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MicroRNAs support a turtle + lizard clade

Tyler R. Lyson1, Erik A. Sperling1, Alysha M. Heimberg2, Jacques A. Gauthier1, Benjamin L. King3 and Kevin J. Peterson*.†

1Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, 210 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, CT 06511, USA
2Department of Biological Sciences, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA
3Mount Desert Island Biological Laboratory, Salisbury Cove, ME 04672, USA

*Author for correspondence (kpeterson@dartmouth.edu).
†Present address: Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Despite much interest in amniote systematics, the origin of turtles remains elusive. Traditional morphological phylogenetic analyses place turtles outside Diapsida—amniotes whose ancestor had two fenestrae in the temporal region of the skull (among the living forms the tuatara, lizards, birds and crocodilians)—and allied with some unfenestrate-skulled (anapsid) taxa. Nonetheless, some morphological analyses place turtles within Diapsida, allied with Lepidosauria (tuatara and lizards). Most molecular studies agree that turtles are diapsids, but rather than alloying them with lepidosaurs, instead place turtles near or within Archosauromorpha (crocodilians and birds). Thus, three basic phylogenetic positions for turtles with respect to extant Diapsida are currently debated: (i) sister to Diapsida, (ii) sister to Lepidosauria, or (iii) sister to, or within, Archosauromorpha. Interestingly, although these three alternatives are consistent with a single unrooted four-taxon tree for extant reptiles, they differ with respect to the position of the root. Here, we apply a novel molecular data set, the presence versus absence of specific microRNAs, to the problem of the phylogenetic position of turtles and the root of the reptile tree, and find that this dataset unambiguously supports a turtle + lepidosaur group. We find that turtles and lizards share four unique miRNA gene families that are not found in any other organisms’ genome or small RNA library, and no miRNAs are found in all diapsids but not turtles, or in turtles and archosaurs but not in lizards. The concordance between our result and some morphological analyses suggests that there have been numerous morphological convergences and reversals in reptile phylogeny, including the loss of temporal fenestrae.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The phylogenetic position of turtles remains labile, owing in part to the fact that, while many primitive cranial features suggest a basal position outside Diapsida, almost as many derived post-cranial traits support a turtle + Lepidosauria sister relationship [4–7], which results in two weakly supported morphological signals [8]. In addition, morphological analyses are hampered by the highly modified anatomy exhibited by turtles (e.g. shell) and lepidosaurs (e.g. cranial kinesis). Stem Testudines have recently been described [3,7], but the least controversial of these have already acquired many of the distinctive autapomorphies of the crown. Likewise, the most basal unequivocal stem lepidosaurs are the kuehneosaurs, gliding reptiles from the Late Triassic [9]; comparing reptiles modified for parachute gliding with those designed as armoured tanks has proven difficult. As a result, many evolutionary biologists accept the molecular hypothesis that turtles are sister to (or nested within) the archosaurs ([10–12]; but see [13]), a hypothesis that has little morphological support [14,15].

Despite the conflict between the morphological and molecular datasets [8,12], all three hypotheses actually agree on the topology of the reptile tree, they simply disagree on the position of its root (figure 1). Thus, the problem is not one of deciding inter-relationships per se, but one of simply determining polarity. Correct rooting in morphological studies relying on highly divergent outgroups is often hampered by difficulty in establishing polarity for individual characters [16], while rooting in traditional molecular phylogenetic analyses is affected by rate and compositional heterogeneity [17]. Given that there is clear homoplasy in reptile morphology irrespective of the true phylogenetic position of turtles [8], and clear rate heterogeneity in molecular sequences in amniotes [12], an alternative data source is needed to correctly root the reptile tree.

Here, we apply a novel molecular dataset, the presence versus absence of specific microRNAs (miRNAs)—genes that encode approximately 22 nucleotide non-coding regulatory RNAs—to this problem. miRNA-based phylogenetics have been successfully applied to many metazoan clades, including vertebrates [18], as miRNAs show a number of characteristics that make them ideal phylogenetic characters, including the fact that new miRNAs are continually added to metazoan genomes through time and, once added, are rarely lost in most metazoan taxa [19–21]. In addition, miRNAs show extreme nucleotide conservation of the mature sequence, and structural considerations based on the requirement to fold into the canonical miRNA hairpin structure make convergence highly unlikely, resulting in little homoplasy [19,20]. Because the acquisition of a novel miRNA family represents the gain of a de novo trans-acting gene class, where the outgroup state (absence) can be established with certainty, miRNAs are ideal candidates for delineating the position of the root.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

RNA was extracted from single individuals of the turtle Chrysemys picta bellii, the lizard Anolis carolinensis (both purchased from Kingsnake.com) and the alligator Alligator mississippiensis (purchased from Watch Them Grow Reptiles) following standard animal care protocols (IACUC number 2009-11302). Total RNA was extracted as described in Wheeler et al. [19]. Small RNA libraries were prepared at the Yale University School of Medicine W. M. Keck Facility.
3. RESULTS
Two hundred and eighty two miRNA genes were annotated, belonging to 186 miRNA families [20] (electronic supplementary material, file S1), with 77 new miRNA families discovered that appear to be specific to Anolis (electronic supplementary material, file S1). As expected, given our understanding of how miRNAs evolve in most taxa [19–21], only two families appear to have been secondarily lost in the lizard: miR-457 and miR-2184. Similarly, in the turtle, reads were not detected for miR-147 and -208, and in alligator, reads were not detected for miR-726 and -727 (the latter a potential shared loss with birds; electronic supplementary material, file S1). Thus, out of the 100 expected miRNA families in the last common ancestor of Tetrapoda (electronic supplementary material, file S3), each of these species has 98, making the occurrence of secondary loss in all these taxa no more than 2 per cent.

The phylogenetic analysis resulted in a single most parsimonious tree with a tree length of 36 (CI = 0.97, RI 0.99). Each of the reptile clades identified in this study is characterized by at least one miRNA (figure 2). Importantly, we find that turtles and lizards share four of the 77 unique miRNA gene families identified in Anolis that are not found in any other organism’s genome or small RNA library (figure 2a; electronic supplementary material, file S1). Thus, these sequences are indeed restricted to the reptiles, and a phylogenetic analysis of the presence/absence of miRNAs families in these taxa (electronic supplementary material, file S2) unambiguously supports a turtle-lizard sister group relationship (figure 2b), as no miRNAs were found in all diapsids but not in turtles, or in turtles and archosaurs but not in lizards. Other nodes including Amniota, Mammalia, Theria and Aves are each supported by one or more unique miRNA (figure 2b).

4. DISCUSSION
Turtles as sister group to lizards are recovered in some morphological analyses [4–7] and this is supported by some, mostly postcranial, characters including the fusion of the astragalus and calcaneum in postnatal ontogeny [25]. However, a diapsid affinity also requires several morphological reversals in turtles, including the closure of the temporal fenestrae [25]. In addition, it suggests that molecular analyses that recover an archosaur affinity might be the result of a systematic artefact caused by the attraction of the long-branched lizards towards the outgroup [8].

The constellations between at least some morphological apomorphies and the evolutionary acquisition of miRNAs suggests the validity of the sister group relationship between lepidosaurs and turtles. Hence, we propose ‘Ankylopoda’ (‘fused foot’ in reference to the fused ankle bones—astragalus and calcaneum—shared by lepidosaurs and turtles) as the name of the Lepidosauria + Testudines crown clade, which is defined as the last common ancestor of Chrysemys picta and A. carolinensis and all of its descendants living or extinct (electronic supplementary material, file S4). If Lepidosauria + Testudines is indeed a monophyletic group, then this implies significant convergence in molecular (nuclear and mitochondrial), developmental and morphological characters, including the loss of temporal fenestrae, in the early evolutionary history of turtles. Further, our study suggests that lizards are the appropriate outgroup comparison for understanding the origin of the turtle body plan.
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Figure 2. microRNAs support a turtle–lizard relationship. (a) Structures and alignments of the mature sequences for three of the 35 families analysed phylogenetically, the reptile-specific miR-1677, the archosaur-specific miR-1791 and miR-5390, a novel miRNA shared between Anolis carolinensis and C. picta. Mature sequences within the context of the miRNA hairpin are shown in grey; changes in the mature sequence with respect to the reference sequence, either chicken or lizard, are shown in bold. (b) To arbitrate among these competing hypotheses (see figure 1), eight amniote taxa were scored for the presence/absence of 35 miRNA families with the frog Xenopus laevis as the outgroup. Using a combination of small RNA library sequencing coupled with genomic searches (electronic supplementary material, file S1), we find that the turtle C. picta shares four miRNA families with the lizard A. carolinensis that are not found elsewhere in the animal kingdom, supporting the rooting position of ‘morphology 2’ in figure 1 [4–7]. Bremer support indexes are indicated at each node. Character changes on branch: grey boxes, acquisition of miRNA family; filled triangle, loss of miRNA family.


