Retroposition Insertion Patterns of Neoavian Birds: Strong Evidence for an Extensive Incomplete Lineage Sorting Era
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Abstract

More than 150 Ma, the avian lineage separated from that of other dinosaurs and later diversified into the more than 10,000 species extant today. The early neoavian bird radiations most likely occurred in the late Cretaceous (more than 65 Ma) but left behind few if any molecular signals of their archaic evolutionary past. Retroposed elements, once established in an ancestral population, are highly valuable, virtually homoplasy-free markers of species evolution; after applying stringent orthology criteria, their phylogenetically informative presence/absence patterns are free of random noise and independent of evolutionary rate or nucleotide composition effects. We screened for early neoavian orthologous retroposition insertions and identified six markers with conflicting presence/absence patterns, whereas six additional retroposons established before or after the presumed major neoavian radiation show consistent phylogenetic patterns. The exceptionally frequent conflicting retroposition presence/absence patterns of neoavian orders are strong indicators of an extensive incomplete lineage sorting era, potentially induced by an early rapid successive speciation of ancestral Neoaves.
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The early diversification of neoavian orders most likely occurred in rapid succession, and attempts to resolve the higher level phylogenetic relationships have yielded some concordance but much controversy (summarized in Mayr 2011).

Phylogenetic reconstructions based on sequence data are vulnerable to systematic errors induced by phenomena such as long branch attractions and biased nucleotide compositional effects. In contrast, retroposition presence/absence data are free of such uncertainties owing to their unlimited character states corresponding to an infinite potential to insert nearly anywhere in the genome (for mathematical background, see Steel and Penny 2000). Although retroposition presence/absence data are not immune to conflicting phylogenetic patterns when they are extracted under strict criteria (unambiguous orthology by accurately defined insertion sites, clear identity of the retroposed element with diagnostic truncations and mutations), revealed discordances are virtually restricted to the rare cases of incomplete lineage sorting or gene flow via hybridization (Shedlock et al. 2004).

CR1 retroposons were successfully used as clade markers in birds (Watanabe et al. 2006; Kaiser et al. 2007; Krieks et al. 2007; Treplin and Tiedemann 2007; Suh et al. 2011), and other retroposed elements successfully identified phylogenetic conflict zones in placental mammals (Churakov et al. 2009; Nishihara et al. 2009; Churakov, Sadasiviuni, et al. 2010) and cichlid fishes (Takahashi et al. 2001). Recently, a data set of bird retroposition markers was published that included four retroposons with inconsistent presence/absence patterns that inserted during the rapid radiation of Neoaves (Suh et al. 2011).

In the present study, we more thoroughly investigated conflicting retroposition presence/absence patterns originating during or close to the assumed rapid radiation period of neoavian birds (see supplementary methods, Supplementary Material online). We hypothesized that the presence of substantially more inconsistent presence/absence patterns would confirm the rapid ancestral radiation as characterized by insertion polymorphism and incomplete lineage sorting in birds (see also Shedlock et al. 2004; Poe and Chubb 2004; Churakov et al. 2009).

Of 161 experimentally investigated retroposition presence/absence candidate loci, 12 met the necessary stringent criteria for informative retroposition markers (see above). These were then experimentally investigated in 26 representative bird species from most of the major bird clades. Six of the 12 new retroposition loci exhibited inconsistent mosaic presence/absence insertion patterns that indicate ancestral polymorphism (fig. 1). The mosaics vary from single outliers (markers ZF19, Gy14) to more complex patterns (ZF42, ZF09, ZF10, ZF89). Interestingly, the ancestral polymorphisms also extended into apparently well-supported clades, such as the positioning of Picus and Trogon within higher landbirds (fig. 2). On the other hand, the retroposons that inserted before the earliest part of the neoavian radiation show...
consistent and phylogenetically informative presence/absence patterns (ZF06, ZF14, Gy11) conforming to the well-accepted part of avian phylogeny (Hackett et al. 2008). If the time of retroposon fixation overlaps succeeding speciation events, inconsistent patterns of insertions may appear and continue as relatively rare cases of ancestral polymorphism in the populations of the new species (Shedlock et al. 2004). Depending on the prevailing effective population size, several million years might be necessary to fix an inserted element (Kimura and Otha 1969; Schmitz and Zischler 2002). Thus, polymorphic markers are of questionable phylogenetic value and should be considered carefully because they do not necessarily display the otherwise high reliability of retroposon-based phylogenetic reconstructions (for example, the parsimony reconstruction based on the underlying data resulting in low bootstrap support and weak consistency indices; see supplementary fig. S1, Supplementary Material online). However, they can provide valuable information about the historical dynamics of populations during speciation and offer reliable evidence for incomplete lineage sorting or ancestral hybridization effects. The critical task is to distinguish such indicators of lineage sorting from misinterpretations of retroposon data that are sometimes introduced by applying relaxed stringency criteria for orthology and/or prejudiced definitions of species trees (e.g., Bashir et al. 2005; Han et al. 2011). We carefully inspected orthologous insertions for identical insertion sites, identical element types (in which small variations in subtype affiliation can occur caused by the deep divergences and occasionally short CR1 element fractions), and identical truncation
points (LINE-derived elements like CR1s usually truncate randomly during the process of insertion), as well as unoccupied sequences for their corresponding flanking sequence similarities.

Favored by incremental changes leading to small effective population sizes (and thereby rapid fixation during population bottlenecks) or/and long periods between speciation, many phylogenetically informative retroposon insertions were established in the early phase of neoavian evolution. This is indicated by a period of increased cumulative retroposon fixation probability. A graphical cumulative activity pattern can be derived from Transposition in Transposition (TinT) data representing the chronological order of retroposon family activity (fig. 3, left peak; see also supplementary figs. S2 and S3, Supplementary Material online; for general information about TinT, see Kriegs et al. 2007; Churakov, Grundmann, et al. 2010). Later, the survivors may have spread into available environments across huge parts of the globe, leading, for a relatively short time, to larger population sizes. Assuming that the individual retroposons distributed relatively constant during this time frame, such hypothetical conditions would have yielded elongated fixation times and the occurrence of polymorphic retroposon insertion patterns during fast speciation succession. The reduced probability of cumulative fixation is indicated in the zebra finch fixation pattern and contrasts with the processes in domestic fowl (fig. 3, saddle between peaks). Incomplete lineage sorting effects resulted in a variety of mutually contradictory retroposon mosaics, involving several active families of CR1 elements during ancient neoavian radiations. The unlikelihood of parallel insertions or exact deletions causing random phylogenetic noise, make the bird retroposon markers particularly suitable for identifying such phylogenetic lineage sorting areas (Suh et al. 2011). Another possible bottleneck or elongated internal branch in Passeriformes may lead to another significant cumulative retroposon fixation peak (fig. 3, right peak).

Indeed, the high percentage of discordant retroposons found in this study, together with the four described previously (Suh et al. 2011), provide evidence to support the rapid ancestral radiation of Neoaves as characterized by insertion polymorphism and incomplete lineage sorting. Historical variations in the effective population sizes might have played one key role in the observed phenomenon. Although there is little information available about these historic population sizes, the variable cumulative TinT patterns indicate an inverse relationship to the assumed historical fluctuations currently thought to have occurred (supposing a relatively constant generation time and constant activity of involved retroposons). It should be noted that, alternatively to the expected drastic change in population size and rapid radiation in ancient Neoaves, an extreme burst of retrotransposon activity might also explain the differences in the cumulative TinT pattern of the zebra finch. The appearance of many new retroposon subfamilies in both peaks of the zebra finch cumulative TinT could be interpreted in this direction. However, because of the virtually homoplasy-free character of retroposon presence/absence markers, they are valuable means of differentiating the random phylogenetic noise of sequence-based data from incomplete lineage sorting effects. They also help to identify phylogenetic issues that have a high chance of being reliably resolved by sequence-based data. However, due to the somewhat questionable nature of the polymorphic retroposon markers, the phylogeny of early neoavian birds remains partially unresolved, and only some internal branches (such as that of the landbird clade) stand out from the nebulous history of this group.
Fig. 3. Cumulative probability of CR1 retroposon fixation in zebra finch and domestic fowl. The classification of CR1 element families in zebra finch (top) and domestic fowl (bottom) are adopted from the RepeatMasker library (A = Aves, P = Passeriformes, T = Taeniopygia). CR1-Y2 and CR1-Y1 were active before the divergence of Neoaves and Galloanseres (see Suh et al. 2011). CR1-Y2 activity was used to calibrate the two cumulative curves, and a neognath-specific CR1-Y1 insertion from Suh et al. 2011 to set the left boundary for the preneovian radiation. The domestic fowl cumulative element fixation profile indicates a homogenous accumulation, whereas the pattern for the zebra finch shows a fissure indicating a period of rapid radiation and reduced probability of retroposon fixation, flanked by periods of high probabilities of retroposon fixation. It is important to mention that these curves are optimized for CR1 elements (see supplementary figs. S2 and S3, Supplementary Material online). Gray circles show the probable location of phylogenetically informative retroposon markers; black circles indicate conflicting markers.
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Supplementary methods, material, and figures S1, S2, and S3 are available at Molecular Biology and Evolution online (http://www.mbe.oxfordjournals.org/).
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