as a proxy for variation in the bindin receptor (with which bindin is expected to show linkage disequilibrium), Palumbi (1999) has found that sexual selection exists in *Echinometra mathaei*. Eggs are fertilized at higher rates by sperm carrying the same bindin allele. Using the same proxy, Levitan and Farrell (2006) and Levitan and Stapper (2010) showed in *Strongylocentrotus franciscanus* and *S. purpuratus* that sperm density and the danger of polyspermy establish different selective regimes for various bindin alleles. At low sperm densities, most offspring are produced by the union of sperm and egg possessing bindin alleles that are most common in the population. At high sperm densities, rare alleles leave behind the most offspring, because common alleles, causing fast fertilization, result in polyspermic zygotes, which fail to develop. Thus, there is always selection on males to effect fast fertilization, but females in high sperm densities benefit from having alleles that retard fertilization: a typical sexual conflict situation. Depending on ecological conditions, sexual conflict can occur in some populations but not others, thus resulting in different rates of bindin evolution.

14.5 Conclusions and future prospects

In comparison to other invertebrate reproductive proteins, bindin evolves moderately rapidly in some genera and slowly in others. Selective reasons for the differences that cause these dissimilarities in rates are still the subject of speculation, but they may well be related to fertilization environments and intraspecific processes. Interspecific processes, such as reinforcement, can also not be ruled out. There may well be no universal explanation for the presence or absence of positive selection in different sea urchin taxa. Gametic proteins are often brought up as examples of rapid evolution. Fast evolution is certainly true for each of these proteins in the particular genus in which they have been studied. However, in a great many of the documented cases of fast molecular evolution, the evidence comes only from a small fraction of taxa. Data on sea urchin bindin, though far from covering the entire echinoid class, derive from multiple genera. This broader taxonomic coverage alone may explain why more diversity in the mode of evolution of this molecule has been documented than has been found in other invertebrate reproductive proteins.

Future laboratory studies linking the structure of different bindin alleles with the specificity of fertilization would be of great benefit in understanding the evolution of this molecule. We already know which amino acids evolve under selection, but we will need to determine the functional reasons for such selection. Additional understanding of the sources of natural selection on this molecule and the rate of its evolution would come from comparative studies that link fertilization ecology in nature with the success of particular bindin alleles. Simply characterizing species as sympatric or allopatric on the basis of their geographic distribution is not adequate for determining the role of reinforcement or other interspecific processes in bindin evolution. Ultimately, interest in the evolution of bindin and similar molecules stems from our desire to understand the process of speciation and the role of sexual selection in the evolution of reproductive isolation. In that respect, assessing the importance of bindin as a reproductive isolation barrier between species relies on studies that are not aimed directly at this molecule alone. Whether

bindin is involved in speciation depends not just on the species-specificity of its interactions with its receptor but on the probability that gametes of two closely related sea urchin species will encounter each other in nature. Even when gametic interactions are, in fact, species-specific, it is still necessary to determine whether bindin or some other molecule, acting earlier in the sequence of fertilization, is responsible. Thus, information on habitat separation, reproductive timing, and pre-spawning chemical communication as well as on the role of other reproductive molecules is important in understanding whether intra- or interspecific interactions mold the evolution of the bindin. Most of all, we will need to link variation of bindin to variation in its egg receptor. The study of EBR1 has been retarded by its enormous size. Recent advances in techniques for massive DNA sequencing have made it practical to gather data on individual variation in large stretches of genetic material, and will no doubt soon be applied to this problem.

Acknowledgments

We thank Laura Geyer and Santosh Jagadeeshan for comments on the manuscript.

References

- Biermann, C.H. (1998) The molecular evolution of sperm bindin in six species of sea urchins (Echinoidea: Strongylocentrotidae). *Mol Biol Evol* **15**: 1761–71.
- Calderon, I., Turon, X., and Lessios, H.A. (2009) Characterization of the sperm molecule bindin in the sea urchin genus *Paracentrotus*. *J Mol Evol* **68**: 366–76.
- Calderon, I., Ventura, C.R.R., Turon, X., and Lessios, H.A. (2010) Genetic divergence and assortative mating between colour morphs of the sea urchin *Paracentrotus gaimardi*. *Mol Ecol* **19**: 484–93.
- Civetta, A. and Singh, R.S. (1998) Sex-related genes, directional sexual selection, and speciation. *Mol Biol Evol* **15**: 901–9.
- Dunn, K.A., Bielawski, J.P., and Yang, Z. (2001) Substitution rates in *Drosophila* nuclear genes: implications for translational selection. *Genetics* **157**: 295–305.
- Gao, B., Klein, L.E., Britten, R.J., and Davidson, E.H. (1986) Sequence of mRNA coding for bindin, a species-specific sea urchin sperm protein required for fertilization. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **83**: 8634–8.

- Geyer, L.B. and Palumbi, S.R. (2003) Reproductive character displacement and the genetics of gamete recognition in tropical sea urchins. *Evolution* **57**: 1049–60.
- Geyer, L.B. and Lessios, H.A. (2009) Lack of character displacement in the male recognition molecule, bindin, in Atlantic sea urchins of the genus *Echinometra*. *Mol Biol Evol* **26**: 2135–46.
- Hellberg, M.E. and Vacquier, V.D. (1999) Rapid evolution of fertilization selectivity and lysin cDNA sequences in teguline gastropods. *Mol Biol Evol* **16**: 839–48.
- Hellberg, M.E., Moy, G.W., and Vacquier, V.D. (2000) Positive selection and propeptide repeats promote rapid interspecific divergence of a gastropod sperm protein. *Mol Biol Evol* **17**: 458–66.
- Jordan, D. S. (1905) The origin of species through isolation. *Science* **22**: 545–62.
- Kamei, N. and Glabe, C.G. (2003) The species-specific egg receptor for sea urchin sperm adhesion is EBR1, a novel ADAMTS protein. *Genes Dev* **17**: 2502–7.
- Kumar, S., Filipowski, A., Swarna, V., Walker, A., and Hedges, S.B. (2005) Placing confidence limits on the molecular age of the human-chimpanzee divergence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**: 18842–7.
- Lessios, H.A. (2007) Reproductive isolation between species of sea urchins. *Bull Mar Sci* **81**: 191–208.
- Lessios, H.A. (2008) The Great American Schism: Divergence of marine organisms after the rise of the Central American Isthmus. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Systema* **39**: 63–91.
- Lessios, H.A. (2010) Speciation in sea urchins. In L.G. Harris, S.A. Böttger, C.W. Walker, and M.P. Lesser (Eds) *Echinoderms: Durham. Proceedings of the 12th Echinoderm Conference, Durham, New Hampshire*, pp. 91–101. London: CRC Press.
- Lessios, H.A. (2011) Speciation genes in free-spawning marine invertebrates. *Integr Comp Biol* **51**(3): 456–65.
- Levitan, D.R. and Ferrell, D.L. (2006) Selection on gamete recognition proteins depends on sex, density, and genotype frequency. *Science* **312**: 267–9.
- Levitan, D.R. and Stapper, A.P. (2010) Simultaneous positive and negative frequency-dependent selection on sperm bindin, a gamete recognition protein in the sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*. *Evolution* **64**: 785–97.
- Lopez, A., Miraglia, S.J., and Glabe, C.G. (1993) Structure/function analysis of the sea-urchin sperm adhesive protein bindin. *Dev Biol* **156**: 24–33.
- McCartney, M.A. and Lessios, H.A. (2004) Adaptive evolution of sperm bindin tracks egg incompatibility in neotropical sea urchins of the genus *Echinometra*. *Mol Biol Evol* **21**: 732–45.
- Metz, E.C. and Palumbi, S.R. (1996) Positive selection and sequence rearrangements generate extensive polymorphism in the gamete recognition protein bindin. *Mol Biol Evol* **13**: 397–406.
- Metz, E.C., Gomez-Gutierrez, G., and Vacquier, V.D. (1998a) Mitochondrial DNA and bindin gene sequence evolution among allopatric species of the sea urchin genus *Arbacia*. *Mol Biol Evol* **15**: 185–95.
- Metz, E.C., Robles-Sikisaka, R., and Vacquier, V.D. (1998b) Nonsynonymous substitution in abalone sperm fertilization genes exceeds substitution in introns and mitochondrial DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **95**: 10676–81.
- Palumbi, S.R. (1999) All males are not created equal: fertility differences depend on gamete recognition polymorphisms in sea urchins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **96**: 12632–7.
- Palumbi, S.R. (2009) Speciation and the evolution of gamete recognition genes: Pattern and process. *Heredity* **102**: 66–76.
- Papadopoulou, A., Anastasiou, I., and Vogler, A.P. (2010) Revisiting the insect mitochondrial molecular clock: The mid-Aegean Trench calibration. *Mol Biol Evol* **27**: 1659–72.
- Patino, S., Aagaard, J.E., MacCoss, M.J., Swanson, W.J., and Hart, M.W. (2009) Bindin from a sea star. *Evol Dev* **11**: 376–81.
- Rocha, S., Lucio, M., Pereira, M.C., Reis, S., and Brezesinski, G. (2008) The conformation of fusogenic B18 peptide in surfactant solutions. *J Peptide Sci* **14**: 436–41.
- Swanson, W.J. and Vacquier, V.D. (2002a) The rapid evolution of reproductive proteins. *Nat Rev Genet* **3**: 137–44.
- Swanson, W.J. and Vacquier, V.D. (2002b) Reproductive protein evolution. *Annu Rev Ecol Systemat* **33**: 161–79.
- Tsaur, S.-C. and Wu, C.-I. (1997) Positive selection and the molecular evolution of a gene of male reproduction, Acp26Aa of *Drosophila*. *Mol Biol Evol* **14**: 544–9.
- Vacquier, V.D. and Moy, G.W. (1977) Isolation of bindin: The protein responsible for adhesion of sperm to sea urchin eggs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **74**: 2456–60.
- Vacquier, V.D. and Swanson, W.J. (2011) Selection in the rapid evolution of gamete recognition proteins in marine invertebrates. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* **3**: a002931.
- Vacquier, V.D., Swanson, W.J., and Hellberg, M.E. (1995) What have we learned about sea urchin sperm bindin? *Dev Growth Differ* **37**: 1–10.
- Vieira, A. and Miller, D.J. (2006) Gamete interaction: Is it species-specific? *Mol Reprod Dev* **73**: 1422–9.
- Wyckoff, G.J., Wang, W., and Wu, C.I. (2000) Rapid evolution of male reproductive genes in the descent of man. *Nature* **403**: 304–8.

- Zigler, K.S. (2008) The evolution of sea urchin sperm bindin. *Int J Dev Biol* **52**: 791–6.
- Zigler, K.S. and Lessios, H.A. (2003a) 250 million years of bindin evolution. *Biol Bull* **205**: 8–15.
- Zigler, K.S. and Lessios, H.A. (2003b) Evolution of bindin in the pantropical sea urchin *Tripneustes*: Comparisons to bindin of other genera. *Mol Biol Evol* **20**: 220–31.
- Zigler, K.S. and Lessios, H.A. (2004) Speciation on the coasts of the new world: Phylogeography and the evolution of bindin in the sea urchin genus *Lytechinus*. *Evolution* **58**: 1225–41.
- Zigler, K.S., Raff, E.C., Popodi, E., Raff, R.A., and Lessios, H.A. (2003) Adaptive evolution of bindin in the genus *Heliocidaris* is correlated with the shift to direct development. *Evolution* **57**: 2293–302.
- Zigler, K.S., Byrne, M., Raff, E.C., Lessios, H.A., and Raff, R.A. (in press) Natural hybridization in the sea urchin genus *Pseudoboletia* between species without apparent barriers to gamete recognition. *Evolution*.