Ancestral reconstruction of karyotypes reveals an exceptional rate of non-random chromosomal evolution in sunflower

Kate L. Ostevik^{1,2}, Kieran Samuk¹, and Loren H. Rieseberg²

- 1. Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC, 27701
- 2. Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada, V6T 1Z4

Running Title: Chromosomal evolution in sunflower

Keywords: chromosomal rearrangement, synteny block, Helianthus, syntR, dot plot

Corresponding author: Kate Ostevik Box 90338, 137 Biological Sciences, 130 Science Drive, Durham, NC, 27708 984-227-0832 kate.ostevik@gmail.com

1 Abstract

2

3 Mapping the chromosomal rearrangements between species can inform our understanding of genome 4 evolution, reproductive isolation, and speciation. Here we present a novel algorithm for identifying 5 regions of synteny in pairs of genetic maps, which is implemented in the accompanying R package, 6 syntR. The syntR algorithm performs as well as previous ad-hoc methods while being systematic, 7 repeatable, and is applicable to mapping chromosomal rearrangements in any group of species. In 8 addition, we present a systematic survey of chromosomal rearrangements in the annual sunflowers, 9 which is a group known for extreme karyotypic diversity. We build high-density genetic maps for two 10 subspecies of the prairie sunflower, Helianthus petiolaris ssp. petiolaris and H. petiolaris ssp. fallax. 11 Using syntR, and we identify blocks of synteny between these two subspecies and previously published 12 high-density genetic maps. We reconstruct ancestral karyotypes for annual sunflowers using those 13 synteny blocks and conservatively estimate that there have been 7.9 chromosomal rearrangements 14 per million years – a high rate of chromosomal evolution. Although the rate of inversion is even higher 15 than the rate of translocation in this group, we further find that every extant karyotype is distinguished 16 by between 1 and 3 translocations involving only 8 of the 17 chromosomes. This non-random exchange 17 suggests that specific chromosomes are prone to translocation and may thus contribute 18 disproportionately to widespread hybrid sterility in sunflowers. These data deepen our understanding 19 of chromosome evolution and confirm that Helianthus has an exceptional rate of chromosomal 20 rearrangement that may facilitate similarly rapid diversification.

21 Introduction

22

Organisms vary widely in the number and arrangement of their chromosomes – i.e., their karyotype.
 Interestingly, karyotypic differences are often associated with species boundaries and, therefore,
 suggest a link between chromosomal evolution and speciation (White 1978, King 1993). Indeed, it is
 well established that chromosomal rearrangements can contribute to reproductive isolation.

27 Individuals heterozygous for divergent karyotypes are often sterile or inviable (King 1987, Lai *et al.*

28 2005, Stathos and Fishman 2014). Apart from directly causing hybrid sterility and inviability, 29 chromosomal rearrangements can also facilitate the evolution of other reproductive barriers by 30 extending genomic regions that are protected from introgression (Noor et al. 2001, Rieseberg 2001), 31 accumulating genetic incompatibilities (Navarro and Barton 2003), and simplifying reinforcement 32 (Trickett and Butlin 1994). Despite its prevalence and potentially important role in speciation, the 33 general patterns of karyotypic divergence are still not well understood. Mapping and characterizing 34 chromosomal rearrangements in many taxa is a critical step towards understanding their evolutionary 35 dynamics.

36

37 The genus *Helianthus* (sunflowers) is well known to have particularly labile genome structure and is 38 thus a viable system in which to map and characterize a variety of rearrangements. These sunflowers 39 have several paleopolyploidy events in their evolutionary history (Barker et al. 2008, Barker et al. 2016, 40 Badouin et al. 2017), have given rise to three homoploid hybrid species (Rieseberg 1991), and are 41 prone to transposable element activity (Kawakami et al. 2011, Staton et al. 2012). Evidence in the form 42 of hybrid pollen inviability, abnormal chromosome pairings during meiosis, and genetic map 43 comparisons suggests that *Helianthus* karyotypes are unusually diverse (Heiser 1947, Heiser 1951, 44 Heiser 1961, Whelan 1979, Chandler 1986, Rieseberg et al. 1995, Quillet et al. 1995, Burke et al. 2004, Heesacker et al. 2009, Barb et al. 2014). In fact, annual sunflowers have one of the highest described 45 46 rates of chromosomal evolution across all plants and animals (Burke et al. 2004).

47

48 Studying chromosomal evolution within any group requires high-density genetic maps. Recently, Barb 49 et al. (2014) built high-density genetic maps for the sunflower species H. niveus ssp. tephrodes and H. 50 argophyllus and compared them to H. annuus. This analysis precisely mapped previously inferred 51 karyotypes (Heiser 1951, Chandler 1986, Quillet et al. 1995), but only captured a small amount of the 52 chromosomal variation in the annual sunflowers. For example, comparisons of genetic maps with 53 limited marker density suggest that several chromosomal rearrangements differentiate H. petiolaris 54 from *H. annuus* (Rieseberg *et al.* 1995, Burke *et al.* 2004) and evidence from cytological surveys 55 suggests that subspecies within *H. petiolaris* subspecies carry divergent karyotypes (Heiser 1961). 56 Adding high-density genetic maps of H. petiolaris subspecies to the Barb et al. (2014) analysis will allow

us to: (1) precisely track additional rearrangements, (2) reconstruct ancestral karyotypes for the group,
 and (3) untangle overlapping rearrangements that can be obscured by directly comparing present-day
 karyotypes.

60

61 Another critical part of a multi-species comparative study of chromosome evolution using genetic map 62 data is a systematic and repeatable method for identifying syntenic chromosomal regions (sensu 63 Pevzner and Tesler 2003). These methods are especially important for cases with high marker density 64 because breakpoints between synteny blocks can be blurred by mapping error, micro-rearrangements, 65 and paralogy (Hackett and Broadfoot 2003, Choi et al. 2007, Barb et al. 2014, Bilton et al. 2018). In 66 previous studies, synteny blocks have been found by a variety of ad-hoc methods, including counting 67 all differences in marker order (Wu and Tanksley 2010), by visual inspection (Burke et al. 2004, Marone 68 et al. 2012, Latta et al. 2019), or by manually applying simple rules like size thresholds (Heesacker et al. 69 2009, Barb et al. 2014, Rueppell et al. 2016) and Spearman's rank comparisons (Berdan et al. 2014, 70 Schlautman et al. 2017). However, these methods become intractable and prone to error when applied 71 to very dense genetic maps. Furthermore, to our knowledge, there is no software available that 72 identifies synteny blocks based on relative marker positions alone (i.e., without requiring reference 73 genomes, sequence data, or markers with known orientations).

74

Here, with the goal of understanding chromosome evolution in *Helianthus* and more generally, we aimed to: (1) build high-density genetic maps for two subspecies of *Helianthus petiolaris*, (2) develop a method and software to systematically and repeatably identify synteny blocks from any number of paired genetic map positions, (3) reconstruct ancestral karyotypes for a subsection of annual sunflowers, and (4) detect general patterns of chromosomal rearrangement in *Helianthus*.

80 Methods

81 Study system

83 We focused on five closely related diploid (2n = 34) taxa from the annual clade of the genus *Helianthus* 84 (Fig 1). These sunflowers are native to North America (Fig S1, Rogers *et al.* 1982) and are naturally self-85 incompatible (domesticated lineages of *H. annuus* are self-compatible). *Helianthus annuus* occurs 86 throughout much of the central United States, often in somewhat heavy soils and along roadsides 87 (Heiser 1947). Helianthus petiolaris occurs in sandier soils and is made up of two subspecies: H. 88 petiolaris ssp. petiolaris, which is commonly found in the southern Great Plains, and H. petiolaris ssp. 89 fallax, which is limited to more arid regions in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona (Heiser 1961). 90 Where H. petiolaris and H. annuus are sympatric, gene flow occurs between the species (Strasburg and 91 Rieseberg 2008). Helianthus argophyllus is primarily found along the east coast of Texas where it also 92 overlaps and hybridizes with H. annuus (Baute et al. 2016). Finally, H. niveus ssp. tephrodes is a 93 facultative perennial that grows in dunes from the southwestern US into Mexico.



94

Figure 1 - The sunflower taxa used in this study. A) Phylogenetic relationships based on Stephens *et al.* (2015)
and Baute *et al.* (2016). B) *H. niveus* ssp. *tephrodes.* C) *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris.* D) *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax.* E) *H. argophyllus.* F) *H. annuus.* Photo credits: Brook Moyers (B, C, E & F) and Rose Andrew (D).

98 Controlled crosses

99

100 To make genetic maps, we crossed an outbred individual with presumably high heterozygosity from

101 each *H. petiolaris* subspecies to a homozygous inbred line of domesticated sunflower and genotyped

- 102 the resulting F1 offspring. This test-cross design allows us to infer where recombination occurred in the
- 103 heterozygous parents because we can reliably track the segregation of those parents' alleles against a
- 104 predictable background (Fig 2).



Figure 2 – Diagram showing how a test-cross can be used to map the recombination events in an outbred
 individual that may (A) or may not (B) share alleles with the inbred line. Each line represents a chromosome, and
 the colors represent ancestry.

109

110 Specifically, we used pollen from a single H. petiolaris ssp. petiolaris plant (PI435836) and a single H. 111 petiolaris ssp. fallax plant (PI435768) to fertilize individuals of a highly inbred and male sterile line of H. annuus (HA89cms). The self-incompatible H. petiolaris accessions were collected in central Colorado 112 113 (PI435836, 39.741°, -105.342°, Boulder County) and the southeast corner of New Mexico (PI435768, 114 32.3°, -104.0°, Eddy County, Fig S1) and were maintained at large population sizes by the United States 115 Department of Agriculture. When it was originally collected, accession PI435768 was classified H. 116 neglectus. However, based on the location of the collection (Heiser 1961) and a more recent genetic 117 analysis of the scale of differences between H. petiolaris ssp. fallax and H. neglectus (Raduski et al.

118 2010), we believe that this accession should be classified *H. petiolaris ssp. fallax*.

- 119 Genotyping
- 120

We collected leaf tissue from 116 *H. annuus* x *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris* F1 seedlings and 132 *H. annuus* x *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax* F1 seedlings. We extracted DNA using a modified CTAB protocol
(Doyle and Doyle 1987) and prepared individually barcoded genotyping-by-sequencing (GBS) libraries
using a version of the Poland *et al.* (2012) protocol. Our modified protocol includes steps to reduce the
frequency of high-copy fragments (e.g., chloroplast and repetitive sequence) based on Shagina *et al.*(2010) and Matvienko *et al.* (2013) and steps to select specific fragment sizes for sequencing (see
Ostevik 2016 appendix B for the full protocol).

128

129 Briefly, we digested 100ng of DNA from each individual with restriction enzymes (either PstI-HF or PstI-130 HF and *Msp*I) and ligated individual barcodes and common adapters to the digested DNA. We pooled 131 barcoded fragments from up to 192 individuals, cleaned and concentrated the libraries using SeraMag 132 Speed Beads made in-house (Rohland and Reich 2012), and amplified fragments using 12 cycles of PCR. 133 We depleted high-copy fragments based on Todesco et al. (2019) using the following steps: (1) 134 denature the libraries using high temperatures, (2) allow the fragments to re-hybridize, (3) digest the 135 double-stranded fragments with duplex specific nuclease (Zhulidov et al. 2004), and (4) amplify the 136 undigested fragments using another 12 cycles of PCR. We ran the libraries out on a 1.5% agarose gel 137 and extracted 300-800 bp fragments using a Zymoclean Gel DNA Recovery kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, 138 USA). Then, following additional library cleanup and quality assessment, we sequenced paired-ends of 139 our libraries on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA, USA).

140

To call variants, we used a pipeline that combines the Burrows-Wheeler Aligner version 0.7.15 (BWA, Li & Durbin 2010) and the Genome Analysis Toolkit version 3.7 (GATK, McKenna *et al.* 2010). First, we demultiplexed the data using sabre (https://github.com/najoshi/sabre, Accessed 27 Jan 2017). Next, we aligned reads to the *H. annuus* reference (HanXRQr1.0-20151230, Badouin *et al.* 2017) with 'bwamem' (Li 2013), called variants with GATK 'HaplotypeCaller', and jointly genotyped all samples within a cross type with GATK 'GentypeGVCFs'. We split variants into SNPs and indels and filtered each marker type using hard-filtration criteria suggested in the GATK best practices (DePristo *et al.* 2011, Van der Auwera *et al.* 2013). Specifically, we removed SNPs that had quality by depth scores (QD) less than 2, strand bias scores (FS) greater than 60, mean mapping quality (MQ) less than 40, or allele mapping bias scores (MQRankSum) less than -12.5 and indels that had QD < 2 or FS > 200. After further filtering variants for biallelic and triallelic markers with genotype calls in at least 50% of individuals, we used

- 152 GATK 'VariantsToTable' to merge SNPs and indels into a single variant table for each cross type.
- 153

154 Finally, we converted our variant tables into AB format, such that the heterozygous parents contribute 155 'A' and 'B' alleles to offspring, while the *H. annuus* parent contributes exclusively 'A' alleles. At biallelic 156 markers (Fig 2A), sites with two reference alleles became 'AA' and sites with the reference allele, and 157 the alternate allele became 'AB'. At triallelic markers (Fig 2B), sites with the reference allele and one 158 alternate allele became 'AA' and sites with the reference allele, and the other alternate allele became 159 'AB'. This method randomly assigns 'A' and 'B' alleles to the homologous chromosomes in each 160 heterozygous parent, so our genetic maps initially consisted of pairs of mirror-imaged linkage groups 161 that we later merged.

162 Genetic mapping

163

We used R/qtl (Broman *et al.* 2003) in conjunction with R/ASMap (Taylor and Butler 2017) to build genetic maps. After excluding markers with less than 20% or greater than 80% heterozygosity and individuals with less than 50% of markers scored, we used the function 'mstmap.cross' with a stringent significance threshold (p.value = 1x10⁻¹⁶) to form conservative linkage groups. We used the function 'plotRF' to identify pairs of linkage groups with unusually high recombination fractions and the function 'switchAlleles' to reverse the genotype scores of one linkage group in each mirrored pair. We did this until reversing genotype scores no longer reduced the number of linkage groups.

- 171
- 172 Using the corrected genotypes, we made new linkage groups with only the most reliable markers.
- 173 Namely, we used the function 'mstmap.cross' (with the parameter values: dist.fun = "kosambi", p.value
- 174 = 1x10⁻⁶, noMap.size = 2, noMap.dist = 5) on markers with less than 10% missing data and without
- 175 significant segregation distortion. We refined the resulting linkage groups by removing (1) markers

with more than three double crossovers, (2) markers with aberrant segregation patterns (segregation
distortion more than two standard deviations above or below the mean segregation distortion of the
nearest 20 markers), and (3) linkage groups made up of fewer than four markers.

179

We progressively pushed markers with increasing amounts of segregation distortion and missing data into the maps using the function 'pushCross'. After adding each batch of markers, we reordered the linkage groups and dropped markers and linkage groups as described above. Once all the markers had been pushed back, we used the function 'calc.errorlod' to identify possible genotyping errors (error scores greater than 2) and replaced those genotypes with missing data. We continued to drop linkage groups, markers, and genotypes that did not meet our criteria until none remained.

186

Finally, we dropped five excess linkage groups, each made up of fewer than 30 markers, from each map. The markers in these linkage groups mapped to regions of the *H. annuus* genome that were otherwise represented in the final genetic maps but could not be explained by reversed genotypes. Instead, these markers were likely polymorphic in the HA89cms individual used for crosses because of the 2-4% residual heterozygosity in sunflower inbred lines (Mandel *et al.* 2013).

192 SyntR development

193

To aid in the identification of chromosomal rearrangements, we developed the R package 'syntR' (code and documentation available at <u>http://ksamuk.github.io/syntR</u>). This package implements a heuristic algorithm for systematically detecting synteny blocks from marker positions in two genetic maps. The key innovation of the syntR algorithm is coupling a biologically-informed noise reduction method with a cluster identification method better suited for detecting linear (as opposed to circular) clusters of data points.

200

We based the syntR algorithm on the following statistical and biological properties of genetic maps andchromosomal rearrangements:

- (1) Synteny blocks appear as contiguous sets of orthologous markers in the same or reversed order
 in pairs of genetic maps (Pevzner and Tesler 2003, Choi *et al.* 2007).
- (2) The inferred order of markers in individual genetic maps is subject to error due to genotyping
 errors and missing data (Hackett and Broadfoot 2003). This error manifests as slight differences
 in the order of nearby markers within a linkage group between maps. This mapping error
 (which we denote 'error rate one') results in uncertainty in the sequence of markers in synteny
 blocks.
- (3) In genomes with a history of duplication, seemingly orthologous markers can truly represent
 paralogs. These errors ('error rate two') look like tiny translocations and also disrupt marker
 orders within synteny blocks.
- 213 (4) When comparing genetic maps derived from genomes without duplications or deletions, every 214 region of each genome will be uniquely represented in the other. Because syntR is made for 215 comparing homoploid genomes with this property, we expect each point in each genetic map 216 to be contained within a single unique synteny block. Therefore, overlaps between synteny 217 blocks are likely errors. Note that this assumption precludes the identification of duplications. 218 (5) Chromosomal rearrangements can be of any size, but smaller rearrangements are difficult to 219 distinguish from error (Pevzner and Tesler 2003). A key decision in synteny block detection is 220 thus the choice of a detection threshold for small rearrangements, which results in a trade-off 221 between error reduction and the minimum size of detectable synteny blocks.
- 222

223 The first step of the syntR algorithm is to smooth over mapping error (error rate one) by identifying 224 highly localized clusters of markers based on a genetic distance threshold (cM) in both maps using 225 hierarchical clustering (Fig 3a). The number of clusters formed is determined by the parameter 226 maximum cluster range (CR_{max}) that defines the maximum genetic distance (cM) that any cluster can 227 span in either genetic map. After determining these initial clusters, we smooth the maps by collapsing 228 each multi-marker cluster down into a single representative point (the centroid of the cluster) for 229 processing in subsequent steps. Next, we address errors introduced by poorly mapped or paralogous 230 markers (error rate two) by flagging and removing outlier clusters that do not have a neighboring

cluster within a specified maximum genetic distance (cM), a parameter we denote nearest neighbor
distance (NN_{dist}, Fig 3b).



Figure 3 – The stages of the syntR algorithm. Each plot shows the relationship between markers or clusters of markers from three chromosomes in two genetic maps. A) Highly localized markers are clustered. Each shade represents an individual cluster of markers that will be collapsed into a single representative point. B) Clusters without another cluster nearby are dropped. Red points represent clusters without a neighbor within 10 cM. C) Clusters are grouped into synteny blocks based on their rank positions. Grey points represent markers that were dropped in previous steps, and each other color represents a different synteny block.

241

234

242 After the noise reduction steps, we define preliminary synteny blocks using a method similar to the 243 "friends-of-friends" clustering algorithm (Huchra and Geller 1982). First, we transform the genetic 244 position of each cluster into rank order to minimize the impact of gaps between markers. We then 245 group clusters that are (1) adjacent in rank position in one of the maps and (2) within two rank 246 positions in the other map (Fig S2). This grouping method further reduces the effect of mapping error 247 by aggregating over pairs (but not triplets) of clusters that have reversed orientations. If a minimum 248 number of clusters per synteny block has been (optionally) defined, we sequentially eliminate blocks 249 that fall below the minimum number of clusters, starting with blocks made up of one cluster and 250 ending with blocks made up of clusters equal to one less than the minimum. After each elimination, we 251 regroup the clusters into new synteny blocks. Finally, we adjust the extents of each synteny block by 252 removing overlapping sections from both synteny blocks so that every position in each genetic map is 253 uniquely represented (Fig 3c).

254 Assessing the performance of the syntR algorithm

255

256 To evaluate the performance of this method and explore the effect of parameter choice on outcomes, 257 we simulated genetic map comparisons with known inversion breakpoints and error rates in R. The 258 genetic map comparisons were made by randomly placing 200 of markers at 100 positions along a 100 259 cM chromosome in two maps, reversing marker positions within a defined inversion region in one 260 map, and then repositioning markers based on simulated mapping noise using the following two error 261 parameters: (1) ER₁ is the standard deviation of a normal distribution used to pick the distances 262 markers are pushed out of their correct positions (e.g., when ER₁ is 1 cM 95% of markers will be within 263 2 cM of their true position); (2) ER₂ is the proportion of markers that are repositioned according to a 264 uniform distribution (i.e., these markers can be moved to any position on the simulated chromosome). 265

266 We initially ran syntR using fixed syntR parameters (CR_{max} = 2 and NN_{dist} = 10) on multiple simulated 267 maps, which were made using variable parameters (inversion size: 2.5-50 cM, ER1: 0-2.0 cM, and ER2: 268 0-20%), and counted the number of times the known breakpoints were identified within 1 cM (Fig S3). 269 As expected, we find that rearrangement size affects the false negative rate (i.e., failing to detect 270 known breakpoints), such that smaller inversions are more likely to be missed (Fig S3c), but does not 271 affect the false positive rate (i.e., detecting breakpoints where there are none). We also find that 272 increasing both types of error in the genetic maps tends to increase both the false positive and false 273 negative rates, although ER1 has a much stronger effect on the false positive rate than any other 274 combination (Fig S3a,b).

275

Using the same simulation methods as above but now varying the syntR parameter CR_{max}, we find that small values of CR_{max} yield high false positive rates while large values yield high false negative rates (Fig S4a). In addition, the ER₁ parameter has a strong effect on the relationship between CR_{max} and the false positive rate. Higher values of CR_{max} are needed to reduce the false positive rate when ER₁ is also high (Fig S4b). This means that picking an appropriate CR_{max} value is key to the accuracy of this method. Although NN_{dist} has a much weaker effect on outcomes than CR_{max}, it is useful to consider both parameter values carefully.

284 When the syntR heuristic algorithm is performing well, the final synteny blocks should represent all 285 positions in the two genetic maps being compared (Chen *et al.* 2009). Based on this characteristic, we 286 developed a method to choose optimal syntR tuning parameters (CR_{max} and NN_{dist}) that maximize the 287 representation of the genetic maps and markers in synteny blocks. In this method a user: (1) runs syntR 288 with a range of parameter combinations; (2) saves summary statistics about the genetic distance of 289 each map represented in the synteny blocks and the number of markers retained for each run; and (3) 290 finds the parameter combination that maximizes a composite statistic that equally weights these three 291 measures. In cases where there are multiple local maxima, we suggest choosing the local maximum 292 with the smallest value of CR_{max} to reduce the number of potential false positives.

293

294 The "maximize representation" method for choosing syntR parameters has several benefits. First, it 295 does not rely on any additional information (e.g., error rate estimates from the genetic maps 296 compared). Second, when we use this method to choose the best parameters for simulated genetic 297 maps, we find that these parameter values also minimize false positive and false negative rates (Fig 298 S5). Third, when we simulate biologically realistic genetic map comparisons, the absolute value of false 299 positives and false negatives are small. For example, when comparing two genetic maps in which ~95% 300 of markers are within 1 cM of their true position ($ER_1 = 0.5$) and 5% of markers are randomly permuted 301 $(ER_2 = 0.05)$, nonexistent breakpoints will be identified 0.1 times and a breakpoint of a 20 cM inversion 302 will be missed 0.04 times. These low error rates also highlight the overall robustness and accuracy of 303 the syntR algorithm.

304

In addition to performing simulations, we compared the synteny blocks identified by syntR to those identified by other means in a previously published comparison of *H. niveus* ssp. *tephrodes* and *H. argophyllus* maps to *H. annuus* (Barb *et al.* 2014). To do this, we formatted the original datasets for input into syntR and used the "maximize representation" method to determine the optimal parameter values for the two comparisons (*H. niveus vs. H. annuus*: CR_{max} = 1.5, NN_{dist} = 30; *H. argophyllus vs. H. annuus*: CR_{max} = 2, NN_{dist} = 20). We found that syntR was in strong agreement with previous work (Fig S6), recovering all the same translocations and most of the same inversions as the Barb *et al.* (2014)

maps. Most of the cases of mismatches were very small or weakly supported inversions in the Barb *et al.* (2014) maps that syntR did not identify.

314

315 Finding synteny blocks

316

317 We used syntR to identify synteny blocks between our newly generated genetic maps and an ultra-318 high-density map of *H. annuus* that was used to build the sunflower genome that we use as a reference 319 (Badouin et al. 2017). This allowed us to easily convert between physical position in the H. annuus 320 reference and position in the *H. annuus* genetic map. Using this property, we further compared two 321 previously published genetic maps for the closely related sunflower species, H. niveus ssp. tephrodes 322 and *H. argophyllus* (Barb *et al.* 2014), to the same *H. annuus* map. We aligned marker sequences from 323 the published maps to the *H. annuus* reference using bwa and converted well-aligned markers (MQ > 324 40) to their positions in the *H. annuus* genetic map.

325

326 Initially, we ran syntR using parameters identified through the "maximize representation" method for 327 each map comparison separately (Table S1). However, varying CR_{max} revealed rearrangements that 328 were shared between the maps (Fig S7). Therefore, we ran syntR again using a range of CR_{max} values 329 that included the best fit for each comparison (1.0 - 3.5 in 0.5 increments) and extracted a curated set 330 of synteny blocks from the output. A synteny block was retained if it fulfilled any of the following 331 criteria (in decreasing order of importance): (1) it was found in another species, (2) it was identified in 332 the majority of syntR runs for a single species, (3) it maximized the genetic distance represented by 333 synteny blocks. We present this curated set of synteny blocks below, but our results are unchanged if 334 we use the individually-fit synteny blocks.

335

We named the chromosomes in our genetic maps based on their synteny with the standard order and orientation of *H. annuus* chromosomes (Tang *et al.* 2002, Bowers *et al.* 2012) following Barb *et al.*

338 (2014) but with shortened prefixes (A = H. annuus, R = H. argophyllus, N = H. niveus ssp. tephrodes, P =

- *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris*, F = *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax*). For example, an *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax*chromosome made up of regions that are syntenic with *H. annuus* chromosomes 4 and 7 is called F4-7.
- 342 Karyotype reconstruction and analysis
- 343

344 We used our inferred synteny blocks and the software MGR v 2.01 (Bourgue and Pevzner 2002) to infer 345 ancestral karyotypes for our five *Helianthus* taxa and to determine the number of chromosomal 346 rearrangements that occurred along each branch of the species tree. To run the MGR analysis, we 347 needed the order and orientations of synteny blocks in all five maps. However, individual synteny 348 blocks were often missing from one or more of our final maps. We approached this problem in two 349 ways. First, we inferred the likely position of missing synteny blocks based on the location of markers 350 that were too sparse to be grouped by syntR and matched the location of synteny blocks in other 351 maps. In the second case, we dropped any synteny blocks that were not universally represented. 352 Because we already had two sets of synteny blocks for each map (curated and individually optimized), 353 we ran the MGR analyses using three different sets of synteny blocks: (set 1) curated and inferred, (set 354 2) curated and present in all five maps, (set 3) individually optimized and present in all five maps. 355

- 356 Data availability
- 357

The R program, syntR, is available on GitHub: <u>https://github.com/ksamuk/syntR.</u> The sequences used to generate genetic maps are available on the SRA: <u>http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/598366</u>. All other data and scripts are available on dryad: <u>https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.7sqv9s4pc</u>.

361 **Results**

362 Genetic maps

364 Both H. petiolaris genetic maps are made up of the expected 17 chromosomes and have very high 365 marker density (Fig 4, Fig S8). Only 6% of the *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris* map and 10% of the *H.* 366 petiolaris ssp. fallax map fails to have a marker within 2 cM (Fig S9). Overall, both maps are somewhat 367 longer than the *H. petiolaris* map reported by Burke *et al.* (2004). Although this could represent real 368 variation between genotypes, it could also be the result of spurious crossovers that are inferred based 369 on genotyping errors. Because genotyping errors are proportional to the number of markers, maps 370 with high marker densities are more likely to be inflated. Indeed, building maps with variants that were 371 thinned to 1 per 150 bp using vcftools version 0.1.13 (Danecek et al. 2011) yields collinear maps that 372 are closer to the expected lengths (Table S2, Fig S10). We present subsequent results based on the full 373 maps to improve our resolution for detecting small rearrangements.

374

375 Despite the general expansion of our maps, we find that chromosomes 2 and 4 in the *H. petiolaris* ssp. 376 fallax map (F2 and F4) are unexpectedly short (Fig 4). When we look at the distribution of markers for 377 this map relative to the *H. annuus* reference, we find very few variable sites in the distal half of these 378 chromosomes (Fig S11). That is, this individual was homozygous along vast stretches of F2 and F4. 379 These runs of homozygosity could be explained by recent common ancestry (i.e., inbreeding) or a lack 380 of variation in the population (e.g, because of background selection or a recent selective sweep). 381 Regardless, the lack of variable sites within the *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax* individual used for crosses 382 explains the shortness of F2 and F4. Notably, we find the same pattern on the distal half of *H. annuus* 383 chromosome 7 and find that this region is also not represented in the *H. petiolaris* spp. *fallax* map. 384



386 Figure 4 – Helianthus petiolaris genetic maps showing blocks of synteny with H. annuus. Each horizontal bar 387 represents a genetic marker. The thick vertical bars next to chromosomes represent synteny blocks that are 388 inverted relative to the H. annuus genetic map. Where there are no translocations between H. petiolaris and H. 389 annuus chromosomes (e.g. all synteny blocks in P1 and F1 are syntenic with A1), the synteny blocks are shown in 390 grey. Where there are translocations, the synteny blocks are color-coded based on their synteny with H. annuus 391 chromosomes. Regions that are not assigned to a synteny block remain white. The synteny blocks plotted are 392 those curated based on multiple runs of syntR using different parameters. Please see Fig S12 for a labeled 393 version. This figure was made with LinkageMapView (Ouellette et al. 2017).

394 Synteny blocks

395

396 Using syntR, we recovered 97 genetic regions that are syntenic between the *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris* 397 and H. annuus and 79 genetic regions that are syntenic between the H. petiolaris ssp. fallax and H. 398 annuus (Fig 4). We also recovered synteny blocks for the *H. niveus* ssp. tephrodes and *H. argophyllus* 399 comparisons that are similar to those found previously (Fig S13). In all four comparisons, syntR 400 successfully identified synteny blocks that cover large proportions (63%-90%) of each genetic map even 401 in the face of a very high proportion of markers that map to a different chromosome than their 402 neighbors (Table 1). These "rogue markers" could be the result of very small translocations, poorly 403 mapped markers, or extensive paralogy. Over and above the prevalence of rogue markers, the 404 karyotypes we recovered are substantially rearranged. Only between 32% and 45% of synteny blocks 405 for each map are collinear with the *H. annuus* genetic map in direct comparisons (Table 1). 406

Table 1 – Properties of the synteny blocks found using a syntR analysis between genetic maps of *H. annuus* and
four other *Helianthus* taxa. The proportion of rogue markers is based only on the chromosomes without
translocations in any map (i.e., chromosomes 1-3, 5, 8-10, 11, and 14). For those chromosomes, the majority of
marker mapped to a single *H. annuus* chromosome. The other markers are considered rogue.

| Genetic map | N synteny | Rogue | Мар | H. annuus | Collinear | Inverted | Translocated |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------|
| | blocks | markers | coverage | coverage | | | |
| H. petiolaris ssp. petiolaris | 97 | 19% | 80% | 74% | 39% | 36% | 26% |
| H. petiolaris spp. fallax | 79 | 17% | 63% | 65% | 32% | 34% | 34% |
| H. niveus ssp. tephrodes | 43 | 26% | 78% | 75% | 40% | 21% | 39% |
| H. argophyllus | 31 | 20% | 90% | 82% | 45% | 16% | 39% |

411

412 Karyotype reconstruction and chromosomal rearrangement

413

414 Because nested and shared rearrangements can obscure patterns of chromosome evolution, we use

415 the MGR analyses to predict the most likely sequence of rearrangements in a phylogenetic context

416 before quantifying the rearrangement rate. These MGR analyses identified similar patterns of

417 chromosome evolution regardless of the exact set of synteny blocks that we used (Table S5). Multiple

- 418 taxa share many rearrangements, and the similarity of karyotypes matches known phylogenetic
- 419 relationships. Moreover, MGR analyses run without a guide tree inferred the known species tree, and
- 420 MGR analyses run with all other topologies identified an inflated number of chromosomal
- 421 rearrangements.
- 422



Figure 5 – Diagram showing the karyotypes of 5 *Helianthus* taxa as well as reconstructed ancestral karyotypes and the locations of chromosomal rearrangements. The karyotypes were built using synteny block set 1, which were curated based on multiple syntR runs and inferred when missing. Each synteny block is represented using a line segment that is color-coded based on its position in the *H. annuus* genome (see Fig S14 for a labeled version). Chromosomes without translocations in any map are plotted in grey, and synteny blocks that are inverted relative to *H. annuus* are plotted using arrows. Also, note that along some branches the same pair of chromosomes is involved in multiple translocations.

431

423

Using the most complete set of synteny blocks (set 1), we find that 88 chromosomal rearrangements occurred across the phylogeny (Fig 5). Then, using the most current divergence time estimates for this group (Todesco *et al.* 2019) and conservatively assuming that *H. niveus* ssp. *tephrodes* diverged at the earliest possible point, we estimate that 7.9 (7.8-8) rearrangements occurred per million years in this clade (Tables S3-S5). To further explore the potential range of rearrangement rates, we considered other estimates of divergence times in sunflower (Sambatti *et al.* 2012, Mason 2018) and the other
sets of synteny blocks. Overall, the lowest rate we identified was 2.6 rearrangements per million years,
while the highest rate was indeterminable because some minimum divergence time estimates for the
group include 0 (Tables S3-S5).

441

442 The 88 rearrangements include 74 inversions and 14 translocations that are quite evenly distributed 443 across the phylogeny. However, the excess inversions indicate that it is unlikely that the rate of 444 inversions is equal to the rate of translocation (binomial test, 5.1x10⁻¹¹). Furthermore, we find that only 445 8 of the 17 chromosomes are involved in the 14 translocations we identified. If translocations were 446 equally likely for all chromosomes, this asymmetry is very unlikely to have happened by chance (the probability of sampling \leq 8 chromosomes in 14 translocations is 8.0x10⁻⁸, Fig S15), suggesting that 447 448 some chromosomes are more likely to be involved in translocations than other. In line with this 449 observation, we see that some chromosome segments are repeatedly translocated. For example, A4 450 and A7 are involved in several exchanges, and part of A6 has a different position in almost every map 451 (Fig 5).

452 Discussion

453 Large-scale chromosomal changes may be key contributors to the process of adaptation and 454 speciation, yet we still have a poor understanding of rates of chromosomal rearrangement and the 455 evolutionary forces underlying those rates. Here, we devised a novel, systematic method for 456 comparing any pair of genetic maps, and performed a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of 457 chromosomal rearrangements in a clade of sunflowers. We created two new genetic maps for 458 Helianthus species and used our new method to identify a wide range of karyotypic variation in our 459 new maps, as well as previously published maps. Consistent with previous studies, we discovered a 460 high rate of chromosomal evolution in the annual sunflowers. Further, we found that inversions are 461 more common than translocations and that certain chromosomes are more likely to be translocated. 462 Below, we discuss the evolutionary and methodological implications of this work and suggest some 463 next steps in understanding the dynamic process of chromosomal rearrangement.

464 Identifying rearrangements

465

Studying the evolution of chromosomal rearrangements requires dense genetic maps and systematic methods to analyze and compare these maps between species. Our new software, syntR, provides an end-to-end solution for systematic and repeatable identification of synteny blocks in pairs of genetic maps with any marker density. Our tests on real and simulated data find that syntR recovers chromosomal rearrangements identified previous by both manual comparisons and cytological study, suggesting that syntR is providing an accurate view of karyotypic differences between species.

Overall, we believe syntR will be a valuable tool for the systematic study of chromosomal
rearrangements in any species. The only data syntR needs to identify synteny blocks is relative marker
positions in two genetic maps. This fact is significant because, although the number of species with
whole genome sequence and methods to detect synteny blocks from those sequences are rapidly
accumulating, such as Mauve (Darling *et al.* 2004), Cinteny (Sinha and Meller 2007), syMAP (Soderlund *et al.* 2011), SynChro (Drillion *et al.* 2014) and SyRI (Goel *et al.* 2019), it is still uncommon to have

multiple closely related whole genome sequences that are of sufficient quality to compare for
karyotype differences. At the same time, the proliferation of reduced representation genome
sequencing methods means that it is easy to generate many genetic markers for non-model species
and produce very dense genetic maps. Furthermore, syntR allows comparisons to include older genetic
map data that would otherwise go unused. The simplicity of the syntR algorithm will facilitate rapid
karyotype mapping in a wide range of taxa.

485

486 We also believe that syntR provides a baseline for the development of further computational and 487 statistical methods for the study of chromosomal rearrangements. One fruitful direction would be to 488 integrate the syntR algorithm for synteny block detection directly into the genetic map building 489 process (much like GOOGA, Flagel et al. 2019). Another key extension would be to allow syntR to 490 compare multiple genetic maps simultaneously to detect synteny blocks in a group of species (e.g., by 491 leveraging information across species). Finally, formal statistical methods for evaluating the model fit 492 and the uncertainty involved with any set of synteny blocks would be a major (albeit challenging) 493 improvement to all existing methods, including syntR.

494 The similarity of *H. petiolaris* maps to previous studies

495

496 Compared with previous work, we found more inversions and fewer translocations between H. 497 petiolaris subspecies and H. annuus (Rieseberg et al. 1995, Burke et al. 2004). This is probably due to a 498 combination of factors. First, there appears to be karyotypic variation within some *Helianthus* species 499 (Heiser 1948, Heiser 1961, Chandler et al. 1986). Second, the maps presented here are made up of 500 more markers and individuals, which allowed us to identify small inversions that were previously 501 undetected as well as to eliminate false linkages that can be problematic in small mapping populations. 502 Lastly, we required more evidence to call rearrangements. Although we recovered some of the 503 translocations supported by multiple markers in Rieseberg et al. (1995) and Burke et al. (2004), we did 504 not recover any of the translocations supported by only a single sequence-based marker. Given the 505 high proportion of "rogue markers" in our maps, it is likely that some of the putative translocations 506 recovered in those earlier comparisons are the result of the same phenomenon.

508 On the other hand, we found that rearrangements between our *H. petiolaris* maps match the 509 translocations predicted from cytological studies quite well. Heiser (1961) predicted that *H. petiolaris* 510 ssp. *petiolaris* and *H. petiolaris* ssp. *fallax* karyotypes would have three chromosomes involved in two 511 translocations that form a ring during pairing at meiosis, as well as the possibility of a second 512 independent rearrangement. This exact configuration is likely to occur at meiosis in hybrids between 513 the *H. petiolaris* subspecies maps we present here (Fig S16). Also, the most noteworthy chromosome 514 configuration in cytological studies of *H. annuus-H. petiolaris* hybrids (Heiser 1947, Whelan 1979, 515 Ferriera 1980, Chandler et al. 1986) was a hexavalent (a six-chromosome structure) plus a quadrivalent 516 (a four-chromosome structure). Again, this is the configuration that we would expect in a hybrid 517 between *H. annuus* and the *H. petiolaris* ssp. *petiolaris* individual mapped here. Furthermore, the 518 complicated arrangement and relatively small size of A12, A16 and A17 synteny blocks in H. petiolaris 519 might explain why cytological configurations in *H. annuus-H. petiolaris* hybrids are so variable. 520 Interestingly, the rearrangements identified between H. argophyllus and H. annuus karyotypes here 521 and in Barb et al. (2014) also match the cytological studies better than an earlier comparison of sparse 522 genetic maps (Heesacker et al. 2009). It seems that, in systems with the potential for high proportions 523 of rogue markers, many markers are needed to identify chromosomal rearrangements reliably.

524

525 Total rearrangement rates

526

527 Our data suggest that annual sunflowers experience approximately 7.9 chromosomal rearrangements 528 per million years. This rate overlaps with recent estimates for this group (7.4-10.3, Barb et al. 2014) 529 and is even higher than the estimate that highlighted sunflower as a group with exceptionally fast 530 chromosomal evolution (5.5-7.3, Burke et al. 2004). However, since Burke et al. (2004), chromosomal 531 rearrangements have been tracked in many additional groups, including mammals (Ferguson-Smith 532 and Trifonov 2007, Martinez et al. 2016, da Silva et al. 2019), fish (Molina et al. 2014, Ayres-Alves et al. 533 2017), insects (Rueppell et al. 2016, Corbett-Detig et al. 2019), fungi (Sun et al. 2017) and plants 534 (Yogeeswaran et al. 2005, Schranz et al. 2006, Huang et al. 2009, Vogel et al. 2010, Latta et al. 2019).

Of these analyses, relatively few have systematically studied karyotypes evolution across multiple species and estimated total rearrangement rates. Of those that do, most studies report less than 7.9 chromosomal rearrangements per million years, for example, in *Solanum* (0.36-1.44, Wu and Tanksley 2010), *Drosophila* (0.44-2.74, Bhutkar *et al.* 2008) and mammals (0.05-2.76, Murphy *et al.* 2005). But there are exceptions, such as a comparison of genome sequences that revealed up to 35.7 rearrangements per million years in some grass lineages (Dvorak *et al.* 2018).

542 At the same time, we are likely underestimating rearrangement rates here for two reasons. First, we 543 used conservative thresholds for calling rearrangements. For example, some proportion of the rogue 544 markers that we identified could be the result of very small but real chromosomal rearrangements. 545 Second, our ability to resolve very small synteny blocks and breakpoints between synteny blocks 546 depends on marker density. Until we have full genome sequences to compare (like for the grass 547 lineages), we could be failing to detect very small rearrangements and falsely inferring that 548 independent rearrangements are shared. However, regardless of just how much we are 549 underestimating the rate, sunflower chromosomes are evolving quickly. This high rate of chromosomal 550 evolution could be a consequence of a higher rate of chromosomal mutation, a decreased chance that 551 chromosomal polymorphisms are lost, or both processes.

552

553 Type of rearrangements

554

555 We found that inversions and interchromosomal translocations dominate chromosomal evolution in 556 Helianthus. This pattern is common in angiosperm lineages (Weiss-Schneeweiss and Schneeweis 2012) 557 and fits with the consistent chromosome counts across annual sunflowers (2n = 34, Chandler et al. 558 1986). In addition, we found more inversions than translocations, which has previously been seen in 559 both plant (Wu and Tanksley 2010, Amores et al. 2014) and animal systems (Rueppell et al. 2016) and 560 echoes general reports that intrachromosomal rearrangements are more common than 561 interchromosomal rearrangements (Pevzner and Tesler 2003). These consistent rate differences are 562 notable because, although both rearrangement types depend on double strand breaks, two of the

major consequences of chromosomal rearrangements, underdominance (i.e., rearrangement
 heterozygotes are less fit than either homozygote) and recombination modification, might be more
 common for some types of rearrangements.

566

567 Translocations have a more predictable effect on hybrid fertility, while inversions consistently reduce 568 recombination. Reciprocal translocation heterozygotes can affect fertility because missegregation 569 during meiosis can cause half of the gametes to be unbalanced and thus inviable (White 1973, King 570 1993). Although inversion heterozygotes can also produce unbalanced gametes, whether that happens 571 is dependent on the size of the inversion and whether disrupted pairing during meiosis inhibits 572 crossovers (Searle 1993). When inversions are small or have suppressed crossing over, they will not be 573 strongly underdominant. On the other hand, inversions often exhibit reduced recombination either 574 because recombination is suppressed through disrupted pairing (Searle 1993) or ineffective through 575 the production of inviable gametes (Rieseberg 2001). While interactions between reduced 576 recombination and adaptation with gene flow have been extensively examined in the case of 577 inversions (Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006, Hoffman and Rieseberg 2008, Yeaman and Whitlock 2011, 578 Yeaman 2013), it is not clear whether the same pattern will be common for translocations (but see 579 Fishman et al. 2013, Stathos and Fishman 2014 for one example). Translocations bring together 580 previously unlinked alleles and mispairing at translocation breakpoints could suppress crossing over, 581 but recombination inside reciprocal translocations will not necessarily produce inviable gametes and 582 thus reduce effective recombination.

583

584 Although any selective force could be responsible for the evolution of any chromosomal 585 rearrangement, potential differences in the relative magnitude of underdominance versus 586 recombination suppression may contribute to the evolution of sunflower chromosomes. While many 587 chromosomal rearrangements in sunflowers appear to be strongly underdominant (Chandler 1986, Lai 588 et al. 2005), inversions typically are not (L. Rieseberg, unpublished). If translocations tend to be more 589 underdominant than inversions, they would be less likely to evolve through drift and more likely to 590 cause reproductive isolation directly. This could explain why translocations are less common than 591 inversions and why pollen viability is accurately predicted by the number of translocations inferred

from cytological studies (Chandler *et al.* 1986). At the same time, recent genomic analyses have
identified several extensive regions of very low recombination caused by large inversions segregating
in natural sunflower populations (Todesco *et al.* 2019, Huang *et al.* 2019). Mutations that segregate for
extended periods are unlikely to be strongly underdominant, and these inversions are associated with
multiple adaptive alleles (Todesco *et al.* 2019), which is consistent with a role for selection in their
origin or maintenance.

598

599 Non-random chromosomal rearrangement

600

601 We also found that some sunflower chromosomes are involved in more translocations than others. 602 This pattern has been observed in wheat (Badaeva et al. 2007) and breakpoint reuse is a common 603 phenomenon in comparative studies of karyotypes (Pevzner and Tesler 2003, Bailey et al. 2004, 604 Murphy et al. 2005, Larkin et al. 2009). Many studies support the idea that chromosomal regions with 605 greater sequence similarity are more likely to recombine and thus potentially generate novel 606 chromosomal arrangements. Some of the clearest examples of this come from the polyploidy 607 literature, where chromosomes with ancestral homology are more likely to recombine (Nicolas et al. 608 2007, Marone et al. 2012, Mason et al. 2014, Tennessen et al. 2014, Nguepjop et al. 2016). However, 609 centromeres and other repetitive regions can also affect the rate of mutations that cause 610 chromosomal rearrangements (Hardison et al. 2003, Murphy et al. 2005, Raskina et al. 2008, Molnár et 611 al. 2010, Vitte et al. 2014, Ayers-Alves et al. 2017, Li et al. 2017, Corbett-Detig et al. 2019). Given that 612 sunflowers have several genome duplications and a burst of transposable element activity in their 613 evolutionary history (Barker et al. 2008, Kawakami et al. 2011, Staton et al. 2012, Barker et al. 2016, 614 Badouin et al. 2017) it is plausible that ancestral homology or repeat content could be associated with 615 translocation propensity.

616

Of the above possibilities, an association between repeated translocations and centromeres would be
particularly compelling. Beyond the repeat content of centromeres explaining non-random mutation
(Kawabe *et al.* 2006, Sun *et al.* 2017, but see Lin *et al.* 2018, Okita *et al.* 2019), the position and size of

620 centromeres on chromosomes is known to affect meiotic drive and thus the repositioning of 621 centromeres through rearrangement could cause non-random fixation of translocations (Kaszás et al. 622 1998, Chmátal et al. 2014, Zanders et al. 2014). The relative placement of centromeres has been 623 associated with chromosome evolution in Brassica (Schranz et al. 2006) and wheat (Badaeva et al. 624 2007), and associations between meiotic drive and chromosome evolution have been found in several 625 animal taxa (Bidau and Martí 2004, Palestis et al. 2004, Molina et al. 2014, Blackmon et al. 2019). In sunflower, we see some hints that centromeric repeats might be associated with repeated 626 627 translocation. Using the locations of the centromere-specific retrotransposon sequence, HaCEN-LINE 628 (Nagaki et al. 2015), to roughly identify the locations of centromeres in our reference, we find that 629 some rearrangement breakpoints, for example, the section of A16 with a different position in each 630 map, are close to putative centromeres (Fig S17-S20). Although a more thorough analysis of 631 centromeric repeat locations and their association with rearrangement breakpoints is required to draw 632 firm conclusions about the importance of centromeres to chromosomal evolution in sunflower, the 633 development of reference sequences for wild sunflower species is underway, which will allow those 634 and other associations to be confirmed. Further, it is time to directly test for meiotic drive in this 635 system by examining the transmission of rearrangements that affect centromeres in gametes produced 636 by plants that have heterozygous karyotypes.

637

638 Conclusion

639

640 Understanding the evolution of chromosomal rearrangements remains a key challenge in evolutionary 641 genetics. By developing new software to systematically detect synteny blocks and building new genetic 642 maps, we show that sunflowers exhibit rapid and non-random patterns of chromosomal evolution. 643 These data generate specific and testable hypotheses about chromosomal evolution in sunflower. We 644 believe that our work will spur additional studies of karyotypic evolution and diversity, and ultimately 645 lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between chromosomal evolution and 646 speciation.

647 Acknowledgments

648

We thank Jessica Barb for providing marker sequence data, Marcy Uyenoyama for help with our
random walk analysis, Greg Baute for sharing hybrid seed, Chris Grassa for growing seedlings and
sharing scripts, and both Marco Todesco and Nadia Chaidir for help in the lab. We also thank Jenn
Coughlan, Andrew MacDonald, Brook Moyers, Mariano Alvarez, Dolph Schluter, Darren Irwin, Sally
Otto, and three anonymous reviewers for thoughtful discussions and help with earlier drafts of this
manuscript. This work was supported by an NSERC Postgraduate Scholarship awarded to KLO and an
NSERC Discovery Grant awarded to LHR (327475).

656

657 Author contributions

658

659 KLO and LHR planned the study. KLO and KS designed and built the R package syntR. KLO made genetic

660 maps, carried out data analysis, and drafted the manuscript. All authors read, edited, and approved the

661 final manuscript.

662 References

- Amores A., J. Catchen, I. Nanda, W. Warren, R. Walter *et al.*, 2014 A RAD-tag genetic map for the
 platyfish (*Xiphophorus maculatus*) reveals mechanisms of karyotype evolution among teleost fish.
 Genetics 197: 625–641.
- Ayres-Alves T., A. L. Cardoso, C. Y. Nagamachi, L. M. de Sousa, J. C. Pieczarka *et al.*, 2017 Karyotypic
 evolution and chromosomal organization of repetitive DNA sequences in species of *Panaque*,
 Panaqolus, and *Scobinancistrus* (Siluriformes and Loricariidae) from the Amazon Basin. Zebrafish
 14: 251–260.
- Badaeva E. D., O. S. Dedkova, G. Gay, V. A. Pukhalskyi, A. V. Zelenin *et al.*, 2007 Chromosomal
 rearrangements in wheat: their types and distribution. Génome 50: 907–926.
- 673
- 674

- Badouin H., J. Gouzy, C. J. Grassa, F. Murat, S. E. Staton *et al.*, 2017 The sunflower genome provides
 insights into oil metabolism, flowering and Asterid evolution. Nature 546: 148-152.
- Bailey J. A., R. Baertsch, W. Kent, D. Haussler, and E. E. Eichler, 2004 Hotspots of mammalian
 chromosomal evolution. Genome Biology 5: R23–7.
- Barb J. G., J. E. Bowers, S. Renaut, J. I. Rey, S. J. Knapp *et al.*, 2014 Chromosomal evolution and patterns
 of introgression in *Helianthus*. Genetics 197: 969–979.
- Barker M. S., N. C. Kane, M. Matvienko, A. Kozik, R. W. Michelmore *et al.*, 2008 Multiple
 paleopolyploidizations during the evolution of the Compositae reveal parallel patterns of duplicate
 gene retention after millions of years. Molecular Biology and Evolution 25: 2445–2455.
- Barker M. S., Z. Li, T. I. Kidder, C. R. Reardon, Z. Lai *et al.*, 2016 Most Compositae (Asteraceae) are
 descendants of a paleohexaploid and all share a paleotetraploid ancestor with the Calyceraceae.
 American Journal of Botany 103: 1203–1211.
- Baute G. J., G. L. Owens, D. G. Bock, and L. H. Rieseberg, 2016 Genome-wide genotyping-by-sequencing
 data provide a high-resolution view of wild Helianthus diversity, genetic structure, and interspecies
 gene flow. American Journal of Botany 103: 2170-2177.
- Berdan E. L., G. M. Kozak, R. Ming, A. L. Rayburn, R. Kiehart *et al.*, 2014 Insight into genomic changes
 accompanying divergence: genetic linkage maps and synteny of *Lucania goodei* and *L. parva* reveal
 a Robertsonian fusion. G3: Genes | Genomes | Genetics 4: 1363–1372.
- Bhutkar A., S. W. Schaeffer, S. M. Russo, M. Xu, T. F. Smith *et al.*, 2008 Chromosomal rearrangement
 inferred from comparisons of 12 *Drosophila* genomes. Genetics 179: 1657–1680.
- Bidau C. J., and D. A. Martí, 2004 B chromosomes and Robertsonian fusions of *Dichroplus pratensis*(Acrididae): Intraspecific support for the centromeric drive theory. Cytogenet Genome Res 106:
 347–350.
- Bilton T. P., M. R.Schofield, M. A. Black, D. Chagné, P. L. Wilcox *et al.*, 2018 Accounting for errors in low
 coverage high-throughput sequencing data when constructing genetic maps using biparental
 outcrossed populations. Genetics 209: 65–76.
- Blackmon H., J. Justison, I. Mayrose, and E. E. Goldberg, 2019 Meiotic drive shapes rates of karyotype
 evolution in mammals. Evolution 73: 511–523.
- Bourque G., and P. A. Pevzner, 2002 Genome-scale evolution: reconstructing gene orders in the
 ancestral species. Genome Research 12: 26–36.
- Bowers J. E., E. Bachlava, R. L. Brunick, L. H. Rieseberg, S. J. Knapp *et al.*, 2012 Development of a 10,000
 locus genetic map of the sunflower genome based on multiple crosses. G3 2: 721–729.
- 707 Broman K. W., H. Wu, S. Sen, and G. A. Churchill, 2003 R/qtl: QTL mapping in experimental crosses.

- 708 Bioinformatics 19: 889–890.
- Burke J. M., Z. Lai, M. Salmaso, T. Nakazato, S. Tang *et al.*, 2004 Comparative mapping and rapid
 karyotypic evolution in the genus *Helianthus*. Genetics 167: 449–457.
- Chandler J. M., C. C. Jan, and B. H. Beard, 1986 Chromosomal differentiation among the annual
 Helianthus species. Systematic Botany 11: 354–371.
- Chen Z., Fu B., M. Jiang, and B. Zhu, 2009 On recovering syntenic blocks from comparative maps. J
 Comb Optim 18: 307–318.
- 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.
- Choi V., C. Zheng, Q. Zhu, and D. Sankoff, 2007 Algorithms for the extraction of synteny blocks from
 comparative maps, pp. 277–288 in *International Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics*.
 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Corbett-Detig R. B., I. Said, M. Calzetta, M. Genetti, J. McBroome *et al.*, 2019 Fine-mapping complex
 inversion breakpoints and investigating somatic pairing in the *Anopheles gambiae* species complex
 using proximity-ligation sequencing. Genetics 213: 1495–1511.
- da Silva W. O., J. C. Pieczarka, M. J. R. da Costa, M. A. Ferguson-Smith, P. C. M. O'Brien *et al.*, 2019
 Chromosomal phylogeny and comparative chromosome painting among *Neacomys* species
 (Rodentia, Sigmodontinae) from eastern Amazonia. BMC Evolutionary Biology 19: 1–13.
- Danecek P., A. Auton, G. Abecasis, C. A. Albers, E. Banks *et al.*, 1000 Genomes Project Analysis Group,
 2011 The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics 27: 2156–2158.
- Darling A. C. E., B. Mau, F. R. Blattner, and N. T. Perna, 2004 Mauve: multiple alignment of conserved
 genomic sequence with rearrangements. Genome Research 14: 1394–1403.
- DePristo M. A., E. Banks, R. Poplin, K. V. Garimella, J. R. Maguire *et al.*, 2011 A framework for variation
 discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data. Nat Genet 43: 491–501.
- Doyle J., and J. Doyle, 1987 A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh leaf tissue.
 Phytochem Bull 19: 11–15.
- Drillon G., A. Carbone, and G. Fischer, 2014 SynChro: A fast and easy tool to reconstruct and visualize
 synteny blocks along eukaryotic chromosomes. PLoS ONE 9: e92621–8.

Dvorak J., L. Wang, T. Zhu, C. M. Jorgensen, K. R. Deal *et al.*, 2018 Structural variation and rates of genome evolution in the grass family seen through comparison of sequences of genomes greatly differing in size. Plant J 95: 487–503.

- Ferguson-Smith M. A., and V. Trifonov, 2007 Mammalian karyotype evolution. Nat Rev Genet 8: 950–
 962.
- Ferriera J. V., 1980 Introgressive hybrisization between *Helanthus annuus* L. and *Helianthus petiolaris* Nutt. Mendeliana 4: 81–93.
- Fishman L., A. Stathos, P. M.Beardsley, C. F. Williams, and J. P. Hill, 2013 Chromosomal rearrangements
 and the genetics of reproductive barriers in *Mimulus* (monkey flowers). Evolution 67: 2547–2560.
- Flagel L. E., B. K. Blackman, L. Fishman, P. J. Monnahan, A. Sweigart *et al.*, 2019 GOOGA: A platform to
 synthesize mapping experiments and identify genomic structural diversity. PLoS Comput Biol 15:
 e1006949–25.
- Goel M., H. Sun, W. B. Jiao, and K. Schneeberger, 2019 SyRI: Finding genomic rearrangements and local
 sequence differences from whole- genome assemblies. Genome Biology 20: 1–13.
- Hackett C. A., and L. B. Broadfoot, 2003 Effects of genotyping errors, missing values and segregation
 distortion in molecular marker data on the construction of linkage maps. Heredity 90: 33–38.
- Hardison R. C., K. M. Roskin, S. Yang, M. Diekhans, W. J. Kent *et al.*, 2003 Covariation in frequencies of
 substitution, deletion, transposition, and recombination during eutherian evolution. Genome
 Research 13: 13–26.
- Heesacker A. F., E. Bachlava, R. L. Brunick, J. M. Burke, L. H. Rieseberg *et al.*, 2009 Karyotypic Evolution
 of the Common and Silverleaf Sunflower Genomes. The Plant Genome 2: 233–14.
- Heiser C. B. Jr, 1947 Hybridization between the sunflower species *Helianthus annuus* and *H. petiolaris*.
 Evolution 1: 249–262.
- Heiser C. B. Jr, 1948 Taxonomic and Cytological Notes on the Annual Species of *Helianthus*. Bulletin of
 the Torrey Botanical Club 75: 512–515.
- Heiser C. B. Jr, 1951 Hybridization in the annual sunflowers: *Helianthus annuus* x *H. argophyllus*. The
 American Naturalist 85: 65–72.
- Heiser C. B. Jr, 1961 Morphological and cytological variation in *Helianthus petiolaris* with notes on
 related species. Evolution 15: 247–258.
- Hoffmann A. A., and L. H. Rieseberg, 2008 Revisiting the impact of inversions in evolution: From
 population genetic markers to drivers of adaptive shifts and speciation? Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.
 39: 21–42.
- Huang K., R. L. Andrew, G. L. Owens, K. L. Ostevik, and L. H. Rieseberg, 2019 Multiple chromosomal
 inversions contribute to adaptive divergence of a dune sunflower ecotype. bioRxiv. doi:
 10.1101/829622 (Preprint posted November 4, 2019).

- Huang S., R. Li, Z. Zhang, L. Li, X. Gu *et al.*, 2009 The genome of the cucumber, *Cucumis sativus* L. Nat
 Genet 41: 1275–1281.
- Huchra J. P., and M. J. Geller, 1982 Groups of galaxies. I-Nearby groups. The Astrophysical Journal 257:
 423–437.
- Kaszás E., and J. B. Genetics, 1998 Meiotic transmission rates correlate with physical features of
 rearranged centromeres in maize. Genetics 150: 1683-1692.
- Kawabe A., B. Hansson, J. Hagenblad, A. Forrest, and D. Charlesworth, 2006 Centromere locations and
 associated chromosome rearrangements in *Arabidopsis lyrata* and *A. thaliana*. Genetics 173:
 1613–1619.

Kawakami T., P. Dhakal, A. N. Katterhenry, C. A. Heatherington, and M. C. Ungerer, 2011 Transposable
 element proliferation and genome expansion are rare in contemporary sunflower hybrid
 populations despite widespread transcriptional activity of LTR retrotransposons. Genome Biol Evol
 3: 156–167.

- 787 King M., 1987 Chromosomal rearrangements, speciation and the theoretical approach. Heredity 59: 1–
 6.
- 789 King M., 1993 *Species Evolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick M., and N. Barton, 2006 Chromosome inversions, local adaptation and speciation. Genetics
 173: 419–434.
- Lai Z., T. Nakazato, M. Salmaso, J. M. Burke, S. Tang *et al.*, 2005 Extensive chromosomal repatterning
 and the evolution of sterility barriers in hybrid sunflower species. Genetics 171: 291–303.
- Larkin D. M., G. Pape, R. Donthu, L. Auvil, M. Welge *et al.*, 2009 Breakpoint regions and homologous
 synteny blocks in chromosomes have different evolutionary histories. Genome Research 19: 770–
 777.
- Latta R. G., W. A. Bekele, C. P. Wight, and N. A. Tinker, 2019 Comparative linkage mapping of diploid,
 tetraploid, and hexaploid Avena species suggests extensive chromosome rearrangement in
 ancestral diploids. Scientific Reports 9: 1–12.
- Li H., 2013 Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. arXiv. doi:
 1303.3997v2. (Preprint posted May 26, 2013).
- Li H., and R. Durbin, 2010 Fast and accurate long-read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform.
 Bioinformatics 26: 589–595.

- Li S. F., T. Su, G. Q. Cheng, B. X. Wang, X. Li *et al.*, 2017 Chromosome evolution in connection with repetitive sequences and epigenetics in plants. Genes 8: 290–19.
- Lin C. Y., A. Shukla, J. Grady, J. Fink, E. Dray *et al.*, 2018 Translocation breakpoints preferentially occur
 in euchromatin and acrocentric chromosomes. Cancers 10: 13–19.
- Mandel J. R., S. Nambeesan, J. E. Bowers, L. F. Marek, D. Ebert *et al.*, 2013 Association mapping and the
 genomic consequences of selection in sunflower. PLoS Genetics 9: e1003378.
- Marone D., G. Laidò, A. Gadaleta, P.Colasuonno, D. B. M. Ficco *et al.* Mastrangelo A. M., 2012 A high density consensus map of A and B wheat genomes. Theor Appl Genet 125: 1619–1638.
- Martinez P. A., U. P. Jacobina, R. V. Fernandes, C. Brito, C. Penone *et al.* 2016 A comparative study on
 karyotypic diversification rate in mammals. Heredity 118: 366–373.
- Mason A. S., M. N. Nelson, J. Takahira, W. A. Cowling, G. M. Alves *et al.* 2014 The fate of chromosomes
 and alleles in an allohexaploid *Brassica* population. Genetics 197: 273–283.
- Mason C. M., 2018 How old are sunflowers? A molecular clock analysis of key divergences in the origin
 and diversification of *Helianthus* (Asteraceae). Int. J Plant Sci. 179: 182–191.
- Matvienko M., A. Kozik, L. Froenicke, D. Lavelle, B. Martineau *et al.*, 2013 Consequences of normalizing
 transcriptomic and genomic libraries of plant genomes using a duplex-specific nuclease and
 tetramethylammonium chloride. PLoS ONE 8: e55913–17.
- McKenna A., M. Hanna, E. Banks, A. Sivachenko, K. Cibulskis *et al.*, 2010 The Genome Analysis Toolkit:
 A MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. Genome Research
 20: 1297–1303.
- Molina W. F., P. A. Martinez, L. A. C. Bertollo, and C. J. Bidau, 2014 Evidence for meiotic drive as an
 explanation for karyotype changes in fishes. Marine Genomics 15: 29–34.
- Molnár I., M. Cifuentes, A. Schneider, E. Benavente, and M. Molnár-Láng, 2010 Association between
 simple sequence repeat-rich chromosome regions and intergenomic translocation breakpoints in
 natural populations of allopolyploid wild wheats. Annals of Botany 107: 65–76.
- Murphy W. J., D. M. Larkin, A. Everts-van der Wind, G. Bourque, G. Tesler *et al.*, 2005 Dynamics of
 mammalian chromosome evolution inferred from multispecies comparative maps. Science 309:
 613–617.
- Nagaki K., K. Tanaka, N. Yamaji, H. Kobayashi, and M. Murata, 2015 Sunflower centromeres consist of a
 centromere-specific LINE and a chromosome-specific tandem repeat. Front. Plant Sci. 6: 1-12.
- Navarro A., and N. H. Barton, 2003 Chromosomal speciation and molecular divergence--accelerated
 evolution in rearranged chromosomes. Science 300: 321–324.

- Nguepjop J. R., H. A. Tossim, J. M. Bell, J. F. Rami, S. Sharma *et al.* 2016 Evidence of genomic exchanges
 between homeologous chromosomes in a cross of peanut with newly synthetized allotetraploid
 hybrids. Front. Plant Sci. 7: 87–12.
- Nicolas S. D., G. L. Mignon, F. Eber, O. Coriton, H. Monod *et al.*, 2007 Homeologous recombination
 plays a major role in chromosome rearrangements that occur during meiosis of *Brassica napus* haploids. Genetics 175: 487–503.
- Noor M. A., K. L. Grams, L. A. Bertucci, and J. Reiland, 2001 Chromosomal inversions and the
 reproductive isolation of species. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 98: 12084–
 12088.
- Okita A. K., F. Zafar, J. Su, D. Weerasekara, T. Kajitani *et al.* 2019 Heterochromatin suppresses gross
 chromosomal rearrangements at centromeres by repressing Tfs1/TFIIS-dependent transcription.
 Communications Biology 2: 1–13.
- 848 Ostevik K. L., 2016 The ecology and genetics of adaptation and speciation in dune sunflowers.
- Ouellette L. A., R. W. Reid, S. G. Blanchard, and C. R Brouwer, 2017 LinkageMapView Rendering High
 Resolution Linkage and QTL Maps. Bioinformatics 34: 306-307.
- Palestis B. G., A. Burt, R. N. Jones, and R. Trivers, 2004 B chromosomes are more frequent in mammals
 with acrocentric karyotypes: Support for the theory of centromeric. drive. Proc. Biol. Sci. 271: 1–3.
- Pevzner P., and G. Tesler, 2003 Genome rearrangements in mammalian evolution: lessons from human
 and mouse genomes. Genome Research 13: 37–45.
- Poland J. A., P. J. Brown, M. E. Sorrells, and J. L. Jannink, 2012 Development of high-density genetic
 maps for barley and wheat using a novel two-enzyme genotyping-by-sequencing approach. PLoS
 ONE 7: e32253.
- Quillet M. C., N. Madjidian, Y. Griveau, H. Serieys, M. Tersac *et al.* 1995 Mapping genetic factors
 controlling pollen viability in an interspecific cross in *Helianthus* sect. *Helianthus*. Theor Appl Genet
 91: 1195–1202.
- Raduski A. R., L. Rieseberg, and J. Strasburg, 2010 Effective population size, gene flow, and species
 status in a narrow endemic sunflower, *Helianthus neglectus*, compared to its widespread sister
 species, *H. petiolaris*. IJMS 11: 492–506.
- Raskina O., J. C. Barber, E. Nevo, and A. Belyayev, 2008 Repetitive DNA and chromosomal
 rearrangements: speciation-related events in plant genomes. Cytogenet Genome Res 120: 351–
 357.
- Rieseberg L., 1991 Homoploid reticulate evolution in *Helianthus* (Asteraceae): evidence from ribosomal
 genes American Journal of Botany 78: 1218-1237.

- Rieseberg L. H., 2001 Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 16:
 351–358.
- Rieseberg L. H., C. R. Linder, and G. J. Seiler, 1995 Chromosomal and genic barriers to introgression in
 Helianthus. Genetics 141: 1163–1171.
- Rogers C. E., T. E. Thompson, and G. J. Seiler, 1982 Sunflowers species of the United States. National
 Sunflower Association.
- Rohland N., and D. Reich, 2012 Cost-effective, high-throughput DNA sequencing libraries for
 multiplexed target capture. Genome Research 22: 939–946.
- Rueppell O., R. Kuster, K. Miller, B. Fouks, S. Rubio Correa *et al.*, 2016 A new metazoan recombination
 rate record and consistently high recombination rates in the honey bee genus *Apis* accompanied
 by frequent inversions but not translocations. Genome Biol Evol 8: 3653-3660.
- Sambatti J. B. M., J. L. Strasburg, D. Ortiz-Barrientos, E. J. Baack, and L. H. Rieseberg, 2012 Reconciling
 extremely strong barriers with high levels of gene exchange in annual sunflowers. Evolution 66:
 1459–1473.
- Schlautman B., L. Diaz-Garcia, G. Covarrubias-Pazaran, N. Schlautman, N. Vorsa *et al.*, 2017
 Comparative genetic mapping reveals synteny and collinearity between the American cranberry
 and diploid blueberry genomes. Molecular Breeding 38: 1-19.
- Schranz M. E., T. Mitchell-Olds, and M. A. Lysak, 2006 The ABC's of comparative genomics in the
 Brassicaceae: Building blocks of crucifer genomes. Trends in Plant Science 11: 535–542.
- Searle J. B., 1993 Chromosomal hybrid zones in eutherian mammals, pp. 309–353 in Hybrid zones and
 the evolutionary process, edited by R. G. Harrison. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Shagina I., E. Bogdanova, I. Mamedov, Y. Lebedev, S. Lukyanov *et al.* 2010 Normalization of genomic
 DNA using duplex-specific nuclease. Biotechniques 48: 455–459.
- Sinha A. U., and J. Meller, 2007 Cinteny: Flexible analysis and visualization of synteny and genome
 rearrangements in multiple organisms. BMC Bioinformatics 8: 82–9.
- Soderlund C. M. Bomhoff, and W. M. Nelson, 2011 SyMAP v3.4: A turnkey synteny system with
 application to plant genomes. Nucleic Acids Research 39: e68–e68.
- Stathos A., and L. Fishman, 2014 Chromosomal rearrangements directly cause underdominant F1
 pollen sterility in *Mimulus lewisii-Mimulus cardinalis* hybrids. Evolution 68: 3109–3119.

Staton S. E., B. H. Bakken, B. K. Blackman, M. A. Chapman, N. C. Kane *et al.*, 2012 The sunflower
 (*Helianthus annuus* L.) genome reflects a recent history of biased accumulation of transposable
 elements. The Plant Journal 72: 142–153.

- Stephens J. D., W. L. Rogers, C. M. Mason, L. A. Donovan, and R. L. Malmberg, 2015 Species tree
 estimation of diploid *Helianthus* (Asteraceae) using target enrichment. American Journal of Botany
 102: 910–920.
- Strasburg J., and L. Rieseberg, 2008 Molecular demographic history of the annual sunflowers
 Helianthus annuus and *H. petiolaris*—Large effective population sizes and rates of long-term gene
 flow. Evolution 62: 1936–1950.
- Sun S., V. Yadav, R. B. Billmyre, C. A. Cuomo, M. Nowrousian *et al.* 2017 Fungal genome and mating
 system transitions facilitated by chromosomal translocations involving intercentromeric
 recombination. PLoS Biol 15: e2002527–31.
- Tang S., J. K. Yu, M. B. Slabaugh, D. K. Shintani, and S. J. Knapp, 2002 Simple sequence repeat map of
 the sunflower genome. TAG Theoretical and Applied Genetics 105: 1124–1136.
- Taylor J., and D. Butler, 2017 RPackage ASMap: Efficient Genetic Linkage Map Construction and
 Diagnosis. J. Stat. Soft. 79: 1–29.
- Tennessen J. A., R. Govindarajulu, T. L. Ashman, and A. Liston, 2014 Evolutionary origins and dynamics
 of octoploid strawberry subgenomes revealed by dense targeted capture linkage maps. Genome
 Biol Evol 6: 3295–3313.
- Todesco M., G. L. Owens, N. Bercovich, J. S. Légaré, S. Soudi *et al.* 2019 Massive haplotypes underlie
 ecotypic differentiation in sunflowers. bioRxiv. doi: 10.1101/790279 (Preprint posted October 2, 2019)
- Trickett A. J., and R. K. Butlin, 1994 Recombination suppressors and the evolution of new species.
 Heredity 73: 339–345.
- Van der Auwera G. A., M. O. Carneiro, C. Hartl, R. Poplin, G. del Angel *et al.*, 2013 From fastQ data to
 high-confidence variant calls: The genome analysis toolkit best practices pipeline. Curr. Protoc.
 Bioinformatics 43: 11.10.1–33.
- Vitte C., M. A. Fustier, K. Alix, and M. I. Tenaillon, 2014 The bright side of transposons in crop evolution.
 Brief. Funct. Genomics 13: 276–295.
- Vogel J. P., D. F. Garvin, T. C. Mockler, J. Schmutz, D. Rokhsar *et al.*, 2010 Genome sequencing and
 analysis of the model grass *Brachypodium distachyon*. Nature 463: 763–768.
- Weiss-Schneeweiss H., and G. M. Schneeweiss, 2012 Karyotype Diversity and Evolutionary Trends in
 Angiosperms, pp. 209-230 in *Plant Genome Diversity Volume 2: Physical Structure, Behaviour and Evolution of Plant Genomes.* Edited by J. Greilhuber, J. Dolezel and J. F. Wendel. Springer Science &
 Business Media
- Whelan E. D., 1979 Interspecific hybrids between *Helianthus petiolaris* Nutt. and *H. annuus* L.: Effect of
 backcrossing on meiosis. Euphytica 28: 297-308.

- 935 White M. J. D., 1973 Animal Cytology and Evolution. Cambridge University Press, London.
- 936 White M. J. D., 1978 *Modes of Speciation*. W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco.
- Wu F., and S. D. Tanksley, 2010 Chromosomal evolution in the plant family Solanaceae. BMC Genomics11: 182.
- Yeaman S., 2013 Genomic rearrangements and the evolution of clusters of locally adaptive loci.
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 110: E1743–E1751.
- Yeaman S., and M. Whitlock, 2011 The genetic architecture of adaptation under migration-selection
 balance. Evolution 65: 1897–1911.
- Yogeeswaran K., A. Frary, T. L. York, A. Amenta, A. H. Lesser *et al.* 2005 Comparative genome analyses
 of *Arabidopsis* spp.: inferring chromosomal rearrangement events in the evolutionary history of *A. thaliana*. Genome Research 15: 505–515.
- Zanders S. E., M. T. Eickbush, J. S. Yu, J. W. Kang, K. R. Fowler *et al.* 2014 Genome rearrangements and
 pervasive meiotic drive cause hybrid infertility in fission yeast. eLife 3: 419–23.
- 248 Zhulidov P. A., 2004 Simple cDNA normalization using kamchatka crab duplex-specific nuclease. Nucleic
 249 Acids Research 32: e37.