**Not all centromeres are equal, or are they?**

Sarah N. Ruckman12†, Michelle Jonika13†, Claudio Casola4, and Heath Blackmon123

1Department of Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

2Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Interdisciplinary Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

3Genetics Interdisciplinary Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

4Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, Texas A&M

†Authors contributed equally to the manuscript. Author order was determined based on an R script simulating a coin toss

**Keywords:** Fusions, fissions, chromosome evolution, holocentric, monocentric, lepidoptera

**Abstract**

Despite the fundamental nature of centromeres two fundamentally different types of centromeres are observed across plants and animals. Monocentric chromosomes possess a single region that function as the centromere while in holocentric chromosomes centromere activity is present across the length of the entire chromosome. Proper segregation may fail in species with monocentric chromosomes after a fusion or fission event, which may disrupt the number of centromeres. In contrast, species with holocentric chromosomes should still be able to safely segregate these chromosomes after fusion or fission events. This along with the observation of high chromosome number in some holocentric clades has led to the hypothesis that holocentricity leads to higher rates of chromosome number evolution. To test for differences in rates of chromosome number evolution between these systems, we analyzed data from 12,411 species of insects in a phylogenetic framework. We found that insect orders exhibit striking differences in rates of fissions, fusions, and polyploidy. Looking across all insects we found no evidence that holocentric clades have higher rates of fissions, fusions, or polyploidy than monocentric clades. Our results suggest that holocentricity alone does not lead to higher rates of chromosome number changes. Instead, we suggest that other co-evolving traits must explain striking differences among clades.

**Introduction**

Chromosome number stability is expected among lineages as shifts in chromosome number can lead to a decrease in fitness (Wilson *et al.* 1975a; White 1978a; Bush 1982). This stability in chromosome number is driven by the underdominance of chromosomal rearrangements (Escudero *et al.* 2016). Change in chromosome number has even been proposed as a possible driver of speciation (White 1978a) . However, theoretical work has suggested that a stasipatric model of speciation may be unlikely (Lande 1984). Furthermore, empirical evidence suggests that many chromosomal rearrangements may have little or no fitness effect (Sites Jr and Moritz 1987; Coyne *et al.* 1993). More recently structural rearrangements have been proposed as a mechanism of speciation without the requirement for underdominance (Rieseberg 2001; Faria and Navarro 2010; Guerrero and Kirkpatrick 2014). In light of the possible role of chromosomal change in speciation, identifying traits associated with increased rates of chromosomal rearrangements may explain patterns of extant diversity.

Unfortunately, the evolution of chromosome number has been recalcitrant to the formation of rules or generalizations that can explain variation in patterns and rates across large clades. Within clades, karyotypes are reshaped primarily through fusions and fissions (Lucek 2018). We use these terms (fusion and fission) for simplicity to describe positive or negative changes in chromosome number by one. However, in reality, fusions decreasing chromosome number capture two different processes at the molecular level. First, Robertsonian translocations followed by the loss of the short arms can decrease chromosome number (Garagna *et al.* 1995). Second, the fusion of telomeres from two chromosomes followed by inactivation of one of the ancestral centromeres can occur as evidenced by the evolutionary history of human chromosome 2 (Miga 2017). In contrast, changes increasing chromosome number can occur through simple fissioning in the centromere region and the gaining of new telomeric sequences (Moretti and Sabato 1984; Garagna *et al.* 1995). Increases in chromosome number can also occur through polyploidy or aneuploidy. In the case of polyploidy, the numbers of copies of the genome will increase by one from an unreduced gamete (Harlan and deWet 1975). Likewise, aneuploidy can lead to the duplication of single chromosomes (Torres *et al.* 2008).

Because chromosomal rearrangements are thought to often be deleterious or underdominant they should be more likely to fix in populations with low effective population size or meiotic drive (White 1968). However, centromeric structure may modulate the fitness effects of fusions and fissions (Lukhtanov *et al.* 2018; Hill *et al.* 2019). In species with monocentric chromosomes fusions and fissions can lead to multiple or no centromeres along the length of a chromosome which leads to failed segregation (Mola and Papeschi 2006; Melters *et al.* 2012). In contrast, the centromeres in holocentric species are diffuse and spindle fibers attach along the entire length of the chromosome. In these species, fusions and fissions do not appear to disrupt proper segregation (Malheiros-Garde and Gardé 1950; Faulkner 1972; Cope 1985; Luceño and Guerra 1996). Therefore, holocentricity has the potential to reduce or eliminate selective pressure against chromosomal rearrangements. This should lead to higher rates of chromosome number evolution in clades with holocentric chromosomes relative to clades with monocentric chromosomes. There is a lack of a clear pattern of ratesof chromosome evolution in holocentric clades, as some show great variation (Schneider *et al.* 2009; Escudero *et al.* 2012) and others remain almost static (Panzera *et al.* 1996).

If holocentric clades have higher rates of chromosome evolution, we might expect holocentric species to exhibit higher chromosome number. Anecdotal evidence does seem to suggest that some of the highest chromosome numbers observed are in clades with holocentric chromosomes. For instance, in insects, the highest chromosome numbers are observed in the holocentric order, Lepidoptera (Blackmon *et al.* 2017). However, initial analyses have found no significant difference in chromosome number among holocentric and monocentric clades of insects (Blackmon *et al.* 2017). This previous study was limited to an order level analysis and looked only for an absolute difference in chromosome number between monocentric and holocentric clades. A stronger test of the impact of holocentricity would be to investigate the rates of fusions, fissions, and polyploidy in clades with holocentric and monocentric chromosomes.

In this study, we used chromosome number and centromere type for 599 insec genera to test whether clades with holocentric chromosomes have a higher rate of fusions and fissions than clades with monocentric chromosomes (Figure 1). We chose to use insects because they have multiple clades with monocentric and holocentric chromosomes, are incredibly speciose, and exhibit striking diversity in chromosome number (Cook 2000; Mora *et al.* 2011; Ross *et al.* 2015; Blackmon *et al.* 2017; Vershinina and Lukhtanov 2017). We found that much of the variation in chromosome number across clades was heterogeneous. For example, Lepidoptera, a holocentric clade, exhibits some of the highest rates of chromosome number evolution, while other holocentric clades exhibit some of the lowest rates. We believe our results suggest other mechanisms that drive chromosome number variation rather than the simple inheritance of holocentric or monocentric chromosomes.

**Methods**

*Data collection:* We downloaded all available chromosome data for insects from a prior study (Blackmon *et al.* 2017). This dataset is composed of 12,411 species comprising 376 families and 3,872 genera. The minimum haploid chromosome number is 2 while the maximum haploid chromosome number is 141. There are 3,465 species with holocentric chromosomes and 8,946 species with monocentric chromosomes. This paper also included classification of each order into either monocentric or holocentric. From this dataset, we extracted the homogametic haploid chromosome number for each of the species. We used genus level phylogenies from a previous study that contained 1,726 tips (Church *et al.* 2019). These trees were built using one of two backbones trees from previous studies (Misof *et al.* 2014; Rainford *et al.* 2014). We downloaded two posterior distributions based on these backbone trees. These trees were used for all downstream comparative analyses. Our trait data set had an overlap of 599 genera with the phylogenetic data (Figure 1). In cases where we had multiple chromosome number records for genus, we retained all values and sampled from them as described below. As a first test of the differences between holocentric and monocentric clades we fit an ANOVA and a phylogenetic ANOVA to determine whether there were any differences in mean chromosome number among holocentric and monocentric clades (Harmon *et al.* 2008).

*Comparative analyses:* We fit a model of chromosome evolution on each tree from the posterior distribution. This model can accommodate up to eight rates: rate of chromosome number increase (fissions γ), rate of chromosome number decrease (fusions δ), rate of whole genome duplication (polyploidy ρ). Each of these is estimated separately for clades with holocentric and monocentric chromosomes leading to six chromosomal rate parameters. The final two parameters describe the transition to and from monocentric and holocentric (qMH and qHM). This model was specified using the R package chromePlus (Blackmon *et al.* 2019) and was fit using a Bayesian approach in the R package diversitree (FitzJohn 2012).

For each of the 100 trees in a posterior distribution we randomly sampled tip states for genera with more than one record in our chromosome data set. By sampling across the dataset and both trees from the posterior we are able to account for both phylogenetic and tips state uncertainty. For purposes of model fitting trees were rescaled to unit length; however, all rates reported in the paper have been back transformed to be in units of millions of years. The Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) was initialized with parameter values drawn from a uniform distribution from 0 to 1. Preliminary analyses were conducted with a uniform prior and while most MCMC chains reached convergence quickly, a small fraction of runs would begin to sample very high rates that are biologically unrealistic. Given sufficient time we might expect these runs to eventually converge on the posterior distribution but this length of time can be large due to the relative flatness of the likelihood surface when rates are unrealistically high. To fix this problem, we added an exponential prior with a shape parameter of 0.5. This is a relatively uninformative prior but does favor lower rates avoiding the problem described above. With application of this prior we found that the vast majority of MCMC chains reach convergence in less than 10 generations. We repeated the MCMC with all 100 trees at 50 generations each. We removed the first twenty-five samples as our burnin for each run and combined the postburnin portion of the MCMC from each of the 100 trees. Because our central question is whether holocentric clades have higher rates than monocentric clades, we report our results in terms of a mean rate difference statistic, where the subscript x indicates the rate parameter. For example, for the rate fissions (γ), for each post-burnin sample we calculated as

In addition to estimating the magnitude of this statistic, we also reduced it to a simple test of the motivating hypothesis by comparing the 95% credible interval of (i.e. the 95% highest posterior density) with zero. If the entire 95% credible interval of is positive, we interpret it as support for a higher rate of chromosome evolution in holocentric clades. If the entire 95% credible interval of is negative, we interpret it as support for a higher rate of chromosome evolution in monocentric clades. Otherwise, we conclude there is not support for a significant rate difference in monocentric and holocentric clades. This approach also allows us to compare across all trees in the posterior distribution even if some trees exhibit on average higher or lower rates.

We repeated similar MCMC analyses as above for the analysis of orders, however, we ran the data under two different models; One with polyploidy and one without polyploidy included in the model and because each order is fixed for either holo- or monocentricity. We only estimate one set of rate parameters in each clade and only included orders with more than 20 tips in our phylogeny to insure a sufficient sample size for rate inference. This led to 10 order level analyses; three of the included orders (Hemiptera, Lepidoptera, and Odonata) have holocentric chromosomes, and seven that have monocentric chromosomes. To compare rates among orders we compared the credible interval for each parameter among orders.

**Results**

*Alternative phylogenies:* The phylogenies used for this study were built using two different backbone trees that differ in the age of some clades. As such the rate estimates that are inferred using the phylogenies could be different. To determine if this variation impacted our results, we fit our full eight parameter model to both sets of phylogenies. As expected, we inferred slightly different rates depending on which posterior distribution we used. Rates were on average lower when using the posterior sampled based on the Rainford (2014) backbone than when using the posterior sampled based on the Misof (2014) backbone. To investigate the impact this has on our inference we calculated the statistic for the rate of fissions, fusions, and polyploidy comparing holocentric and monocentric species. We found that the statistics had nearly identical distributions (supplemental figure 1). Based on this finding for the remainder of the paper we present results based on our analysis of the Misof tree.

*Monocentric and Holocentric Rates:* Rates of chromosome number evolution were estimated from the two sets of posterior distributions with 599 genera each. The eight parameters discussed in the methods were included in our model. These parameters included fusion, fission, polyploidy, and the transitions between monocentric and holocentric chromosomes. Overall, the data had low variability in the posterior distribution generated by the MCMC (Figure 2). The rates were subtracted from one another to create the differences in rate parameters and graphed in Figure 2. The differences in rates of fusions (descending), fissions(ascending), and polyploidy did not show a difference between monocentric and holocentric chromosomes because all differences in the rates overlapped with zero (Figure 2). This indicates that there are no significant differences among rates of chromosome number evolution based on the type of chromosome.

*Orders Rates:* Rates of chromosome number were tested for each of the 10 investigated orders. Three orders have holocentric chromosomes (Hemiptera, Lepidoptera, Odonata), while the other 7 have monocentric chromosomes (Blattodea, Coleoptera, Diptera, Hymenoptera, Isoptera, Neuroptera, and Phasmatodea). Our analysis of the data described with ascending (fissions) and descending (fusions) rates of chromosome number evolution alone showed a large variability between orders, with Phasmatodea and Lepidoptera having the largest variance (Figure 3a). Despite this variability, there is no pattern in chromosome number evolution associated with monocentric or holocentric orders. This indicates differences in rates of change among orders, however these differences are not attributed to holocentricity.

With the addition of polyploidy into the model, the variance among rates of chromosome number evolution is reduced among the orders (Figure 3b). Despite this, the descending rate was higher in Blattodea, Isoptera, and Phasmatodea. This increase in rates is representative of some, but not all monocentric orders. The order Lepidoptera shows a decrease in ascending and descending rates of chromosome number evolution with the addition of polyploidy into the model. This is most likely driven by the large variation in chromosome number associated with the order.

**Discussion**

Lepidoptera have long been recognized as exhibit striking variation in chromosome number (Robinson 1971). This extreme variation in Lepidoptera chromosome number had been hypothesized to be due to rapid changes in chromosome number allowed by holocentricity (Lukhtanov *et al.* 2018; Hill *et al.* 2019). Our results find little support for this hypothesis. Looking across insects we find that rate estimates for all holocentric and all monocentric clades are nearly equal. In fact, when we investigated rates of chromosome number evolution within orders, we found that clades with holocentric chromosomes exhibited both some of the highest and lowest rates observed in insects. We propose that the variation in chromosome number within Lepidoptera is likely better explained by other traits that can impact the rate of chromosome number evolution—meiotic drive, polyploidy, and population size.

Meiotic drive is one possible driver of changes in chromosome number. We have recently shown that meiotic drive in mammals likely explains variation in rates of chromosome evolution and the distribution of chromosome morphologies (Blackmon *et al.* 2019). Work in mice has shown that meiotic drive is based on the strength of centromeres, where strength is characterized by the ability to express kinetochore proteins and interact with spindle fibers (Chmátal *et al.* 2014). In this system, a fusion with the same centromere strength was shown to be either favored or disfavored depending on the genetic background that it was segregating within. In holocentric chromosomes, since they have a diffuse centromere, meiotic drive is thought to be less likely since multiple sequences must be favored simultaneously to have a strong impact on segregation (Gassmann *et al.* 2012). Therefore, meiotic drive could potentially increase or decrease rates of chromosome number evolution. This may suggest monocentric clades maintain more extreme rate variation dependent on the presence or absence of meiotic drive. We note however that we observe roughly equal amounts of chromosome number variation in our comparison of rates in insect orders.

While fissions and fusions can make small changes to chromosome number, polyploidy events have the potential to lead to large increases in chromosome number much more rapidly. Recent analyses of transcriptome data suggest that insects including Lepidoptera have had multiple large scale genome duplications (Li *et al.* 2018; Li *et al.* 2019; but see Nakatani and McLysaght 2019). Even a small number of polyploidy events depending on their distribution in the tree could lead to much higher variance in chromosome number for a clade. The application of probabilistic models that include polyploidy as a parameter are particularly important if the goal is to understand whether or not fissions and fusions are occurring at different rates among clades (Mayrose *et al.* 2010; Glick and Mayrose 2014; Zenil‐Ferguson *et al.* 2017; Blackmon *et al.* 2019).

Likewise, analyses within any one clade are difficult to interpret. For instance the Reduviidae are a group of holocentric hemipterans as such we would predict that they should have higher rates of chromosome evolution. Surveys of this group show that they have very little variation in chromosome number (Poggio *et al.* 2007). However, without a closely related clade with monocentric chromosomes, it is difficult to weight the evidence against the traditional hypothesis for increased rates in holocentric clades. Furthermore, comparisons among studies is also difficult because rates are directly affected by divergence time estimates. We would argue that comparisons of rates are only informative in cases where a single phylogeny with a consistent approach to dating has been applied to both clades with holocentric and monocentric chromosomes.


One potentially important cause of variation in rates of chromosome evolution is population size. This idea has its origins in the development of models of chromosomal speciation (White 1978b). White proposed that most chromosomal rearrangements were underdominant and would be more likely to fix in small demes due to drift, and that these changes could then act as reproductive barriers when demes expanded their range and came into secondary contact (White *et al.* 1969). This model of speciation likely is not representative of most diversity and has been shown to be unlikely under a range of potential parameter values (Lande 1984). However, White’s ideas led to an intense focus on predictors of chromosomal variation (Wilson *et al.* 1975b; Bush *et al.* 1977; Bengtsson 1980; Imai *et al.* 1983; Coyne 1984; Larson *et al.* 1984; Petitpierre 1987). Many of these studies suggest that species or clades with small population sizes have higher rates of chromosome evolution. Unfortunately, these were all completed prior to the robust development of comparative methods than can be applied to the evolution of chromosome number across large clades and some compared highly divergent clades. Explicitly modeling the impact of population size on estimated rates of chromosome evolution within clades would be a significant advancement to our understanding of the determinant of rates of chromosome evolution.

Variation in chromosome number is highly heterogeneous across clades – some large clades are nearly static while other closely related clades show striking variation. This observation has been difficult to explain despite a century of investigation. We believe that the approach that we have used here modeling chromosome number and a possible explanatory variable simultaneously offer a way forward to finally answer the recalcitrant question of what causes variation in rates of chromosome number evolution.

**Figures:**



**Figure 1: Phylogeny of type of centromeres and chromosome number.** The black branches represent orders with monocentric chromosomes and the gray branches represent orders with holocentric chromosomes. The colored circles at the tips represent the haploid chromosome number. The color scale is log transformed to allow better visualization of variation in species with low chromosome number.



**Figure 2: Rates of chromosome evolution.** Each curve represents the posterior distribution of the statistic. Where is either fission, fusion, or polyploidy which is indicated by the color of the fill. Positive values of this statistic indicate that holocentric clades evolve more quickly while negative values indicate that monocentric clades evolve more quickly. Below the curves the three lines indicate the 95% credible interval of each statistic. Since all overlap zero we infer no significant difference in rates of chromosome evolution in clades with holocentric and monocentric chromosomes.



**Figure 3:** **Rate of chromosome evolution based on order**. Ascending rates represent the rate of fissions, descending rates represent the rate of fusions, and pol rates represent the rate of polyploidy. (A) Modeling for the rates of chromosome evolution without polyploidy. The removal of polyploidy has kept most of the other species at about the same rates of chromosome evolution, expect for Lepidoptera. Lepidoptera has an increase in both fusion and fission rates. (B) Modeling for rates of chromosome evolution with polyploidy. The addition of polyploidy in the model has decreased the variation of all rates of chromosome evolution. There is no trend between holocentric and monocentric chromosome orders.

**Supplement**



**Supplemental Figure 1. Comparison of inferences under alternative backbones**. In each plot we show the statistic for the three parameters of interest in our model. We find that regardless of the backbone phylogeny the resulting statistic has a largely similar distribution. Black lines represent the statistic estimate using the Misof backbone while red lines represent the statistic estimate using the Rainford backbone.

**References**

Bengtsson, B. O., 1980 Rates of karyotype evolution in placental mammals. Hereditas 92**:** 37-47.

Blackmon, H., J. Justison, I. Mayrose and E. E. Goldberg, 2019 Meiotic drive shapes rates of karyotype evolution in mammals. Evolution 73**:** 511-523.

Blackmon, H., L. Ross and D. Bachtrog, 2017 Sex Determination, Sex Chromosomes, and Karyotype Evolution in Insects. Journal of Heredity 108**:** 78-93.

Bush, G. L., 1982 What do we really know about speciation? Perspectives on evolution.**:** 119-131.

Bush, G. L., S. M. Case, A. C. Wilson and J. L. Patton, 1977 Rapid speciation and chromosomal evolution in mammals. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 74**:** 3942-3946.

Chmátal, L., S. I. Gabriel, G. P. Mitsainas, J. Martínez-Vargas, J. Ventura *et al.*, 2014 Centromere strength provides the cell biological basis for meiotic drive and karyotype evolution in mice. Current Biology 24**:** 2295-2300.

Church, S. H., S. Donoughe, B. A. de Medeiros and C. G. Extavour, 2019 Insect egg size and shape evolve with ecology but not developmental rate. Nature 571**:** 58-62.

Cook, L. G., 2000 Extraordinary and extensive karyotypic variation: a 48-fold range in chromosome number in the gall-inducing scale insect Apiomorpha (Hemiptera: Coccoidea: Eriococcidae). Genome 43**:** 255-263.

Cope, T., 1985 Cytology and hybridization in the Juncus bufonius L. aggregate in western Europe, pp. in *Watsonia*. Citeseer.

Coyne, J. A., 1984 Correlation between heterozygosity and rate of chromosome evolution in animals. The American Naturalist 123**:** 725-729.

Coyne, J. A., W. Meyers, A. P. Crittenden and P. Sniegowski, 1993 The fertility effects of pericentric inversions in Drosophila melanogaster. Genetics 134**:** 487-496.

Escudero, M., M. Hahn, B. H. Brown, K. Lueders and A. L. Hipp, 2016 Chromosomal rearrangements in holocentric organisms lead to reproductive isolation by hybrid dysfunction: The correlation between karyotype rearrangements and germination rates in sedges. American journal of botany 103**:** 1529-1536.

Escudero, M., A. L. Hipp, T. F. Hansen, K. L. Voje and M. Luceño, 2012 Selection and inertia in the evolution of holocentric chromosomes in sedges (Carex, Cyperaceae). New Phytologist 195**:** 237-247.

Faria, R., and A. Navarro, 2010 Chromosomal speciation revisited: rearranging theory with pieces of evidence. Trends in ecology & evolution 25**:** 660-669.

Faulkner, J., 1972 Chromosome studies on Carex section Acutae in north-west Europe. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 65**:** 271-301.

FitzJohn, R. G., 2012 Diversitree: comparative phylogenetic analyses of diversification in R. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 3**:** 1084-1092.

Garagna, S., D. Broccoli, C. A. Redi, J. B. Searle, H. J. Cooke *et al.*, 1995 Robertsonian metacentrics of the house mouse lose telomeric sequences but retain some minor satellite DNA in the pericentromeric area. Chromosoma 103**:** 685-692.

Gassmann, R., A. Rechtsteiner, K. W. Yuen, A. Muroyama, T. Egelhofer *et al.*, 2012 An inverse relationship to germline transcription defines centromeric chromatin in C. elegans. Nature 484**:** 534-537.

Glick, L., and I. Mayrose, 2014 ChromEvol: assessing the pattern of chromosome number evolution and the inference of polyploidy along a phylogeny. Molecular biology and evolution 31**:** 1914-1922.

Guerrero, R. F., and M. Kirkpatrick, 2014 Local adaptation and the evolution of chromosome fusions. Evolution 68**:** 2747-2756.

Harlan, J. R., and J. M. deWet, 1975 On Ö. Winge and a prayer: the origins of polyploidy. The botanical review 41**:** 361-390.

Harmon, L. J., J. T. Weir, C. D. Brock, R. E. Glor and W. Challenger, 2008 GEIGER: investigating evolutionary radiations. Bioinformatics 24**:** 129-131.

Hill, J., P. Rastas, E. A. Hornett, R. Neethiraj, N. Clark *et al.*, 2019 Unprecedented reorganization of holocentric chromosomes provides insights into the enigma of lepidopteran chromosome evolution. Science advances 5**:** eaau3648.

Imai, H. T., T. Maruyama and R. H. Crozier, 1983 Rates of Mammalian Karyotype Evolution by the Karyograph Method. The American Naturalist 121**:** 477-488.

Lande, R., 1984 The expected fixation rate of chromosomal inversions. Evolution**:** 743-752.

Larson, A., E. M. Prager and A. C. Wilson, 1984 Chromosomal evolution, speciation and morphological change in vertebrates: the role of social behaviour. Chromosomes Today 8**:** 215-228.

Li, Z., G. P. Tiley, S. R. Galuska, C. R. Reardon, T. I. Kidder *et al.*, 2018 Multiple large-scale gene and genome duplications during the evolution of hexapods. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115**:** 4713-4718.

Li, Z., G. P. Tiley, R. J. Rundell and M. S. Barker, 2019 Reply to Nakatani and McLysaght: analyzing deep duplication events. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116**:** 1819-1820.

Lucek, K., 2018 Evolutionary mechanisms of varying chromosome numbers in the radiation of Erebia butterflies. Genes 9**:** 166.

Luceño, M., and M. Guerra, 1996 Numerical variations in species exhibiting holocentric chromosomes: a nomenclatural proposal. Caryologia 49**:** 301-309.

Lukhtanov, V. A., V. Dincă, M. Friberg, J. Šíchová, M. Olofsson *et al.*, 2018 Versatility of multivalent orientation, inverted meiosis, and rescued fitness in holocentric chromosomal hybrids. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115**:** E9610-E9619.

Malheiros-Garde, N., and A. Gardé, 1950 Fragmentation as a possible evolutionary process in the genus Luzula DC. Genetica Iberica 2**:** 257-262.

Mayrose, I., M. S. Barker and S. P. Otto, 2010 Probabilistic models of chromosome number evolution and the inference of polyploidy. Systematic Biology 59**:** 132-144.

Melters, D. P., L. V. Paliulis, I. F. Korf and S. W. Chan, 2012 Holocentric chromosomes: convergent evolution, meiotic adaptations, and genomic analysis. Chromosome Research 20**:** 579-593.

Miga, K. H., 2017 Chromosome-specific centromere sequences provide an estimate of the ancestral chromosome 2 fusion event in hominin genomes. Journal of Heredity 108**:** 45-52.

Misof, B., S. Liu, K. Meusemann, R. S. Peters, A. Donath *et al.*, 2014 Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. Science 346**:** 763-767.

Mola, L., and A. Papeschi, 2006 Holokinetic chromosomes at a glance. BAG-Journal of Basic and Applied Genetics 17**:** 17-33.

Mora, C., D. P. Tittensor, S. Adl, A. G. Simpson and B. Worm, 2011 How many species are there on Earth and in the ocean? PLoS biology 9.

Moretti, A., and S. Sabato, 1984 Karyotype evolution by centromeric fission inZamia (Cycadales). Plant Systematics and Evolution 146**:** 215-223.

Nakatani, Y., and A. McLysaght, 2019 Macrosynteny analysis shows the absence of ancient whole-genome duplication in lepidopteran insects. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116**:** 1816-1818.

Panzera, F., R. Pérez, S. Hornos, Y. Panzera, R. Cestau *et al.*, 1996 Chromosome numbers in the Triatominae (Hemiptera-Reduviidae): a review. Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 91**:** 515-518.

Petitpierre, E., 1987 Why beetles have strikingly different rates of chromosomal evolution. Elytron 1**:** 25-32.

Poggio, M., M. Bressa and A. Papeschi, 2007 Karyotype evolution in Reduviidae (Insecta: Heteroptera) with special reference to Stenopodainae and Harpactorinae. Comparative Cytogenetics 1**:** 159-168.

Rainford, J. L., M. Hofreiter, D. B. Nicholson and P. J. Mayhew, 2014 Phylogenetic distribution of extant richness suggests metamorphosis is a key innovation driving diversification in insects. PLoS One 9.

Rieseberg, L. H., 2001 Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. Trends in ecology & evolution 16**:** 351-358.

Robinson, R., 1971 *Lepidoptera genetics.* Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Ross, L., H. Blackmon, P. Lorite, V. E. Gokhman and N. B. Hardy, 2015 Recombination, chromosome number and eusociality in the Hymenoptera. Journal of evolutionary biology 28**:** 105-116.

Schneider, M. C., A. A. Zacaro, R. Pinto-da-Rocha, D. M. Candido and D. M. Cella, 2009 Complex meiotic configuration of the holocentric chromosomes: the intriguing case of the scorpion Tityus bahiensis. Chromosome Research 17**:** 883-898.

Sites Jr, J. W., and C. Moritz, 1987 Chromosomal evolution and speciation revisited. Systematic Zoology 36**:** 153-174.

Torres, E. M., B. R. Williams and A. Amon, 2008 Aneuploidy: cells losing their balance. Genetics 179**:** 737-746.

Vershinina, A. O., and V. A. Lukhtanov, 2017 Evolutionary mechanisms of runaway chromosome number change in Agrodiaetus butterflies. Scientific reports 7**:** 1-9.

White, M., 1968 Models of speciation. Science 159**:** 1065-1070.

White, M., K. Key, M. André and J. Cheney, 1969 Cytogenetics of the viatica group of morabine grasshoppers II. Kangaroo Island populations. Australian Journal of Zoology 17**:** 313-328.

White, M. J., 1978a Modes of speciation, pp.

White, M. J. D., 1978b *Modes of speciation*. WH Freeman, San Francisco: .

Wilson, A., G. Bush, S. Case and M. King, 1975a Social structuring of mammalian populations and rate of chromosomal evolution. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 72**:** 5061-5065.

Wilson, A. C., G. L. Bush, S. M. Case and M. C. King, 1975b Social structuring of mammalian populations and rate of chromosomal evolution. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 72**:** 5061-5065.

Zenil‐Ferguson, R., J. M. Ponciano and J. G. Burleigh, 2017 Testing the association of phenotypes with polyploidy: An example using herbaceous and woody eudicots. Evolution 71**:** 1138-1148.