**Metamorphosis imposes variable constraints on genome expansion**

**Abstract**

Genome size varies ~ 100,000-fold across eukaryotes. Genome size is heavily shaped by transposable element accumulation, the dynamics of which are increasingly well understood. However, given that traits like cell size and rate of development co-vary strongly with genome size, organism-level trait evolution likely shape genome size diversity as well. Metamorphosis ¾ a radical transformation of morphology ¾ has been hypothesized to impact genome size because it can be a vulnerable part of the life cycle. Thus, selection may act to limit metamorphic duration, indirectly constraining the rate of development as well as genome and cell sizes. Salamanders have large and variable genomes ¾ 5 to 40 times the size of the human genome ¾ and species exhibit a range of metamorphic and non-metamorphic life histories. Using salamanders, we test the hypothesis that different types of metamorphic repatterning during the life cycle impose different constraints on genome expansion. We show that metamorphosis during which animals are unable to feed imposes the most severe constraint against genome expansion. Metamorphosis in which the animals can feed, as well as metamorphic repatterning that occurs inside the egg at the end of embryogenesis, impose less severe constraints.

**Introduction**

Across the tree of life, few characters exhibit the tremendous scale of variation of genome size, encompassing a ~100,000-fold range across eukaryotes (Gregory 2020). Decades of research have revealed the consistent covariation of two organismal features with genome size: a negative correlation with cell division rate, and a positive correlation with cell size (Mueller, 2015; reviewed in Gregory 2001). Genome size has also been associated with a variety of organismal or ecological factors including: developmental rate or complexity (Wake and Marks 1993; Gregory 2002; Sessions 2008; Bonnett, et al., 2020), temperature (), metabolic rate (), invasiveness (), or speciation and extinction rates (), but these associations vary across studies.

Comparative biologists often think of adaptive explanations for character associations, which would suggest that genomes evolve toward an "optimum" size with respect to one or more of these correlated traits. However, the context-sensitive nature of associations with these factors belies a strongly adaptive explanation for genome size. For example, metabolic rate and genome size is correlated in some vertebrate clades, but not in others, and genome size provides no overall explanatory power for basal metabolic rate across vertebrates (cite Uyeda et al 2017 and Gardner et al 2020 as well as Licht and Lowcock and some of the disagreeing bird studies). Genome size evolution may instead evolve nearly neutrally until some threshold value is reached, beyond which fitness is impacted (Gregory 2002). This process is more aptly described as governed by constraints. As far as we are aware, the constraint model has never been formally tested within a phylogenetic comparative framework for a univariate trait.

Recent years have seen tremendous improvement in our understanding of the mechanistic processes by which genome size evolves. Variation in genome size can reflect the accumulation of many types of sequences, from simple repeats to increases in ploidy (Elliott and Gregory 2015; Pasquesi, et al. 2018; Carta, et al. 2020), such that the majority of the genome is non-coding or “junk” DNA. In vertebrate animals, genome size is strongly determined by the accumulation of transposable elements (TEs), sequences that replicate and spread throughout host genomes (Sotero-Caio, et al. 2017; Shao, et al. 2019). TEs are also deleted by mutations introduced during replication, recombination, and DNA repair (cite). In the absence of selection or constraint on genome size, the background process for genome evolution is stochastic, with genome size increasing if TE insertions outpace deletions. TE activity is often neutral at the cellular and organismal levels, with most individual insertions and deletions missing functional regions of the genome and resulting in negligible fitness consequences (Arkhipova 2018). Non-coding DNA can therefore accumulate until genome size crosses a threshold where it begins to impact fitness through a correlated trait (e.g. cell size or developmental rate; Fix these citations Horner and Macgregor 1983; Sessions and Larson 1987; Jockusch 1997; Womack, et al. 2019).

While the notion of constraint on genome size is conceptually appealing, there are few comparative methods that can detect constraint and possibly distinguish it from adaptation. Phylogenetic comparative methods that focus primarily on the mean or "location" of the phenotype are primed to detect adaptive evolution, as selection is expected to move the phenotype toward an optimum. For example, testing for a correlation between traits after independent contrasts may reveal whether, on average, a phenotype covaries across species with some other trait, with the relationship maintained presumably as a result of adaptive evolution. How mean-focused methods enable the detection of constraint, however, is unclear. Methods that model both the mean and variance of a stochastically evolving phenotype, such as Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based methods, may open the door to exploring constraint by revealing whether a stochastically spreading phenotype evolves by selection, or by weak selection bounding the phenotype consistent with the presence of constraint, or by no selection at all.

Salamanders are an ideal group to test hypotheses of selection and constraint on genome size. They have both the largest genomes and the largest range of variation in genome size among vertebrates. Genome sizes range from 15 Gb – 120 Gb across the 743 extant species (Gregory 2020), reflecting varying levels of TE accumulation. Salamanders also have exceptional life-history diversity, in particular, with metamorphosis lost, modified, and regained throughout their evolutionary history (Wiens, et al. 2005; Bonett, et al. 2014). Metamorphosis has been hypothesized to shape genome size evolution because of the effects that genome (and therefore cell) size has on the rate of development (Wake and Marks 1993; Gregory 2002). Because metamorphosis can be a vulnerable part of the life cycle, its duration has been proposed as a target of natural selection. Selection to limit the time in metamorphosis would indirectly select for faster development, constraining genomes (and cells) to smaller sizes (Gregory 2002; Bonett, et al. 2020).

Several studies have linked life history to genome size in salamanders, with smaller (albeit still enormous relative to other taxa) genome sizes associated with metamorphosis (Wake and Marks 1993; Gregory 2002; Sessions 2008; Bonett, et al. 2020). Bonnett (2020) used phylogenetic comparative methods to demonstratee that salamander genome size is better explained by models that account for differences in life history ¾ including the presence or absence of metamorphosis ¾ as opposed to variation in ecology or habitat stability. However, this study was largely focused on the effects of facultative loss of metamorphosis on genome size evolution; thus, it did not explore the concept of evolutionary constraint versus adaptation. In addition, it did not examine the connection between energetic vulnerability and metamorphic duration, which we propose as a key conceptual link between metamorphosis and genome size.

In this study, we build on this previous body of work, revisiting the hypothesis that the radical morphological repatterning associated with metamorphosis imposes evolutionary constraints on genome size in salamanders. In particular, we model characteristics that are likely to place energetic limits on the duration of metamorphosis: Does repatterning happen inside the egg, fueled solely by yolk stores? Does repatterning happen in an organism that is free-living, but unable to feed? We use life history and genome size data to inform stochastic models of trait evolution that explore how different metamorphic regimes interact with genome expansion. More generally, we demonstrate the ability of OU-based stochastic models to identify trait evolution governed by constraint, expanding their use beyond classic scenarios of adaptive evolution.

*Life History Regimes Constraining Genome Size Evolution*

In the absence of any selection or constraint, genome size in salamanders is expected to expand by biased stochastic evolution. Overall mutation pressure is biased towards TE accumulation as TE deletion rates are low and TE silencing is incomplete (Sun, Arriaza, et al. 2012; Frahry, et al. 2015; Madison-Villar, et al. 2016; Mohlhenrich and Mueller 2016). Salamanders’ enormous genomes is the cumulative result from unusually high levels of TE activity (Sun, Shepard, et al. 2012; Sun and Mueller 2014; Keinath, et al. 2015; Nowoshilow, et al. 2018).

The ancestral salamander life history included a larval growth stage followed by metamorphosis. Metamorphosis is a radical transformation of morphology during the life cycle that produces strikingly different, largely decoupled larval and adult forms (Moran 1994). During metamorphosis, as during embryogenesis, salamanders undergo rapid cell division, differentiation, migration, and apoptosis (Alberch 1989). The dynamics of these cellular processes are affected by genome size and cell size; as genome/cell sizes increase, developmental rates throughout ontogeny ¾ from embryogenesis through metamorphosis ¾ slow down (Horner and Macgregor 1983; Jockusch 1997). Metamorphosis has been lost and regained from the life cycle numerous times by different mechanisms (Wiens, et al. 2005; Bonett, et al. 2014), producing multiple life history regimes that could shape genome size evolution. We outline these regimes, and their predicted effects on genome size evolution, below and in Figure 1:

*Paedomorphosis:* In paedomorphic species, some or all stages of metamorphic repatterning are lost, and organisms reach sexual maturity retaining largely larval traits (Gould 1977). Because there is no selection to limit time in metamorphosis, there is no associated constraint on genome size. Thus, paedomorphs are expected to most closely reflect the background condition of stochastic genome expansion.

*Direct development:* In direct-developing species, the larval growth stage is eliminated, and embryogenesis and metamorphosis are integrated into a single sequence of developmental events that takes place inside the egg (Alberch 1989; Rose 2014). This entire developmental process must be fueled by yolk provisioned by the mother. Thus, we might expect selection to limit time in metamorphosis, imposing a constraint on genome size.

*Non-feeding metamorphosis:* Within the salamander family Plethodontidae, metamorphic repatterning events happen relatively synchronously in a free-living organism. During this metamorphosis, the organisms are unable to feed because of the replacement of cartilaginous elements associated with the change from suction to projectile feeding (Rose 1995b; Deban and Marks 2002). The entire process must be fueled by energy reserves built up during the larval stage. Thus, we might expect selection to limit time in metamorphosis, imposing a constraint on genome size.


*Feeding metamorphosis:* In non-plethodontid salamanders, metamorphic repatterning events happen in a free-living organism that is able to feed throughout the transformation. Thus, we would not expect selection based on energy demands to limit time spent in metamorphosis. There are, however, other ways in which metamorphosis can increase vulnerability that might translate into selection on metamorphic duration, constraining genome size.

Figure 1. Alternative hypotheses for constraints imposed by development on genome size evolution in salamanders. On each phylogeny, alternative life history regimes are painted in different colors as indicated in each legend (see text). Genome sizes are shown on the right in Gb.

**Methods**

*Taxon Sampling, Genome Size, and Phylogeny*

Genome size data were available for 106 species of salamanders (out of a total of 759 currently named extant species), encompassing all ten salamander families and 35 of 68 genera (Supplemental Table 1; (AmphibiaWeb 2020; Gregory 2020). We transformed the data with natural logarithms prior to analysis. Our sampling includes representatives with diverse life histories: direct development, paedomorphosis, feeding metamorphosis, and non-feeding metamorphosis (AmphibiaWeb 2020). Hereafter, we distinguish between "feeding" and "non-feeding metamorphosis", and use "metamorphosis" to indicate all species which undergo metamorphosis, whether feeding or non-feeding. Several lineages are facultative paedomorphs, which retain the ability to undergo metamorphosis under certain conditions. We coded these taxa as metamorphic, reflecting the experience of constraint, even if only occasionally, and supported by recent work examining the evolutionary impacts of facultative paedomorphosis (Bonett, et al. 2020).

We used a previously published phylogeny (Mueller, et al. 2008; Pyron and Wiens 2011; Vieites, et al. 2011; Zheng, et al. 2011) and estimated branch lengths on this topology using sequence data for two mitochondrial genes ⎯ cytochrome-b and 16S obtained from GenBank. Additional Sanger sequences were collected as necessary at the Colorado State University sequencing core facility or the Joint Genome Institute following (Mueller, et al. 2004);Supplemental Table 2). Loci were aligned using MUSCLE (Edgar 2004). Branch lengths were estimated for each locus independently and then averaged, weighted by gene length. Branch lengths were estimated using RAxML (Stamatakis 2006) using the best-fit (AIC) model of nucleotide substitution in ModelTest 3.6 (Posada and Crandall 1998), with Cyt-b partitioned by codon. The resulting tree was ultrametricized using penalized likelihood implemented in r8s with the truncated Newton algorithm and cross validation to select the optimal smoothing parameter value (Sanderson 2003).

*Models of Genome Size Evolution*

We modeled genome size evolution using both Brownian motion (BM) and Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) models of evolution (Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004; O'Meara, et al. 2006; Beaulieu, et al. 2012). As these models have been described previously, we cover them only briefly here. The BM model is the simplest stochastic model used in comparative analysis and has a single rate parameter σ, which can be thought of as a stochastic noise intensity parameter shared by all taxa and describing the magnitude of the independent random walks of the trait evolving along the branches of the phylogeny. This model predicts that across lineages, there will be no change in mean phenotype, but variance will grow through time as lineages wander over trait space, and the expected variance between two lineages will be proportional to the time since their divergence. Conceptually, the BM model may be a good candidate for purely stochastic genome size evolution if increases occur as frequently as decreases.

The multiple-rate BM model, introduced by O’Meara, et al. (2006), allows different σ values across different portions of a phylogenetic tree. We use this model to represent changes in the rate of stochastic evolution accompanying changes in constraint resulting from shifts in life history regime. Under this model, lineages evolving under different regimes may differ in variance.

OU models generalize the BM model by including terms that allow the mean to shift as well as allowing variance to narrow. They include a deterministic component of trait evolution that models the tendency of the trait to move toward an equilibrium value. Mathematically, the model for trait evolution expressed as a differential equation is

,

where is the deterministic equilibrium for the trait at time *t* and is an evolutionary rate describing the *strength of the deterministic pull (e.g. selection)* towards that equilibrium along a branch of a tree. Hypotheses regarding trait evolution are specified by painting “regimes” on the tree to indicate where these parameters are expected to shift. The simplest OU models allow multiple equilibria leading to the evolution of differences in mean phenotype across regimes (Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004); for example, in the current study, if separate equilibria exist for paedomorphs, metamorphosers, and direct developers. Further model extensions also allow the strength of the deterministic pull and the stochastic noise intensity to vary across regimes (Beaulieu, et al. 2012), as might be consistent with the lifting or imposition of constraints on genome size evolution.

We formalized five hypotheses for how life history regime could constrain genome size evolution in salamanders: (1) Brownian motion: Genome size evolves by purely stochastic evolutionary processes with no constraint nor bias. (2) *metamorphosis-other*: Metamorphosis imposes a constraint on genome expansion that is distinct from the other life histories. (3) *meta-paed-dd*: Metamorphosis, direct development, and paedomorphosis each impose distinct constraints on genome expansion. (4) *metaf-metanf-other*: Feeding metamorphosis (*metaf*) and non-feeding metamorphosis (*metanf*) each impose constraints that are distinct from those experienced by salamander species possessing other life histories. (5) *metaf-metanf-paed-dd*: non-feeding metamorphic species, feeding metamorphic species, paedomorphic species, and direct-developing species each experience different levels of constraint on genome expansion.

These five biologically-inspired hypotheses are specified by fitting evolutionary models that allow their parameters to vary with life history regime. The simplest form allows the equilibrium to vary with life history regime while assuming the rates of evolution are constant across the phylogeny. Additional subhypotheses fitt evolutionary models that vary stochastic noise intensity values (), and/or deterministic pull values () according to life history regime (Table 1). In all, we tested 21 models to exoplore life history constraints on genome size and model parameters (Table 2). We fit all of the models with the character state of the node at the base of the plethodontid lineage defined as metamorphosing as well as direct-developing (Bonett, et al. 2014), and found that the choice of the basal character state made no qualitative difference to our conclusions. In addition, we made a series of pairwise comparisons to further assess the degree of influence of feeding metamorphosis, paedomorphosis, direct development, and non-feeding metamorphosis on genome size evolution in combinations of increasing complexity (Table 3).

We fit models of evolution using the software package OUwie (Beaulieu, et al. 2012) and compared the multiple optimum OU models with results fitted in OUCH (Butler and King 2004; King and Butler 2009). All analyses were conducted in the R statistical computing environment (R Core Team 2020). We note here that OUwie has different options for dealing with the root state, *X*(0). Absent any information about the phenotype deep in the tree, this parameter is often very difficult to estimate in OU models (Cressler, et al. 2015). One alternative is to assume that the value of *X*(0) is distributed according to the stationary distribution of an OU process, which eliminates this parameter by absorbing the variance into the covariance matrix implied by the phylogeny itself (Ho and Ané 2013). However, OUwie does not currently support this approach for OU models with multiple or parameters, and as far as we know, the mathematical modifications for these models have not been worked out. Because the option to estimate the value of the root node as in the earlier implementations (Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004; and specified in OUwie by setting root.station=FALSE) is available for all of the models of interest, we used it for all model fitting. However, as we show in the Supplementary Materials, the parameter estimates of a single-, single- OU model fit assuming the root is in the stationary distribution are very different from the parameter estimates obtained by fitting the root state, although model selection conclusions hold. This large difference in the parameter values reinforces a general point in phylogenetic comparative hypothesis testing, which is that parameter estimation is often more fraught than hypothesis testing, and as such, parameter estimates should be interpreted with caution (Beaulieu, et al. 2012; Ho and Ané 2013; Ho and Ané 2014; Cressler, et al. 2015; Cooper, et al. 2016).

As sometimes happens when fitting OU models, it is possible to recover an extremely low value of a (weak deterministic pull), with equally extremely large q (equilibrium values). This combination can reasonably be interpreted as weak selection, or a biased nearly-random walk. Rather than look only at these parameters in isolation, we considered whether it may be more informative to determine their combined effect on trait evolution. To this end, we calculated the value of for each life history regime to estimate any "deterministic trend" imposed by the best-fitting model, where is the average genome size of species in that regime at the end of the evolutionary process.

Table 1. BM and OU models with single or multiple parameters used to fit the data. Numbers in parentheses specify (1) model parameters and notation, (2) parameters that remain constant across the phylogeny, (3) parameters that vary with shifts in life history regime, (4) OʻMeara (2006) model notation, (5) notes for the model implementations and citations.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Models** | **Uniform** | **Variable with Regime** | **O’Meara Notation** | **Notes** |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Single noise intensity *σ* | *σ* |  | BM1 | Classic BM model of (Felsenstein 1985) |
| Multiple noise intensities *σi* |  | *σi* | BMS | Multiple-rate BM model of O’Meara et al. (2006) |
| Multiple equilibria | *σ* | *i* | OUM | OU model of Butler and King (2004) |
| Multiple equilibria and deterministic pull strengths | *σ* | *i*  *I* | OUMA | Multiple- model of Beaulieu et al. (2012). |
| Multiple equilibria and noise intensities |  | *σi*  *i* | OUMV | The multiple- model of Beaulieu et al. (2012) |
| Multiple equilibria, noise intensities, and deterministic pull strengths |  | *σi*  *i*  *i* | OUMVA | The full model of Beaulieu et al. (2012). |

*Model Comparison and Parameter Estimation*

We compared the fit of each of the models using the Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc). We further performed model selection bootstrap analysis (phylogenetic Monte Carlo; (Boettiger, et al. 2012) for targeted comparisons of the models in Table 3 to assess the strength of evidence for different hypotheses as well as the power to detect differences in model support. Model selection bootstrap analysis is necessary because AICc differences can favor more complicated models, even when a simpler model is correct (Boettiger, et al. 2012). For each comparison, we computed the observed likelihood difference,

*δ­­*obs = –2 (log *L*0 – log *L*1),

where *L*0 is the likelihood of the simpler model and *L*1 is the likelihood of the more complex model.

Determining whether *δ*obs is significantly different from a null expectation requires an approximate *p-*value ¾ the probability of observing *δ*obs *if the simpler model were true*. That is, we need to compare the value *δ*obs to the distribution of *δ* values under the simpler model. To create this distribution, we generate 500 datasets by simulating the simpler model at its MLE parameter estimates; we then fit both the simpler and more complex models to each simulated dataset and compute the values of *δ*, producing a null distribution of *δ* under the simpler model. We compared the observed value of *δ* to this null distribution to calculate an approximate *p*-value.

Power conveys the (desirable) probability of rejecting the simpler model when the more complex model is true. To estimate power, we generate 500 datasets by simulating the more complex model at its MLE parameter estimates; we then fit the two models and computed the values of *δ.* The fraction of these *δ* values that are greater than the 95% quantile of the distribution generated under the simpler model (described above) gives an estimate of power.

**Results**

The best-fitting model for salamander genome size evolution accounted for four regimes: both non-feeding and feeding metamorphosis, paedomorphosis, and direct development (*meta*f *-meta*nf *-paed-dd*; Table 2) under an OU model that allowed both equilibrium genome size and noise intensity to vary across these regimes (qi, si, a, Table 2). An identical 4-regime model with only a single noise intensity fit nearly as well (Table 2). Additionally, the three-regime *meta*f *-meta*nf *-other* (qi, si, a) hypothesis provided some explanatory power. These three models were far superior to the remaining models.

Overall, the addition of multiple a values resulted in worse model fit relative to a uniform a value, whereas the addition of multiple s values relative to a single s both improved and worsened model fit, depending on the hypothesis (Table 2, Figure 2). We present the results with the character state of the node at the base of the plethodontid lineage defined as metamorphosing. In Appendix B, we show that defining this node as direct-developing has no effect on the evolutionary conclusions we draw here.

The model selection bootstrap analysis allows us to quantify the support for specific hypotheses (Fig. 2). Note that for each comparison, we used the version of the OU model that had the lowest AICc (Table 2), so comparisons involving *metamorphosis-other* and *meta-paed-dd* used the single- model, whereas comparisons involving *meta*f *-meta*nf *-paed-dd* and *meta*f *-meta*nf *-other* used the multiple- model. Based on these results, we can reject any purely stochastic hypothesis for genome size evolution, as a model that allows for separate equilibrium values for metamorphosers was far superior to any purely neutral model (Table 2; Fig. 2A). Specifying distinct equilibrium values for non-feeding and feeding metamorphosis substantially improves the explanatory power of any model (Fig. 2C, D). In particular, the separation of metamorphosis into feeding and non-feeding categories provided far greater improvement of the model than subdividing the "other" category into direct development and paedomorphosis (compare the results in Fig. 2C to those in Fig. 2B, and Fig. 2D to 2E). Allowing distinct noise parameters for each regime slightly improves the fit of the OU models with separate equilibria for non-feeding and feeding metamorphosis (Table 2), although the improvement over the single- model is not significant (Comparison [6], Table 3; Fig. 2F). Therefore, the best model included distinct equilibrium values for direct development, paedomorphosis, feeding, and non-feeding metamorphosis.

Table 2. Model comparison statistics. Best models (interrogated by boostrap Table 3) indicated in bold. Model parameterizations are indicated by: s = Brownian motion; s*i* = Brownian motion with multiple noise intensities; q*i,* s*,* a = OU model with multiple equilibria; q*i,* s*i,* a = OU model with multiple equilibria and multiple noise intensities; q*i,* s*,* a*i* = OU model with multiple equilibria and multiple selection strengths; q*i,* s*i,* a*i* = OU model with multiple equilibria, noise intensities, and selection strengths.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ΔAICc | Model | | | | | |
| OU Models | | | | BM Models | |
| Hypotheses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *meta*f *-meta*nf *-paed-dd* | **0** | **1.1b** | 7.5 | 8.1 | 12.9 |  |
| *meta*f *-meta*nf *-other* | 1.4 | 3.6a | 6.1 | 8.1 | 11.1 |  |
| *meta-paed-dd* | 6.0 | 3.4 | 10.7 | 7.9 | 11.4 |  |
| *metamorphosis-other* | 5.8 | 4.1 | 8.0 | 6.3 | 9.5 |  |
| Brownian motion |  |  |  |  |  | 31.8 |

a *meta*f *-meta*nf *-other* is compared against the best model via bootstrap in Table 3.5.

b *meta*f *-meta*nf *-dd-paed* with single or multiple noise parameters s is compared in Table 3.6.



A picture containing dark, lit

Description automatically generated

Figure 2. Bootstrap distributions of the likelihood difference (*δ*)calculated by generating 500 datasets under each of two competing models at their MLE parameter estimates, refitting the two models, and computing *δ*. The light gray region shows the probability density of the parameter when the data is generated by the simpler model; the dark gray region shows the density when the data is generated by the more complex model. The dashed line gives the observed value (*δ*obs)from fitting the actual genome size data. The reported *p-*value is the fraction of the light gray distribution that lies to the right of *δ*obs; the power is the fraction of the dark gray distribution that lies to the right of the 95th percentile of the light gray distribution. Each panel evaluates the support for a different hypothesis: (A) metamorphosis imposes a constraint on genome expansion; (B) there are distinct constraints imposed by the different non-metamorphosing strategies, direct development and paedomorphosis; (C) non-feeding metamorphosis imposes a distinct constraint from feeding metamorphosis; (D) non-feeding metamorphosis imposes a distinct constraint from feeding metamorphosis, after accounting for differences in non-metamorphosing strategies; (E) non-metamorphosing strategies impose unique constraints, after accounting for differences between feeding and non-feeding metamorphosis; (F) after identifying *meta­­­f-metanf -paed-dd* as best-fitting, this comparison tested whether fitting each regime with a distinct stochastic noise intensity improved fit to the data.

Parameter values for each regime estimated under the best-fitting model are presented in Table 3. Direct-developers, non-feeding metamorphosers, paedomorphs, and feeding metamorphosers have broadly overlapping stochastic noise intensity (s) values. Deterministic pull strength (a) takes an extremely small value, and the equilibrium values (q) take extreme values both large and small. Although the deterministic pull strength parameter is vanishingly small, nevertheless, the models that account for metamorphosis are far superior to a purely stochastic model (Table 2). We note that the extreme nature of the parameter estimates are a consequence of the handling of the root state (see Supplementary Materials).

Table 3: Maximum likelihood parameter estimates and parametric bootstrap confidence intervals for the best-fitting model (*meta*f *-metanf -dd-paed :* separate equilibrium values and noise intensities for lineages in the four selection regimes: dd = direct development, metanf = non-feeding metamorphosis, metaf = feeding metamorphosis, paed = paedomorphosis).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter |  | MLE | 95% CI |
| Deterministic pull strength |  | 1.05e-7 | (1.01e-7, 1.7) |
| Stochastic noise intensity | *dd* | 0.365 | (0.308, 0.545) |
|  | *meta\_nf* | 0.355 | (0.252, 0.525) |
|  | *meta* | 0.187 | (0.108, 0.283) |
|  | *paed* | 0.249 | (0.112, 0.464) |
| Equilibrium value | *dd* | -3.77e5 | (-2.67e6, 1.99e6) |
|  | *meta\_nf* | 3.62 | (3.32, 3.90) |
|  | *meta* | -5.55e6 | (-7.62e6, 3.28) |
|  | *paed* | 4.41e6 | (3.96, 6.29e6) |

There is evidence of a deterministic trend towards small genome size in salamanders that undergo non-feeding metamorphosis as well as a trend towards large genome size in paedomorphic salamanders (Table 4). In contrast, genome sizes in direct developing and feeding metamorphosing salamanders show no such trends. The range of values for the strength of the overall deterministic trend (Table 4) is much greater than the range of values for stochastic noise intensity (Table 3).

Table 4: Estimates of the deterministic trend in the best-fitting model for lineages evolving in each regime, based on the average genome size (log-scale) of salamanders in each regime.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Regime | Average log genome size | Deterministic trend |
| Direct development | 3.66 (38.9pg) | -0.0396 |
| Feeding metamorphosis | 3.46 (31.8pg) | 1.68e-8 |
| Non-feeding metamorphosis | 3.07 (21.5pg) | -0.583 |
| Paedomorphosis | 3.89 (48.9pg) | 0.463 |

**Discussion**

*Biased stochastic expansion and life history constraints shape genome size.*¾

Overall, evolution of genome size in salamanders is well-described by a weakly deterministic model with separate equilibria for each life history regime and moderate stochasticity. An increased level of constraint in lineages that evolved non-feeding metamorphosis, as well as a decreased level of constraint in lineages that have lost metamorphosis exert the greatest deterministic influences on the evolution of genome size. The strength of the deterministic trend towards genome expansion for paedomorphs is roughly the same as the strength of the deterministic trend towards genome reduction for non-feeding metamorphosers; both are an order of magnitude stronger than the trend for direct-developers. Feeding metamorphosers have no deterministic trend (Table 4). Taken together, these results, and the observed spread of genome sizes within regimes, suggest that genome size evolution is driven by stochasticity with a bias toward increase ¾ likely representing TE insertions that outpace deletions ¾ constrained to varying degrees by metamorphic repatterning, when selection acts to limit metamorphic duration.

*Metamorphosis as a vulnerable stage of the life cycle in amphibians*

Metamorphosis is assumed to exert evolutionary pressure for reduced genome size in amphibians to speed development during a vulnerable life stage. This notion comes from evidence primarily from frogs. Metamorphosing frogs experience higher predation levels because they can neither swim nor hop effectively (Wassersug and Sperry 1977; Arnold and Wassersug 1978). In addition, frogs are unable to feed during metamorphosis, at a time when their energetic requirements can nearly double as compared to the period immediately preceding metamorphosis (Orlofske and Hopkins 2009; Wright, et al. 2011). Despite being homologous and retaining broad similarities at the transcriptomic, hormonal, and organismal levels (Sanchez, et al. 2018), salamander metamorphosis is different ¾ and less dramatic ¾ than frog metamorphosis. The process takes much longer in salamanders; timescales are on the order of weeks to months rather than days (Norman 1985; Downie, et al. 2004; Vladimirova, et al. 2012; Sanchez, et al. 2018), suggesting little, if any, time pressure. Metamorphosing salamanders do not experience compromised locomotion are thus not more vulnerable to predation as are frogs (Landberg and Azizi 2010). In addition, metamorphosing salamanders do not have higher energetic requirements compared to non-metamorphosing individuals of the same species (Vladimirova, et al. 2012). Some salamanders, however, are unable to feed during metamorphosis, requiring that they undergo the transformation using only stored energy reserves (i.e., non-feeding metamorphosers; Deban and Marks 2002). Direct developers undergo the transformation inside the egg, fueled only by yolk stores. Genome size constraints for these two life history regimes likely reflect energetic vulnerability that is not relevant for the other two life histories considered here: feeding metamorphosis and paedomorphosis.

*Genome size evolution in feeding metamorphosers.*¾Lineages that undergo metamorphosis, but are able to feed throughout the process, show no deterministic trend in genome size evolution. Rather, trait evolution is described by moderate stochastic noise around an equilibrium value that we interpret as a balance between TE accumulation and a constraint imposed by metamorphosis. Although ablee to feed, there are other ways in which fitness can be lowered during salamander metamorphosis; for example, metamorphosing individuals are less able to exploit stream habitat refugia than either larvae or adults, which increases their mortality (Lowe, et al. 2019). Our results indicate that feeding metamorphosis imposes a less severe constraint on genome size than non-feeding metamorphosis, and infer that the constraint is mediated by vulnerabilities other than depletion of energetic stores.

*Genome size evolution in non-feeding metamorphosers.*¾Although other analyses have demonstrated a link between metamorphosis and genome size in salamanders (Wake and Marks 1993; Gregory 2002; Sessions 2008; Bonett, et al. 2020), here we show that non-feeding metamorphosis imposes a substantial and distinct constraint, relative to feeding metamorphosis, as predicted if energetic vulnerability shapes the duration of metamorphosis. The deterministic trend toward smaller genome sizes within this regime is consistent with the imposition of a more severe constraint against genome expansion ¾ or, put another way, selection towards genome size reduction ¾¾ to shorten the duration of metamorphosis.

The evolution of non-feeding metamorphosis in plethodontids has been an important target of research because the phylogeny suggests that it evolved from a direct-developing ancestor(s), which necessitates the evolutionary reappearance of the “lost” larval stage (Chippindale, et al. 2004; Mueller, et al. 2004). This evolutionary transformation series was historically considered unlikely, although more recent work has revealed potential scenarios for regain of the larval stage (Bonett, et al. 2005; Bonett, et al. 2014). Under this scenario, in the direct-developing ancestral lineage(s), metamorphic repatterning steps were retained as part of the longer sequence of developmental events that occurred inside the egg (Kerney, et al. 2012). These changes were likely mediated by evolutionary changes in the timing of thyroid hormone activity and response (Rose 1995b, c; Bonett 2016). The re-evolution of (now non-feeding) metamorphosis reflected the insertion of a long, slow-growing larval growth phase back into ontogeny, followed by the synchronous occurrence of more drastic metamorphic repatterning events in the free-living organism which preclude feeding (Rose 1995c, a; Beachy, et al. 2017). Repatterning of the feeding apparatus is more drastic in plethodontids than in other salamanders. The ceratobranchials, which are cartilaginous components of the tongue skeleton, are replaced by new structures in the adult rather than remodeled from existing larval structures, and the overall changes to the tongue skeleton cause the inability to feed (Alberch 1989; Rose 1995a; Deban and Marks 2002). Under the classical scenario, in contrast, this synchronization of metamorphosis and drastic remodeling of feeding structures would have evolved in a metamorphosing ancestor to produce non-feeding metamorphosis (Wake and Hanken 2004). Under either scenario, our results illustrate how phylogenetic comparative methods can reveal the evolutionary forces that have acted on genome size as lineages moved through the different life history regimes.

Much remains to be learned about how selection on organismal traits translates into changes in genome size, and this represents a gap in our knowledge of genome biology and evolution that studies of salamanders can help to fill. For example, our results suggest that salamanders that undergo non-feeding metamorphosis can be leveraged as a model system to distinguish between possible mechanisms of genome reduction. Variation in genome size is introduced into a population by TE insertions and deletions. Selection could, in principle, sort among these genome size variants, even as the fitness consequences of individual TE loci are typically miniscule and effectively neutral (Lynch 2007; Arkhipova 2018). In addition, selection could sort among differences in TE control machinery including the pathways that underlie TE silencing and deletion, which could yield variants with greater differences in TE composition and fitness (Mueller 2015; Parhad and Theurkauf 2019; Parhad, et al. 2020). Comparing TE control machinery in non-feeding metamorphosers versus other life history regimes (e.g. paedomorphs) could identify the mechanisms underlying genome reduction.

*Genome size evolution in direct developers.*¾In direct-developing lineages, some or all of the developmental steps of metamorphic repatterning occur inside the egg at the end of embryogenesis (Alberch 1989; Kerney, et al. 2012) and show a weak deterministic trend towards genome size reduction. Because they are occurring in an embryo rather than a free-living organism that has undergone a growth period, the repatterning happens to a smaller number of cells in a smaller overall mass of tissue compared with metamorphosing lineages (Downie, et al. 2004). Thus, the energetic requirements for comparable developmental steps are lower in direct developers than in metamorphosers. On the other hand, the energy to fuel these steps comes from yolk stores which, although plentiful in direct developers, are still finite (Wake and Hanken 2004). Thus, we infer that direct development imposes a less severe constraint on genome size than does non-feeding metamorphosis, mediated by the potential for depletion of energy stores if the duration of metamorphic repatterning during embryogenesis is too long. We note that there is greater variation across direct developers in metamorphic repatterning than modeled here. In some cases, the sequence of developmental events is shortened because the formation of larval structures is lost from ontogeny. In other cases, most or all events of embryogenesis and metamorphosis are retained but occur inside the egg (which allows for the possibility of re-evolution of metamorphosis; Alberch 1989). We would predict more severe constraints in these latter lineages. Although we treated both scenarios as a single category for simplicity, these two types of direct development may be different in their effects on genome size evolution and warrant more detailed study.

*Genome size evolution in paedomorphs.*¾Paedomorphic salamanders retain a larval body form throughout life and show a deterministic trend towards genome expansion. This trend is consistent with TE accumulation proceeding to higher overall levels, unchecked by any constraints imposed by metamorphic repatterning. However, we do not suggest that genome size is free from all constraints. The impacts of decreased surface-area-to-volume ratio that accompany increased cell size likely impose an upper limit on cell function that salamanders may well have reached (Chan and Marshall 2010); their cells are among the largest found in animals (Horner and Macgregor 1983). In addition, the duration of embryogenesis may well have an upper bound that constrains genome expansion at the extremely high end. In the past, huge cells have been proposed as adaptive because they coincide, at broad taxonomic levels, with low metabolic rates; salamanders and lungfishes have the lowest metabolic rates and the largest genomes/cells within vertebrates. This correlation led to the proposal that selection shaped an adaptive “frugal metabolic strategy” in these taxa (Szarski 1983; Olmo, et al. 1989). More recent analyses of the relationship between genome/cell size and metabolic rate, however, have failed to find a clear relationship (Licht and Lowcock 1991; Uyeda, et al. 2017; Gardner, et al. 2020). Thus, empirical evidence that huge genomes are a product of directional selection is currently lacking. Our results are more consistent with the relaxation of a constraint against genome expansion because of the extremely weak deterministic pull strength and strong stochastic noise parameters.

*Model complexity to capture the evolutionary process.*¾ While the best model includes a deterministic pull parameter, its magnitude is miniscule. Yet our model selection results demonstrate that models with deterministic pull provide a huge improvement over any purely stochastic model (Table 2). One of the challenges of an OU model with a weak deterministic component is that the model parameters will be poorly defined (Cressler, et al. 2015). Intuitively, if the pull parameter () is important but close to zero, the equilibria (*)* can take on a wide range of values in combination with a range of values for the stochastic parameter and explain the phenotypic distribution equally as well. The difference between a purely stochastic (BM) model and one that has any degree of deterministic pull is that the variance of a BM model will grow unbounded over time (as variance of a trait undergoing a brownian motion process is proportional to time), whereas the variance in a model with deterministic pull will not (variance ~; Add Hansen and Martins 1996, Butler and King 2004). Thus, while the phenotype may explore a wide range of values in an OU model with very small , it will remain bounded. For paedomorphs, a weak deterministic pull allows the mean to wander, while a far-away equilibrium value captures a deterministic trend toward increase. In OU models, increasing deterministic pull strength influences the approach to the equilibrium, but also will tend to dampen stochastic effects (apart from the influence of ), so it is possible to have both weak deterministic pull and substantial noise in the stochastic process. This analysis demonstrates that deterministic pull can exert an important evolutionary influence, even if the magnitude of alpha is weak.

But how complex a model is necessary? One might suppose that stronger deterministic pull on one portion of the tree would support a rate shift in . However, all multiple a models performed poorly. This is consistent with extensive simulation results showing that, among the three basic parameters of the OU model, a is most poorly defined (Cressler, et al. 2015) (Ho and Ane, 2013, Boettiger et al. 2013). Thus, even if a rate shift in a existed, there is probably little power to detect it. In this study, we find that with multiple free parameters, we can readily capture shifts in the evolutionary process with variable q and perhaps s over the tree (although not seen in these results), with stronger deterministic trends accomplished by moving q to more extreme values. Thus, a shift in a is superlative, as changes in a and q are not independently identifiable. Beyond cases with weak deterministic pull, difficulty in identifiability of a may be a general problem for all comparative studies, as we do not know of a case as of yet where a multiple a model was superior.

*Exploring evolutionary constraints with the comparative method.*¾Constraint has long been argued as a necessary component of the evolutionary toolbox, as workers realized that selection alone is insufficient to explain macroevolutionary shifts in phenotype (Alberch 1980, Gould, 1980; Cheverud 1984). The concept of constraint is paradoxically both simple: "evolutionary constraints are restrictions or limitations on the course or outcome of evolution" and wide-reaching including genetic, selective, developmental, and functional constraints (Arnold, 1992). Many fields have attempted to quantify constraints at various levels of biological organization using the notion of limitation. Genetic constraints have been identified as limitations on genetic variation (Kirkpatrick and Lofsvold, 1992), constrained responses to selection (Cheverud 1984), or multivariate correlations that are antagonistic to the direction of selection (Etterson and Shaw, 2001). All of these mechanisms allow the phenotype to change in ways not directly adaptive. Developmental canalization, decisions in the developmental program which narrow the phenotypic possibilities in some traits later in ontogeny, illustrate the potentially creative force of constraint when coupled with modularity by opening opportunities for the larger jumps in phenotype that become possible by evolutionary changes in modules (Wagner 1988, Wagner and Altenberg 1996, Jones et al., 2018). Here bounds to evolution clearly extend the range of possible phenotypic evolution. In terms of broader comparative study, modularity in multivariate shape evolution has been studied via patterns of multivariate covariation, especially for skeletal features (Parsons et al, 2012, Jones, et al. 2018). However, progress in applying concepts of constraint on single characters has been hampered by a lack of precision in the concept of constraint and how it could be detected.

Adaptation is typically envisioned as an evolutionary process whereby phenotypes evolve in response to the strong pull toward an optimum, which tends to concentrate phenotypes about one or more optima after sufficient time has proceeded. On the other hand, an evolutionary process bounded by constraint would be dominated by stochastic evolution for much of the range of a phenotype, appearing as random evolution with a substantially larger variance. Only when the phenotype crosses a threshold, would selection come into play at all, and this may occur perhaps due to correlated selection on another linked trait. Thus the evolutionary “driving force” can simply be stochastic change with limits imposed by constraints. This is the perfect theoretical model to explain genome size evolution in salamanders that we find here. The fact that salamanders have low metabolic rate and develop slowly provides the flexibility to adopt a wide range of developmental schedules and genome sizes and still maintain fitness.

It has been said that adaptation and constraint are two ends of a continuum, but a linear scale provides an incomplete picture. It may be more accurate to say that these evolutionary forces differ in terms of whether they are dominated by a strong pull toward an optimum or weak selection with bounded variance. OU models, which model both the change in the mean as well as variance of the phenotype can be used to distinguish amongst alternatives. Phylogenetic comparative methods have by and large focused on explaining shifts in mean phenotype, and have thus lent themselves well to studying adaptation, convergent evolution, parallelism. By diving deeper into the exploration of stochastic models with opportunities for varying selection and noise we can make great progress in understanding the action of constraint in shaping evolution.

*Conclusion.*¾Overall, our study shows that the evolution of a life history that includes non-feeding metamorphosis exerts a unique influence on the evolution of genome size, imposing the most severe constraints of any salamander life history strategy. This result suggests that selection to shorten the duration of metamorphosis because of energetic vulnerability has indirectly selected for faster development, constraining cells and genomes to smaller sizes. We show that genome size evolution is shaped by strong stochastic forces that are not widely variable across the salamander clade, but that deterministic forces ¾ which vary enormously across life histories ¾ have also played an important role. We broaden the application of stochastic models of trait evolution to include constraint, and we highlight the challenges inherent in connecting model parameters and parameter values to complex biological phenomena.

**Literature cited**

Alberch P. 1980. Ontogenesis and morphological diversification. American Zoologist 20:653-667.

[Alberch P. 1989. Development and the evolution of amphibian metamorphosis. In: Splechtna/Hilgers, editor. Trends in Vertebrate Morphology. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag. p. 163-173.](http://amphibiaweb.org/)

[AmphibiaWeb: Information on amphibian biology and conservation [Internet]. 2020. Berkeley, California. Available from http://amphibiaweb.org/](http://amphibiaweb.org/).

Arkhipova IR. 2018. Neutral theory, transposable elements, and eukaryotic genome evolution. Molecular Biology and Evolution 35:1332-1337.

Arnold SJ, Wassersug RJ. 1978. Differential predation on metamorphic anurans by garter snakes (thamnophis): Social behavior as a possible defense. Ecology 59:1014-1022.

Arnold SJ. 1992. Constraints on phenotypic evolution. The American Naturalist 140:S85-S107.

Beachy CK, Ryan TJ, Bonett RM. 2017. How metamorphosis is different in plethodontids: Larval life history perspectives on life-cycle evolution. Herpetologica 73:252-258.

Beaulieu JM, Jhwueng D-C, Boettiger C, O’Meara BC. 2012. Modeling stabilizing selection: Expanding the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck model of adaptive evolution. Evolution 66:2369-2383.

Bilinski P, Albert PS, Berg JJ, Birchler JA, Grote MN, Lorant A, Quezada J, Swarts K, Yang J, Ross-Ibarra J. 2018. Parallel altitudinal clines reveal trends in adaptive evolution of genome size in Zea mays. PLoS Genetics 14:e1007162.

Boettiger C, Coop G, Ralph P. 2012. Is your phylogeny informative? Measuring the power of comparative methods. Evolution 66:2240-2251.

Bonett RM. 2016. An integrative endocrine model for the evolution of developmental timing and life history of plethodontids and other salamanders. Copeia 104:209-221.

Bonett RM, Hess AJ, Ledbetter NM. 2020. Facultative transitions have trouble committing, but stable life cycles predict salamander genome size evolution. Evol Biol 47:111-122.

Bonett RM, Mueller RL, Wake DB. 2005. Why should reaquisition of larval stages by Desmognathine salamanders surprise us? Herpetological Review 36:112.

Bonett RM, Steffen MA, Robison GA. 2014. Heterochrony repolarized: a phylogenetic analysis of developmental timing in plethodontid salamanders. EvoDevo 5:27.

Butler Marguerite A, King Aaron A. 2004. Phylogenetic comparative analysis: A modeling approach for adaptive evolution. The American Naturalist 164:683-695.

Carta A, Bedini G, Peruzzi L. 2020. A deep dive into the ancestral chromosome number and genome size of flowering plants. New Phytologist 228:1097-1106.

Chan Y-HM, Marshall WF. 2010. Scaling properties of cell and organelle size. Organogenesis 6:88-96.

Cheverud J. Quantitative genetics and developmental constraints on evolution by selection. J. Theoretical Biology 110:155-171.

Chippindale PT, Bonett RM, Baldwin AS, Wiens JJ. 2004. Phylogenetic evidence for a major reversal of life-history evolution in plethodontid salamanders. Evolution 58:2809-2822.

Cooper N, Thomas GH, Venditti C, Meade A, Freckleton RP. 2016. A cautionary note on the use of Ornstein Uhlenbeck models in macroevolutionary studies. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 118:64-77.

Cressler CE, Butler MA, King AA. 2015. Detecting adaptive evolution in phylogenetic comparative analysis using the ornstein–uhlenbeck model. Systematic Biology 64:953-968.

Deban SM, Marks SB. 2002. Metamorphosis and evolution of feeding behaviour in salamanders of the family Plethodontidae. Zool J Linn Soc 134:375-400.

Downie JR, Bryce R, Smith J. 2004. Metamorphic duration: an under-studied variable in frog life histories. Biol J Linn Soc 83:261-272.

Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput. Nucleic Acids Research 32:1792-1797.

Elliott TA, Gregory TR. 2015. What's in a genome? The C-value enigma and the evolution of eukaryotic genome content. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 370:20140331.

Felsenstein J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. The American Naturalist 125:1-15.

Frahry MB, Sun C, Chong R, Mueller RL. 2015. Low levels of LTR retrotransposon deletion by ectopic recombination in the gigantic genomes of salamanders. Journal of Molecular Evolution 80:120-129.

Gardner JD, Laurin M, Organ CL. 2020. The relationship between genome size and metabolic rate in extant vertebrates. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 375:20190146.

Gould SJ. 1977. Ontogeny and Phylogeny. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gould SJ. 1980. Is a new and general theory of evolution emerging? Paleobiology 6:119-130.

Gregory TR. 2001. Coincidence, coevolution, or causation? DNA content, cell size, and the C-value enigma. Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 76:65-101.

Gregory TR. 2002. Genome size and developmental complexity. Genetica 115:131-146.

Gregory, T. R. 2020. Animal Genome Size Database (<http://www.genomesize.com>) [Internet].

Hanken J. 1992. Life history and morphological evolution. J Evol Biol 5:549-557.

Hansen TF. 1997. Stabilizing selection and the comparative analysis of adaptation. Evolution 51:1341-1351.

Hansen TF. and Martins EP. 1996. Translating between microevolutionary process and macroevolutionary patterns: The correlation structure of interspecific data. Evolution 50:1404-1417.

Ho LST, Ané C. 2013. Asymptotic theory with hierarchical autocorrelation: Ornstein-Uhlenbeck tree models. Ann. Statist. 41:957-981.

Ho LST, Ané C. 2014. Intrinsic inference difficulties for trait evolution with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 5:1133-1146.

Horner HA, Macgregor HC. 1983. C value and cell volume: their significance in the evolution and development of amphibians. Journal of Cell Science 63:135.

Jockusch EL. 1997. An evolutionary correlate of genome size change in plethodontid salamanders. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences 264:597.

Johnson CK, Voss SR. 2013. Salamander paedomorphosis: Linking thyroid hormone to life history and life cycle evolution. In: Shi Y-B, editor. Current Topics in Developmental Biology: Academic Press. p. 229-258.

Jones, KE, Benitez, L, Angielczyk KD, and Pierce SE. 2018. Adaptation and constraint in the evolution of the mammalian backbone/ BMC Evolutionary Biology 18:172 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-018-1282-2

Kapusta, A., Suh, A., Feschotte, C. 2017. Dynamics of genome size in birds and mammals. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114(8) E1460-E1469. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1616702114>

Keinath MC, Timoshevskiy VA, Timoshevskaya NY, Tsonis PA, Voss SR, Smith JJ. 2015. Initial characterization of the large genome of the salamander Ambystoma mexicanum using shotgun and laser capture chromosome sequencing. Scientific Reports 5:16413.

Kerney RR, Blackburn DC, Müller H, Hanken J. 2012. Do larval traits re-evolve? Evidence from the embryogenesis of a direct-developing salamander, Plethodon cinereus. Evolution 66:252-262.

King Aaron A, Butler Marguerite A. 2009. OUCH: Ornstein-Uhlenbeck models for phylogenetic comparative hypotheses (R package).

Landberg T, Azizi E. 2010. Ontogeny of escape swimming performance in the spotted salamander. Functional Ecology 24:576-587.

Lertzman-Lepofsky G, Mooers AØ, Greenberg DA. 2019. Ecological constraints associated with genome size across salamander lineages. Proc Roy Soc B 286:20191780.

Licht LE, Lowcock LA. 1991. Genome size and metabolic rate in salamanders. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Comparative Biochemistry 100:83-92.

Liedtke HC, Gower DJ, Wilkinson M, Gomez-Mestre I. 2018. Macroevolutionary shift in the size of amphibian genomes and the role of life history and climate. Nature Ecology & Evolution 2:1792-1799.

Lowe WH, Swartz LK, Addis BR, Likens GE. 2019. Hydrologic variability contributes to reduced survival through metamorphosis in a stream salamander. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116:19563.

Lynch M. 2007. The Origins of Genome Architecture. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Lyu H, He Z, Wu C-I, Shi S. 2018. Convergent adaptive evolution in marginal environments: unloading transposable elements as a common strategy among mangrove genomes. New Phytologist 217:428-438.

Madison-Villar MJ, Sun C, Lau N, Settles M, Mueller RL. 2016. Small RNAs from a big genome: the piRNA pathway and transposable elements in the salamander species Desmognathus fuscus. Journal of Molecular Evolution 83:126-136.

Mohlhenrich E, Mueller RL. 2016. Genetic drift, mutational hazard, and the evolution of genomic gigantism in salamanders. Evolution 70:2865-2878.

Moran NA. 1994. Adaptation and constraint in the complex life cycles of animals. Ann Rev Ecol Syst 25:573-600.

Mueller RL. 2015. Genome biology and the evolution of cell size diversity. In: Heald R, Hariharan I, Wake DB, editors. Size Control in Biology, from Organelles to Organisms: Cold Spring Harbor Press.

Mueller RL, Gregory TR, Gregory SM, Hsieh A, Boore JL. 2008. Genome size, cell size, and the evolution of enucleated erythrocytes in attenuate salamanders. Zoology 111:218-230.

Mueller RL, Macey JR, Jaekel M, Wake DB, Boore JL. 2004. Morphological homoplasy, life history evolution, and historical biogeography of plethodontid salamanders inferred from complete mitochondrial genomes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 101:13820-13825.

Norman MF. 1985. A practical method for staging metamorphosis in the tiger salamander Ambystoma tigrinum. The Anatomical Record 211:102-109.

Nowoshilow S, Schloissnig S, Fei J-F, Dahl A, Pang AWC, Pippel M, Winkler S, Hastie AR, Young G, Roscito JG, et al. 2018. The axolotl genome and the evolution of key tissue formation regulators. Nature 554:50-55.

O'Meara BC, Ané C, Sanderson MJ, Wainwright PC. 2006. Testing for different rates of continuous trait evolution using likelihood. Evolution 60:922-933.

Olmo E, Capriglione T, Odierna G. 1989. Genome size evolution in vertebrates: Trends and constraints. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Comparative Biochemistry 92:447-453.

Orlofske SA, Hopkins WA. 2009. Energetics of metamorphic climax in the pickerel frog (Lithobates palustris). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology 154:191-196.

Parhad SS, Theurkauf WE. 2019. Rapid evolution and conserved function of the piRNA pathway. Royal Society Open Biology 9:180181.

Parhad SS, Yu T, Zhang G, Rice NP, Weng Z, Theurkauf WE. 2020. Adaptive evolution targets a piRNA precursor transcription network. Cell reports 30:2672-2685.e2675.

Parsons KJ, Marquez E, Albertson RC. 2012. Constraint and opportunity: The genetic basis of modularity in the cichlid mandible. Am. Nat. 179:64-78. DOI: 10.1086/663200

Pasquesi GIM, Adams RH, Card DC, Schield DR, Corbin AB, Perry BW, Reyes-Velasco J, Ruggiero RP, Vandewege MW, Shortt JA, et al. 2018. Squamate reptiles challenge paradigms of genomic repeat element evolution set by birds and mammals. Nature Communications 9:2774.

Posada D, Crandall KA. 1998. MODELTEST: testing the model of DNA substitution. Bioinformatics 14:817-818.

Pyron AR, Wiens JJ. 2011. A large-scale phylogeny of Amphibia including over 2800 species, and a revised classification of extant frogs, salamanders, and caecilians. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 61:543-583.

R Core Team. 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Revell, L. J. 2007. The G matrix under fluctuating correlational mutation and selection. Evolution 61:1857–1872.

Rose CS. 2014. The importance of cartilage to amphibian development and evolution. International Journal of Developmental Biology 58:917-927.

Rose CS. 1995a. Skeletal morphogenesis in the urodele skull:1. Postembryonic development in the hemidactyliini (amphibia: Plethodontidae). J. Morph. 223:125-148.

Rose CS. 1995b. Skeletal morphogenesis in the urodele skull: Ii. Effect of developmentalstage in thyroid hormone-induced remodeling. J. Morph. 223:149-166.

Rose CS. 1995c. Skeletal morphogenesis in the urodele skull: Ill. Effect of hormone dosage in th-induced remodeling. J. Morph. 223:243-261.

San Mauro D, Gower DJ, Müller H, Loader SP, Zardoya R, Nussbaum RA, Wilkinson M. 2014. Life-history evolution and mitogenomic phylogeny of caecilian amphibians. Mol Phylogen Evol 73:177-189.

Sanchez E, Küpfer E, Goedbloed DJ, Nolte AW, Lüddecke T, Schulz S, Vences M, Steinfartz S. 2018. Morphological and transcriptomic analyses reveal three discrete primary stages of postembryonic development in the common fire salamander, Salamandra salamandra. J Exp Zool B: 330:96-108.

Sanderson MJ. 2003. r8s: inferring absolute rates of molecular evolution and divergence times in the absence of a molecular clock. Bioinformatics 19:301-302.

Sessions SK. 2008. Evolutionary cytogenetics in salamanders. Chromosome Research 16:183-201.

Sessions SK, Larson A. 1987. Developmental correlates of genome size in plethodontid salamanders and their implications for genome evolution. Evolution:1239-1251.

Shao F, Han M, Peng Z. 2019. Evolution and diversity of transposable elements in fish genomes. Scientific Reports 9:15399.

Sotero-Caio CG, Platt RN, II, Suh A, Ray DA. 2017. Evolution and diversity of transposable elements in vertebrate genomes. Genome Biology and Evolution 9:161-177.

Stamatakis A. 2006. RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. Bioinformatics 22:2688-2690.

Sun C, Arriaza JRL, Mueller RL. 2012. Slow DNA loss in the gigantic genomes of salamanders. Genome Biology and Evolution 4:1340-1348.

Sun C, Mueller RL. 2014. Hellbender genome sequences shed light on genome expansion at the base of crown salamanders. Genome Biology and Evolution 6:1818-1829.

Sun C, Shepard DB, Chong RA, Arriaza JL, Hall K, Castoe TA, Feschotte C, Pollock DD, Mueller RL. 2012. LTR retrotransposons contribute to genomic gigantism in plethodontid salamanders. Genome Biology and Evolution 4:168-183.

Szarski H. 1983. Cell size and the concept of wasteful and frugal evolutionary strategies. Journal of Theoretical Biology 105:201-209.

Szarski H. 1957. The origin of larva and metamorphosis in amphibia. The American Naturalist 91:283-301.

Uyeda JC, Pennell MW, Miller ET, Maia R, McClain CR. 2017. The evolution of energetic scaling across the vertebrate tree of life. The American Naturalist 190:185-199.

Vieites DR, Rom·n SN, Wake MH, Wake DB. 2011. A multigenic perspective on phylogenetic relationships in the largest family of salamanders, the Plethodontidae. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 59:623-635.

Vladimirova IG, Kleimenov SY, Alekseeva TA. 2012. Dynamics of body mass and oxygen consumption in the ontogeny of the Spanish ribbed newt (Pleurodeles waltl): 2. Larval stage. Biology Bulletin 39:10-14.

Wake D, Hanken J. 2004. Direct development in the lungless salamanders: what are the consequences for developmental biology, evolution and phylogenesis? International Journal of Developmental Biology 40:859-869.

Wake DB, Marks SB. 1993. Development and evolution of plethodontid salamanders: a review of prior studies and a prospectus for future research. Herpetologica 49:194-203.

Wang J, Itgen MW, Wang H, Gong Y, Jiang J, Li J, Sun C, Sessions SK, Mueller RL. 2020. Gigantic genomes can provide empirical tests of TE dynamics models — an example from amphibians. bioRxiv:2020.2008.2019.257527.

Wassersug RJ, Sperry DG. 1977. The relationships of locomotion to differential predation on pseudacris triseriata (anura: Hylidae). Ecology 58:830-839.

Wiens JJ, Bonett RM, Chippindale PT. 2005. Ontogeny discombobulates phylogeny: paedomorphosis and higher-level salamander relationships. Systematic Biology 54:91-110.

Womack MC, Metz MJ, Hoke KL. 2019. Larger genomes linked to slower development and loss of late-developing traits. The American Naturalist 194:854-864.

Wright ML, Richardson SE, Bigos JM. 2011. The fat body of bullfrog (Lithobates catesbeianus) tadpoles during metamorphosis: Changes in mass, histology, and melatonin content and effect of food deprivation. Comp. Biochem. Phys. A 160:498-503.

Zheng Y, Peng R, Kuro-o M, Zeng X. 2011. Exploring patterns and extent of bias in estimating divergence time from mitochondrial DNA sequence data in a particular lineage: a case study of salamanders (Order Caudata). Molecular Biology and Evolution 28:2521-2535.