



Elmer, K.R. (2017) Barrier loci and progress towards evolutionary generalities. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 30(8), pp. 1491-1493. (doi:[10.1111/jeb.13104](https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13104))

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

This is the peer-reviewed version of the following article: Elmer, K.R. (2017) Barrier loci and progress towards evolutionary generalities. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 30(8), pp. 1491-1493, which has been published in final form at [10.1111/jeb.13104](https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13104). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#).

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/145821/>

Deposited on: 15 September 2017

1 Barrier loci and progress toward evolutionary generalities - Kathryn R. Elmer

2
3 This excellent target review by Ravinet and colleagues gives a strong general
4 introduction to the processes involved in speciation-with-gene-flow, issues
5 with identifying barrier loci, and how to study speciation events using genomic
6 methods. The review is divided into three main sections. The first section
7 focuses on "Barriers to gene flow in the genomic landscape". Here the
8 authors clearly outline definitions and concepts that are key to the paper and
9 the research field, such as 'barrier loci' ("loci that contribute to a barrier to
10 gene flow"), the theoretical population genetic conditions under which they
11 arise, and their genome-wide effects. The second section addresses "Other
12 factors modifying the genomic landscape", which considers the role of
13 demographic history, genomic properties such as mutation rates,
14 recombination rates, and gene density, and the influence of background
15 selection. This section is a warning call for the research field, as it highlights
16 processes and properties that may not be given sufficient attention in
17 population genomic studies. Throughout the paper, the authors stress the
18 importance of estimating those modifying factors, in addition to merely
19 estimating differentiation across the genome. These genomic issues can be
20 challenging, especially in non-model systems, and preclude simplistic
21 interpretations.

22
23 By the time I had reached the third and final section of the paper, "A road map
24 for the genomic landscape", I must admit I was feeling despair that we could
25 ever disentangle the genomics of speciation in natural systems. The first two
26 sections had emphasised that a formidable range of demographic and
27 structural issues affect genomes and genomic divergence: incomplete lineage
28 sorting, complex population histories of contact and isolation, population size
29 fluctuations, mutation rate variation, genome organisation, and the
30 inconsistent and variable forces of selection and gene flow. These factors
31 vary not only within genomes but also across individuals, across evolutionary
32 time scales, and across space. To add further complexity at all scales, the
33 speciation process itself alters properties of the genome: these are non-linear
34 processes and subject to extensive feedback that amplifies or mutes the
35 effects. This presents great challenges, especially in studying populations in
36 their natural habitats.

37
38 But then on this brink, the authors revived and inspired me with their 'road
39 map', which includes concrete suggestions for speciation genomics research.
40 The authors outline six research steps that may facilitate realistic and
41 comprehensive conclusions about barrier loci and genomic divergence. Most
42 or all aspects of the road map cannot be accomplished without an annotated
43 reference genome, genetic maps, and study organisms that can be bred in
44 the lab or subjected to transplant experiments. This remains a challenge for

45 some research groups and some biological systems. But regardless of
46 resources, the road map can aid researchers in dissecting components of
47 their question, assessing limitations, and reflecting on the most suitable
48 experimental approaches to pursue. Further, throughout the paper the authors
49 make a welcomed effort to clarify terminology, which is important for paving
50 clear comparisons and discussion in the literature.

51

52 Understanding evolution in all its complexity will require extensive research on
53 non-model organisms - that is, messy and difficult natural populations
54 adapting and diversifying in their environments. Therefore, I was relieved that
55 the road map has a distinctively non-model air. It includes suggestions for
56 complex systems in nature, where the ability to parameterise all the past and
57 detailed issues is not necessarily available. Yet it is clear from the Target
58 Review and the applied road map that concerted efforts are required to
59 identify true signals of barrier loci and subsequently to validate the functional
60 role of those loci.

61

62 In my opinion, this focus on barrier loci - of this review and the research field
63 broadly - begs a question of evolutionary generality. Identifying common
64 processes and patterns of evolution ought to be the long-term goal of the
65 research efforts in evolutionary genomics. But given the great complexity of
66 evolutionary and demographic histories, genomic properties, and
67 environmental selection pressures all fluctuating over time, how often are the
68 lessons learned about barrier loci in a given study species going to be
69 generally applicable? I think this question is far from resolved and only will
70 become clearer with an accumulation of effort across many biological
71 systems.

72

73 Therefore, this review led me to reflect on the 'what next' from speciation
74 genomics. In this case, the identification of barrier loci is not the central
75 objective in itself, but rather a key intermediate step in progress towards more
76 generality in understanding the evolution of contemporary biodiversity. To
77 arrive at that goal will require comparisons that go much higher than particular
78 populations of interesting species. For example, what are the properties of
79 genomes in lineages that show particular characteristics? Those that speciate
80 rapidly; that diversify in phenotypic parallels; that colonise new environments
81 readily; that adapt quickly to climate or environmental changes? These
82 questions have direct and immediate utility in biodiversity sciences, medicine,
83 agriculture, aquaculture and conservation. This Target Review focuses on the
84 advances with empirical genomic analyses but has less discussion on how
85 and when barrier loci can, or cannot, aid in discerning common evolutionary
86 patterns.

87

88 One example of shared evolutionary patterns touched upon in this review is
89 that of 'parallel evolution'. This is outlined in the road map as part of a step to
90 'identify selection at barriers, taking modifying factors into account'. Parallel
91 evolution studies are those that assess differentiation at genomic loci or
92 genomic regions across population or species pairs (see review table 2). To
93 that definition, I would add 'while considering the consistency of phenotypes
94 across these replicated environments'. At the fine scale, parallel evolution
95 comparisons across populations within species can explore demographic
96 histories, environmental or ecological contexts of diversification, the formation
97 of barrier loci, and their consistency across stages of speciation and
98 environments. Data from replicated population divergences, including
99 comparing across similar and different environments, have improved power to
100 detect and interpret meaningful signatures of parallelism at the genomic level
101 (Roesti *et al.* 2014). The consistency, or lack of consistency, of barrier loci in
102 contemporary populations can provide key insights to the underlying
103 processes of speciation genomics. This is the case for genomic patterns of
104 evolution from shared ancestral variation, distinguishing *de novo* mutations,
105 and even for the importance of identifying the key phenotypes that are in fact
106 parallel (Elmer & Meyer 2011; Berner & Salzburger 2015).

107

108 I do not propose that parallel evolution is a panacea to solving all the
109 challenges of speciation genomics, but I think there are some strengths that
110 can be drawn from research on barrier loci, which are very relevant for
111 seeking evolutionary generality. Thus my reasoning for further exploring the
112 strengths of the parallel evolution framework in the context of speciation
113 genomics are twofold here. First, it is an approach that compares replicate
114 phenotypes, and these replicate phenotypes are a proxy for similar
115 adaptations to environmental challenges. In a manner of speaking, this is a
116 way of seeing evolutionary problems being solved in equivalent ways.
117 However, these can be by similar or dissimilar evolutionary routes (Elmer *et al.*
118 2014). Second, parallel evolution research intrinsically involves a structured
119 analysis of populations or lineages in replicate. These comparisons can
120 provide insight for testing barrier loci, assessing properties of the surrounding
121 genome, and the continuity of barrier loci across evolutionary scales. Such a
122 context is important for delimiting the genetic variation that is shared
123 ancestrally vs. derived, or pervasive vs. unique, and thereby may facilitate
124 disentangling factors such as selection, shared genomic elements, or
125 recombination patterns that result in contemporary patterns of similarity
126 across genomes (Brawand *et al.* 2014; Burri *et al.* 2015; Berner & Salzburger
127 2015). This will be most powerful when it involves explicitly controlled
128 phylogenetic comparisons. I realise a detailed exploration of the utility of
129 parallelism and evolutionary replicates was beyond the scope of this Target
130 Review. My aim here is simply to offer an extension of the road map and
131 explore the potential at some of its intersections.

132

133 In short, such replicated comparisons, at shallow and deeper evolutionary
134 scales, may have the power to inform about genomic characteristics within
135 lineages that are associated with diversification and then the consistency of
136 those characteristics across higher taxonomic levels. Importantly, such an
137 understanding might then facilitate predictions about which loci act as barriers
138 and the generality of those barriers across lineages and across a breadth of
139 taxa. This in turn may feed back into our advancing knowledge of fundamental
140 evolutionary processes, and subsequently new research directions. Accurate
141 inference of barrier loci is a key first step.

142

143 The progress of speciation genomics from barrier loci to evolutionary
144 generalities is well underway, as evidenced by the range of empirical
145 examples and mechanisms explicated in this Target Review. It has an
146 excellent spirit of blue skies thinking, of pushing the envelope of where
147 speciation genomics research can go, and of inspiring ideas of 'if you could do
148 anything, what would you do with your study system'. This is mixed with some
149 practical suggestions and cautions with an emphasis on rigour at each
150 research step. This review and my notes scrawled across in pencil will sit on
151 my desk as a resource for my own work as it is a useful and timely addition to
152 the literature.

153

154

155 **Acknowledgements**

156 I thank Mike Ritchie for the invitation to contribute and Kevin Schneider, Arne
157 Jacobs, Barbara Helm, and Konrad Lohse for valuable comments on an
158 earlier draft.

159

160

161 **References**

162 Berner, D. & Salzburger, W., 2015. The genomics of organismal
163 diversification illuminated by adaptive radiations. *Trends Genet* **31**: 491-499.

164

165 Brawand, D., Wagner, C.E., Li, Y.I., Malinsky, M., Keller, I., Fan, S., Simakov,
166 O., Ng, A.Y., Lim, Z.W., Bezault, E., Turner-Maier, J., *et al.* 2014. The
167 genomic substrate for adaptive radiation in African cichlid fish. *Nature* **513**:
168 375-381.

169

170 Burri, R., Nater, A., Kawakami, T., Mugal, C.F., Olason, P.I., Smeds, L., Suh,
171 A., Dutoit, L., Bureš, S., Garamszegi, L.Z., Hogner, S. *et al.* 2015. Linked
172 selection and recombination rate variation drive the evolution of the genomic
173 landscape of differentiation across the speciation continuum of *Ficedula*
174 flycatchers. *Genome Research* **25**: 1656-1665.

175

176 Elmer, K.R. & Meyer, A., 2011. Adaptation in the age of ecological genomics:
177 insights from parallelism and convergence. *Trends Ecol Evol* **26**: 298-306.
178

179 Elmer, K.R., Fan, S., Kusche, H., Spreitzer, M.L., Kautt, A.F., Franchini, P. &
180 Meyer, A., 2014. Parallel evolution of Nicaraguan crater lake cichlid fishes via
181 non-parallel routes. *Nature Communications*, 5, p.5168.
182

183 Huang, W., Massouras, A., Inoue, Y., Peiffer, J., Ràmia, M., Tarone, A.M.,
184 Turlapati, L., Zichner, T., Zhu, D., Lyman, R.F. & Magwire, M.M., 2014.
185 Natural variation in genome architecture among 205 *Drosophila melanogaster*
186 Genetic Reference Panel lines. *Genome Research* **24**: 1193-1208.
187

188 Nosil, P. 2012. *Ecological Speciation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
189

190 Roesti, M., Gavrillets, S., Hendry, A.P., Salzburger, W. & Berner, D. 2014. The
191 genomic signature of parallel adaptation from shared genetic variation. *Mol.*
192 *Ecol.* **23**: 3944–3956.

193 Seehausen, O., Butlin, R.K., Keller, I., Wagner, C.E., Boughman, J.W.,
194 Hohenlohe, P.A., Peichel, C.L., Saetre, G.P., Bank, C., Brännström, Å. *et al.*
195 2014. Genomics and the origin of species. *Nature Rev Genet* **15**: 176-192.
196
197
198