

Patterns of floral and chromosome evolution in Onagraceae: a fossil-calibrated supermatrix analysis

William A. Freyman^{a,*}

^a*Jepson Herbarium and Department of Integrative Biology, University of California,
Berkeley*

Abstract

blah blah

1. Introduction

Questions: are the taxonomic groups described in Wagner et al. (2007) mono-
phyletic? When did the major clades diverge? What are the patterns of petal
color and petal number evolution, and are their evolution correlated? What is
5 the pattern of chromosome number evolution?

2. Methods

Supermatrix assembly. Lythraceae was selected to use as an outgroup since
previous molecular phylogenetic analyses place it sister to Onagraceae (Conti
et al., 1997; Sytsma et al., 2004). I downloaded all DNA sequences from Gen-
10 Bank release 200 PLN division and performed an exhaustive all-by-all BLASTn
(Camacho et al., 2009) comparison of sequences in Onagraceae and Lythraceae.
Using a BLASTn e-value of 1.0×10^{-10} threshold and a sequence length per-
cent similarity cutoff of 0.5, I constructed clusters of putative homologs using a
single-linkage hierarchical clustering algorithm. Subspecies names were removed
15 from all sequences, and all but one sequence of each species was pruned from
each cluster. Clusters that were not phylogenetically informative (< 4 taxa)

*Corresponding author

Email address: freyman@berkeley.edu (William A. Freyman)

were discarded, and each cluster was aligned using MUSCLE (Edgar, 2004). The alignments were concatenated by species, and any species that was not present in at least two clusters was removed from the supermatrix. The program written to data-mine GenBank and assemble the supermatrix is available
20 as the open source Python module SUMAC (Freyman, 2014). SUMAC can be used to assemble supermatrices for any taxonomic group recognized in GenBank, and is optimized to run on multicore processors and clusters by utilizing multiple parallel processes.

25 *Phylogenetic analyses.* Maximum likelihood (ML) analyses were performed with RAxML-HPC (Stamatakis, 2014) on the CIPRES Scientific Gateway (Miller et al., 2010) using the rapid bootstrap heuristic and the GTRCAT nucleotide substitution model. I used the ML tree to select 15 taxa phylogenetically widely distributed in Lythraceae to act as outgroup for the divergence time analysis;
30 all other members of Lythraceae were subsequently removed from the supermatrix. Bayesian estimates of divergence times were inferred using BEAST v1.8 (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007; Suchard and Rambaut, 2009) on CIPRES and calibrated with five fossils identified with morphological synapomorphies (Table 1). The *Ludwigia* fossil pollen was dated broadly to the Paleocene (Grímsson
35 et al., 2012), so I set the prior to a normal distribution with a wide standard deviation to cover the entire time period. For all other calibration points I used a lognormal prior distribution with the offset (the minimum age of the node) corresponding to the fossil age. The BEAST analysis utilized the GTR+ Γ nucleotide substitution model with a relaxed molecular clock (uncorrelated log-normal model) and a Yule process tree prior. The Markov Chain Monte Carlo
40 (MCMC) was run for 100 million generations, sampling every 10 thousand generations. Tracer v1.6 (Rambaut et al., 2013) was used to assess the MCMC output for parameter convergence and ensure that the effective sample size for all parameters was above 200. The first 1000 trees were discarded as burn-in,
45 and the remaining 9000 trees were summarized as a maximum clade credibility (MCC) tree with mean divergence times.

Group	Age (Mya)	Prior Distribution	Mean	SD	Offset	Reference
<i>Circaea</i> (Onagraceae)	12	lognormal	0.0	2.0	12	(Grímsson et al., 2012)
<i>Epilobium</i> (Onagraceae)	12	lognormal	0.0	2.0	12	(Grímsson et al., 2012)
S. Pacific <i>Fuschia</i> (Onagraceae)	23	lognormal	0.0	1.0	23	(Lee et al., 2013)
<i>Ludwigia</i> (Onagraceae)	Paleocene	normal	60.0	3.0	-	(Zhi-Chen et al., 2004)
Lythraceae	82	lognormal	0.0	2.0	82	(Graham, 2013)

Table 1: Fossils used as priors in the Bayesian divergence time analysis.

Character state reconstruction. I scored six characters, including chromosome number, floral merosity, petal color, and self-compatibility/incompatibility. Character data was assembled from the comprehensive Wagner et al. (2007) Onagraceae monograph. Ancestral character state reconstructions of petal number and petal color were performed using Mesquite v2.75 (Maddison and Maddison, 2011) over the Bayesian MCC tree. Characters were treated as unordered categorical data, and optimized using maximum likelihood with the Markov k-state 1 parameter (Mk1) model (Lewis, 2001).

3. Results

Supermatrix assembly. SUMAC evaluated 5571 Onagraceae and 2832 Lythraceae nucleotide sequences to construct the supermatrix. The completed supermatrix consisted of 11 clusters of homologous sequences (Table 2). As used in the maximum likelihood analyses (before pruning the number of outgroup taxa), the supermatrix contained 521 taxa, was 31862 nucleotides long, and contained 93.0% missing data.

Phylogeny and divergence time estimates. The topologies of the ML and Bayesian phylogenies were identical for all major clades within Onagraceae, so only the Bayesian MCC tree (Figures 1 and 2) is shown here. All Onagraceae genera described in Wagner et al. (2007) were recovered as monophyletic clades with posterior probabilities of > 0.95 except for sister genera *Neoholmgrenia* and *Camissoniopsis* (posterior = 0.31) (Figure 1). Onagraceae was found to diverge from Lythraceae at 109 Mya (Figure 2). Divergence time estimates of other

DNA Region	# of Taxa	Aligned Length	Missing data (%)	Taxon Coverage Density
ITS	453	1746	13.2	0.87
trnL	234	1429	55.2	0.45
rpl16	91	1414	82.6	0.17
rbcL	77	1474	85.2	0.15
rps16	74	1016	85.8	0.14
rbcL	64	1310	87.7	0.12
PgiC2	47	4028	91.0	0.09
matK	37	921	92.9	0.07
ndhF	37	2063	92.9	0.07
pgiC	26	14709	95.0	0.05
R5	18	3129	96.6	0.03

Table 2: Clusters of homologous sequences used to assemble the supermatrix.

major clades and 95% highest posterior density (HPD) intervals can be seen in

70 Table 3.

Character evolution. blah blah

4. Conclusion

blah blah

References

- 75 Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., Madden, T.L., 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10, 421.
- Conti, E., Litt, A., Wilson, P.G., Graham, S.A., Briggs, B.G., Johnson, L., Sytsma, K.J., 1997. Interfamilial relationships in Myrtales: molecular phy-
- 80 logeny and patterns of morphological evolution. Systematic Botany 22, 629–647.

Clade	Mean Age (Mya)	95% HPD Min	95% HPD Max
Onagraceae / Lythraceae	109	88	131
<i>Ludwigia</i>	97	76	118
<i>Hauiya</i>	49	35	64
<i>Circaea</i> / <i>Fuchsia</i>	37	28	47
<i>Lopezia</i>	71	55	68
<i>Gongylocarpus</i>	60	45	77
<i>Epilobium</i>	49	38	60
<i>Chamerion</i>	47	36	57
<i>Xylonagra</i>	43	33	52
<i>Clarkia</i>	40	32	48
<i>Terapteron</i>	19	10	29
<i>Camissoniopsis</i> / <i>Neoholmgrenia</i>	14	5	23
<i>Eremothera</i> / <i>Camissonia</i>	24	16	33
<i>Taraxia</i>	30	22	38
<i>Chylismiella</i> / <i>Gayophytum</i>	20	10	30
<i>Eulobus</i>	26	19	34
<i>Chylismia</i> / <i>Oenothera</i>	25	18	31

Table 3: Bayesian divergence time estimates of major clades.

	Number of Petals			
	2	4	5	6
Petal Color				
Pink	-0.005	.011	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
Yellow	-0.008	.021	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
White	0.008	0.013	-0.006	-0.006
Green	<i>ns</i>	-0.011	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
Red	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>

Table 4: Test statistics for the correlation between flower color and number of petals. *d* values are shown for the pairwise comparison of states with $p < 0.01$. *ns* indicates no significant association. The overall *D* value was 0.263 ($p = 0.00$).




Figure 1: Bayesian maximum clade credibility phylogeny of 280 Onagraceae taxa and 15 Lythraceae taxa. Estimated posterior probabilities close to 1.0 are shown in green. All genera described in Wagner et al. (2007) were found to be monophyletic with posterior probabilities of > 0.95 except for sister genera *Neoholmgrenia* and *Camissoniopsis* (posterior = 0.31).




Figure 2: Bayesian chronogram of 280 Onagraceae taxa and 15 Lythraceae taxa. Approximate positions of fossil calibration points are shown as black circles. All genera described in Wagner et al. (2007) are colored, and their divergence time estimates and %95 HPD intervals can be seen in Table 3.

- Drummond, A.J., Rambaut, A., 2007. BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by sampling trees. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7, 214.
- Edgar, R.C., 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy
85 and high throughput. *Nucleic Acids Research* 32, 1792–1797.
- Freyman, W.A., 2014. SUMAC: Supermatrix Constructor. <https://github.com/wf8/sumac>.
- Graham, S.A., 2013. Fossil records in the Lythraceae. *The Botanical Review* 79, 48–145.
- 90 Grímsson, F., Zetter, R., Leng, Q., 2012. Diverse fossil Onagraceae pollen from a Miocene palynoflora of north-east China: early steps in resolving the phytogeographic history of the family. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 298, 671–687.
- Lee, D.E., Conran, J.G., Bannister, J.M., Kaulfuss, U., Mildenhall, D.C., 2013.
95 A fossil *Fuchsia* (Onagraceae) flower and an anther mass with in situ pollen from the early Miocene of New Zealand. *American Journal of Botany* 100, 2052–2065.
- Lewis, P.O., 2001. A likelihood approach to estimating phylogeny from discrete morphological character data. *Systematic Biology* 50, 913–925.
- 100 Maddison, W.P., Maddison, D., 2011. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis. Version 2.75. <http://mesquiteproject.org>.
- Miller, M.A., Pfeiffer, W., Schwartz, T., 2010. Creating the CIPRES science gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees, in: Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE), 2010, IEEE. pp. 1–8.
- 105 Rambaut, A., Suchard, M., Drummond, A.J., 2013. Tracer v1.6. <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>.
- Stamatakis, A., 2014. RAxML Version 8: A tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* .

- Suchard, M.A., Rambaut, A., 2009. Many-core algorithms for statistical phylo-
110 genetics. *Bioinformatics* 25, 1370–1376.
- Sytsma, K., Litt, A., Zjhra, M., 2004. Clades, clocks, and continents: Historical
and biogeographical analysis of Myrtaceae, Vochysiaceae, and relatives in the
southern Hemisphere source. *International Journal of Plant Sciences* 165,
S85–S105.
- 115 Wagner, W.L., Hoch, P.C., Raven, P.H., 2007. Revised classification of the
Onagraceae. *Systematic Botany Monographs* 83.
- Zhi-Chen, S., Wei-Ming, W., Fei, H., 2004. Fossil pollen records of extant
angiosperms in China. *The Botanical Review* 70, 425–458.