Retroposon Insertions Provide Insights into Deep Lagomorph Evolution
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Abstract

The homogenous mammalian order Lagomorpha comprises about 80 species in two families, Ochotonidae (pikas) and Leporidae (rabbits and hares). However, the phylogenetic relationships among leporids are controversial. Molecular data, particularly from mitochondrial sequences, give highly homoplasious signals. To resolve the controversy between mitochondrial and nuclear data, we analyzed genomic orthologous retroposon insertion sites, a virtually homoplasy-free marker system. From a differential screen of rabbit genomic data for intronic retroposon insertions of CSINE elements, we polymerase chain reaction–amplified and sequenced 11 retroposons in eight representative lagomorphs. We found three retroposons shared among all lagomorphs but absent in outgroups, four confirmed the monophyly of leporids, and three significantly supported Pronolagus as the sister group to all other leporids. One retroposon supported the monophyly of Lepus. The position of Pronolagus outside of the remaining leporids supports the sequence-based signals of nuclear genes and clearly refutes the misleading signals of mitochondrial genes.
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About 62–100 million years ago (Ma), lagomorphs (pica, rabbits, and hares) diverged from their shared common ancestor with rodents (Benton and Donoghue 2007). Although hotly debated in the middle of the twentieth century, the clade Glires, comprising lagomorphs and rodents, is clearly supported today by molecular data (Murphy et al. 2001; Douzery and Huchon 2004; Kriegs, Churakov, et al. 2007). Within Glires, lagomorphs represent the well-separated group of Duplicidentata that have a second small upper incisor located behind the primary incisors, in contrast to the single incisors of the Simplicidentata, such as rodents (Rose 2006). Lagomorphs consist of two families, Ochotonidae (pikas) and Leporidae (rabbits, hares) that are distributed over large parts of Africa, Eurasia, and America. Despite intensive investigations, the evolutionary history of lagomorphs, including the European rabbit, an important model for biomedical research, is far from settled. Phylogenetic reconstructions have been made using morphological characters (Dawson 1958; Hibbard 1963; Dawson 1981), molecular sequences of mitochondrial genes (Halanych and Robinson 1999), chromosome rearrangements (Robinson et al. 2002), and a combination of nuclear and mitochondrial data in a so-called supermatrix approach (Matthee et al. 2004). Especially, the comparison of nuclear and mitochondrial phylogenies of leporids led to confounding results. In a mitochondrial data set of cytochrome b and 12S rRNA sequences, Matthee et al. (2004) failed to find any clear phylogenetic signals for grouping the leporids (their fig. 2b). Halanych and Robinson (1997) attributed such inconsistent homoplasious phylogenetic signals to a rapid radiation and mutational saturation of mitochondrial sequences. However, despite the high level of homoplasie in leporid mitochondrial sequences, combining information from mitochondrial genes with that of five nuclear DNA fragments (their fig. 2a) enabled Matthee et al. (2004) to reconstruct a leporid tree corresponding to the topology derived from their nuclear data.

To obviate the problem of homoplasie in the deep splits of lagomorph phylogeny, we examined an entirely different set of characters. We conducted a genome-wide screening for phylogenetically informative rare genomic changes (RGCs) in rabbits (Oryctolagus cuniculus). RGCs, especially retroposed elements, leave behind distinctive unambiguous traces of relatedness recognizable as orthologous genomic insertions (Shedlock and Okada 2000). Such shared insertions were previously used to resolve, for example, the extremely intricate deep nodes in mammalian phylogeny (Kriegs et al. 2006; Nishihara et al. 2006; Churakov et al. 2009; Nishihara et al. 2009) and the highly complex comparable to lagomorphs rodent phylogeny (Farwick et al. 2006; Churakov et al. 2010). Random indels are also useful markers of phylogenomic relatedness, but, due to the lack
of complexity of their insertions (e.g., no flanking direct repeats), they are not as comparably informative and are much more exposed to homoplasy.

We focused our retroposon search on lagomorph-specific Short INterspersed Elements (SINEs), so called CSINEs that are subdivided by diagnostic mutations into three subtypes: CSINE1, CSINE2, and CSINE3 (Krane et al. 1991). We first used the Transpositions in Transpositions (TinT) tool (Kriegs, Matzke, et al. 2007; http://www.bioinformatics.uni-muenster.de/tools/tint) to determine the correct chronological activity periods of CSINE subtypes for pica (Ochotona princeps) and rabbit (Oryctolagus cuniculus). For full distribution patterns, we used the preliminary genomic assemblies available for pica at http://www.broadinstitute.org/ftp/pub/assemblies/mammals/pika/OchPri2.0 and for rabbit at http://www.broadinstitute.org/ftp/pub/assemblies/mammals/rabbit.

![Fig. 1. TinT analysis for different CSINEs in pika and rabbit. The lower parts of (A) (Ochotona princeps) and (B) (Oryctolagus cuniculus) represent the data matrices used for deriving the TinT profiles shown in the upper parts of the figures. The identifiers across the top of the matrix represent elements fragmented by those elements listed along the side. The copy numbers of CSINEs and the sums (Σ) of nested insertions are indicated. The TinT profiles present the elements sorted by their specific chronological activities, with older elements to the left and younger ones to the right along the relative time lines shown below. Ovals represent the 75% probability of the activity distribution, vertical lines the 95%, and the horizontal lines the 99% probability. OP denotes potential O. princeps-specific variations. 2/3A and B are element variations. Note that the current CSINE classification should be updated, as CSINE2B_OP and CSINE2C_OP consensus sequences are probably also distributed in O. cuniculus. CSINE3_OP and CSINE3A arose independently in pica and rabbit (see also supplementary fig. 1, Supplementary Material Online).](image-url)
These TinT results showed that the CSINE2 elements were the oldest, followed by the CSINE1, and then the CSINE3 elements (fig. 1). Thus, for our first genome-wide RepeatMasker screening (http://www.repeatmasker.org/RMDownload.html) of rabbit trace sequences (ftp://ftp.ncbi.nih.gov/pub/TraceDB/oryctolagus_cuniculus), we searched for CSINE2 elements, and then for CSINE1 and CSINE3 elements in a second screening. Extracted sequences were blasted against 185,000 downloaded human introns (http://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgTables) to identify those intronic CSINE elements with conserved exonic/intronic flanks for primer design. This strategy enabled the most successful polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification and sequencing in all taxa analyzed [regions <800 nucleotide (nt)]. PCR amplification, cloning, and sequencing were performed using standard protocols (Farwick et al. 2006). We experimentally analyzed 74 potential phylogenetically informative loci; ten of them were amplifiable in a representative set of species and contained 11 phylogenetically informative retroposon insertions (one of the loci contains two diagnostic retroposon insertions) and additionally three diagnostic random indels greater than 3 nt (supplementary table S1, Supplementary Material online). The species sampling and all diagnostic insertions are shown in figure 2.

Three independent insertions of CSINE2s, which were clearly absent at orthologous positions in human or guinea pig, significantly (Waddell et al. 2001) support the monophyly of the order Lagomorpha. Four independent retroposon insertions (3× CSINE2s, 1× CSINE1) and one 4-nt deletion that were absent in Ochotonidae, but present in all Leporidae, significantly support the monophyly of this family, confirming most previous investigations (Matthee et al. 2004). We identified three additional independent retroposon insertions (2× CSINE3s, 1× CSINE1) and one 8-nt deletion that were absent in Pronolagus but present in all other leporids, providing significant evidence that Pronolagus is the sister group to the remaining leporids. In addition, one orthologous CSINE3 element and one 17-nt deletion were found in all Lepus species, but not in other Leporidae, indicating the monophyly of Lepus.

Although the monophyly of lagomorphs was already generally accepted and the distribution of CSINEs in all lagomorphs but absent in all other mammals is a confirmation of this, the three orthologous CSINE2 insertions demonstrate the activity of CSINE2 elements before the first lagomorph splits, approximately 45 Ma (Lopez-Martinez 2008). One of the more controversial divergences in lagomorphs was the earliest branching within Leporidae. Our data provide significant evidence that Pronolagus is the sister group to the remaining leporids. This supports the nuclear gene analyses of Matthee et al. (2004) and clearly refutes the misleading signals from mitochondrial genes, underlining their impracticality and unreliability for phylogenetic reconstructions in this taxonomic group (see also Slimen et al. 2008). The consistent phylogenetic

![Phylogenetic tree of lagomorphs reconstructed from CSINE insertion patterns. Green dots depict phylogenetically informative CSINE2 insertions, purple dots represent CSINE1, and gray dots represent CSINE3 events. Triangles depict the presence of random indels with the numbers of inserted/deleted nucleotides. A corresponding presence/absence matrix and all alignments are presented as supplementary table S1 and supplementary material S1, Supplementary Material online. The images show Ochotona princeps, Oryctolagus cuniculus, and Lepus capensis.](http://example.com/phylogenetic-tree.png)
signals of nuclear gene sequences (Matthee et al. 2004) and the retroposon data presented here indicate that previous misinterpretations were more likely due to deficient signals in mitochondrial sequences and not ancestral polymorphism in connection with rapid radiation. There are many other examples of errant mitochondrial phylogenies, one of the most impressive being the “significant support” for primate paraphyly mistakenly suggested by the clustering of colugo (Cynocephalus variegatus, Dermoptera) close to anthropoids. This was caused by a significant simultaneous change in the mitochondrial nt composition of these two clades (Schmitz et al. 2002).

Our investigation represents the first successful step in evaluating the deep splits within lagomorph phylogeny with the unambiguous, virtually homoplasys-free SINE marker system. Further investigations will move from the deep to more recent nodes to understand the detailed relationships between rabbits and hares. CSINE1 and CSINE3 elements should be well suited to finally resolve the last uncertainties in this rapidly diverged group. Especially important for further investigations will be to supplement screening for retroposon-free rabbit introns, with high-throughput experimental amplifications of all additional investigated species, to randomly find evidence of speciation events apart from the lineage leading to rabbit. This strategy should enable us to unbiasedly track all speciation events within the Lagomorpha. The resulting completely resolved homoplasys-free reconstruction of relationships within the entire order will be a major step forward in lagomorph research that will open the doors to meaningful management and conservation.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary tables S1 and S2, supplementary figure 1, and supplementary material S1 are available at Molecular Biology and Evolution online (http://www.mbe.oxfordjournals.org/).
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