Emergence and influence of sequence bias in evolutionarily malleable, mammalian tandem arrays

Margarita V Brovkina[1,*], Margaret A. Chapman[2,*], Matthew L. Holding[3], and E. Josephine Clowney[4,5, #]

1. Graduate Program in Cellular and Molecular Biology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

2. Neurosciences Graduate Program, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

3. Life Sciences Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

4. Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

5. Michigan Neuroscience Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

To whom correspondence should be addressed:
jclowney@umich.edu

Abstract

The radiation of mammals at the extinction of the dinosaurs produced a plethora of new forms—as diverse as bats, dolphins, and elephants—in only 10-20 million years. Behind the scenes, adaptation to new niches is accompanied by extensive innovation in large families of genes that allow animals to contact the environment, including chemosensors, xenobiotic enzymes, and immune and barrier proteins. Genes in these "outward-looking" families are allelically diverse among humans and exhibit tissue-specific and sometimes stochastic expression. Here, we show that outward-looking genes are clustered in tandem arrays, enriched in AT-biased isochores, and lack CpG islands in their promoters. Models of mammalian genome evolution have not incorporated the sharply different functions and transcriptional patterns of genes in AT- versus GC-biased regions. To examine the relationship between gene family expansion, sequence content, and functional diversification, we use population genetic data and comparative analysis. First, we find that AT bias can emerge with gene family expansion *in cis*. Second, human genes in AT-biased isochores or with GC-poor promoters experience relatively low rates of *de novo* point mutation today but are enriched for functional variants. Finally, we find that isochores containing gene clusters exhibit low rates of recombination. We hypothesize that the depletion of GC bases in outward-facing gene clusters results from tolerance of sequence variation and low recombination. In turn, high AT content exerts a profound effect on their chromatin organization and transcriptional regulation.

Introduction

Reports of newly sequenced genomes frequently describe gene families that have "bloomed," undergoing explosive diversification in the focal species (1–3). Gene blooms are expansions *in cis* that result in arrays of dozens or even hundreds of genes. During gametogenesis, these tandem duplication events are thought to arise via incorrect crossovers between paralogues or via non-homologous repair of chromosome breaks (4). The resulting expansions can confer unique life history traits recognized as definitive characteristics of the species: Examples include Cytochrome p450 genes for plant detoxification in koala and insects, lipocalins for pheromone communication in mouse, NK cell receptors for viral response in bats, keratins for whale baleen, venom production in snakes, and amylase copy number for starch consumption in modern humans (1,2,5–11). The definitive gene family of mammals, the caseins, arose through local duplication of enamel genes (12). In the mouse, we have shown that genes in copy-number-variable blooms exhibit extremely high AT content in their promoters and are often located in AT-biased regions of the genome (13).

GC content in mammalian genomes varies markedly at the megabase scale (14). Since the earliest days of cytology, variation in staining patterns of DNA-binding dyes were apparent across the nucleus (heterochromatin and euchromatin) or along chromosomes (banding patterns). Banding patterns served as the original genetic maps and allowed scientists to link genetic phenotypes to physical positions in DNA (15). Banding patterns were found to reflect local variation in AT/GC content: Giemsa-staining "G bands" are AT-biased, and Quinacrine-staining "Q bands" are GC-biased (15–18). Early reports suggested that G-bands were depleted for genes; that genes in G-bands tended to be "tissue-specific;" and that genes in Q-bands tended to be "housekeeping genes" (15,19). Moreover, human-chimp divergence rates were found to be higher in AT-rich G-bands than in GC-rich Q bands (20). In the genome sequencing era, breaks between bands were found to correspond to local transitions in GC content, and bands were found to be composed of smaller "isochores" with locally consistent GC content (21,22). While

isochore definition has been debated, a representative classification breaks the human genome up
into ~3000 isochores of 100kb-5Mb that range from 35-58% GC (22–25).
The variation in GC content along the chromosome that is observed in mammals is not a
general feature of metazoan, animal, or even vertebrate genomes. Both average GC content and
the amount of local variation show wide divergence across clades (26,27), leading to
adaptationist speculation that isochore structure serves a function related to endothermy (28).
However, consensus has emerged that GC-biased gene conversion (gBGC) following meiotic
recombination, which occurs in most eukaryotes, is one important contributor to isochore
emergence in mammals (26,29). In this process, crossovers are statistically more likely to result
in gene conversion towards more GC-rich sequences, resulting in a higher likelihood of
inheriting higher-GC alleles. As stated by Pouyet and colleagues, "The gBGC model predicts
that the GC-content of a given genomic segment should reflect its average long-term
recombination rate over tens of million years" (30,31). In this model, the isochores themselves
do not serve an adaptive function, but rather have emerged due to the molecular genetic
("neutral") forces of meiosis. Over evolutionary time, the GC-increasing effect of recombination
is counteracted by the AT-increasing effect of point mutation due to mutation of fragile cytosines
to thymines (32–37). As the rate of recombination and cytosine loss may themselves be
influenced by sequence context (i.e. recombination more likely in GC-rich regions, cytosine
mutation more common in AT-rich regions), positive feedback could have caused large genomic
regions to diverge (20,30,32,38). However, the influence of these neutral forces on the genes
contained within AT- versus GC-biased isochores has not been described.
Here, we examine the local and isochore-level AT/GC content of human protein-coding
genes. Genes located in AT-rich regions of the genome have unique and consistent
characteristics: They are copy-number-variable families located in tandem arrays, are expressed
in terminally differentiated cells, are cell surface or secreted proteins, lack CpG islands in their
promoters, and often have stochastic or variegated expression. These protein families are
overwhelmingly involved in the "input-output" functions of an organism: sensation of the
environment, protection from the environment, consumption of the environment, and production
of bodily fluids. AT- versus GC-skewed isochores differ in their replication timing and histone
marks, they associate in nuclear space with other isochores of the same type, and they occupy
different domains within the nucleus (16,39–41). The distinct treatment of AT- versus GC-rich
isochores by the molecular machinery of the mammalian cell means that the genes located in
AT-rich isochores must experience distinct molecular events from those located in GC-rich
isochores.
Next, we ask how mammalian genes with outward-looking functions came to be located
in AT-rich regions of the genome. By comparing gene blooms of different sizes within the
human genome and across mammalian species, we find that AT content is not necessarily
inherited from the ancestral species but can emerge with cluster expansion. Many of the
mutagenic and repair processes that contribute to the neutral mutation spectrum are likely to
differ in strength across AT-rich and GC-rich regions (reviewed in (42)). Using human
population genetic data, we analyze allelic variation, patterns of point mutation, and
recombination in human genes located in AT- versus GC-biased isochores. We find that genes in
paralogous clusters are subject to less recombination than genes located near non-paralogues.
Recombination may be dangerous in gene clusters due to the potential for chromosome
rearrangements or within-cluster ectopic exchange that leads to duplications or deletions. It could
also separate genes in large families from locus control regions they depend on for expression.

In addition, we find that while genes in AT-biased isochores have high sequence diversity among humans and divergence across species, they currently exhibit relatively low rates of *de-novo* point mutation, as expected from the neutral mutation spectrum. Instead, they appear to have accumulated sequence variants over evolutionary time. These genes also lack CpG islands in their promoters. We hypothesize that the functional roles of genes whose protein products interface with unpredictable and rapidly changing molecules in the environment ("outward-looking genes") make them particularly likely to tolerate point mutations. Lack of purifying selection on these genes is expected to shift GC content down over evolutionary time due to deamination of cytosine leading to C->T transitions (42); intolerance of recombination would prevent gBGC from shifting GC content back up (37). We propose a model in which reduced recombination and relaxation of selection on point mutations act together to strand arrays of outward-looking paralogues in wells of low GC content (Figure 1). Loss of CpG islands and residence in AT-rich genomic regions predisposes these genes to exotic forms of highly tissue-specific transcriptional regulation (43–47).

Figure 1: Outward- versus inward- looking genes (A) Summary of inward-looking and outward-looking gene families and their genomic distinctions. This table is inspired by (48). Descriptions derive from our analyses here and from references cited throughout the text. (B) Model of possible relationships between expansion of gene families in cis, genomic architecture, selective forces, and mode of expression.

Results

Characterizing a set of human isochores and their gene contents

We first comprehensively characterized the types of genes located in AT- versus GC-biased isochores and assessed if genes in AT-biased isochores are more likely to have numerous paralogues as neighbors. Isochore boundaries have been computed for previous genome assemblies, including for hg38 (22–24,49). While previous methods of isochore annotation binned the genome into 100kb pieces or used manual inspection to annotate isochore ends, we used a segmentation algorithm which detects transitions in GC content and created a UCSC Genome Browser track for easy visualization of isochore assignments versus other genomic elements (50). Cozzi et al compare various methods of isochore assignment, including GC Profile, showing that differences are subtle and are most prevalent in the mid-ranges of GC

content. We tested three resolutions and selected a map that visually matched 100kb-Mb
transitions in GC content using the %GC track on the UCSC Genome Browser (Fig 2A,B). At
this resolution, we call 4328 isochores; these range from ~30-70% GC and most are between
100kb and 5Mb (Figure 1C, D, S2A-C, Supplemental Tables 1 and 2).
We next defined the home isochore of each gene in the NCBI MANE set. The MANE set
includes one promoter and splice isoform for each intact, protein-coding gene and omits
pseudogenes and complex "gene parts" such as V, D, and J segments of the B and T cell
receptors (51). On average, higher-GC isochores were more likely to contain protein-coding
genes and had higher gene density (Figure 2C, Figure S2A, B) (15). To compare features across
isochores, we ordered isochores by GC% and divided them into ten groups (deciles) of ~400. To
test whether tandemly arrayed "gene blooms" were associated with AT-rich isochores, we used
Shannon's H to measure gene name prefix diversity in isochores with at least ten genes (Figure
2D). Gene names were least diverse in AT-rich isochores, consistent with the presence of tandem
arrays in these isochores. We extended our analysis to isochores with fewer genes (at least five)
and again found that gene arrays were less common in high-GC isochores (Figure 2E, S2H,I).
While AT-rich isochores are longer, gene diversity is lower in AT-rich isochores across the
length distribution and for isochores with different numbers of genes (Figure S2F, G). Arrays in
AT-rich isochores contained more paralogues, and the kinds of proteins present in AT-rich arrays
versus GC-rich arrays were different (Figure 2E, S2F): Arrays in AT-rich isochores often served
sensory, digestive, or barrier functions, while arrays in higher-GC isochores most often
contained *HOX* and *ZNF* transcription factors or arrays of histones (Figure 2E, S2I).
Only 25% of genes are located in isochores <40% GC. What sorts of gene families have
bloomed in these isochores? As GO analysis is biased by the annotations that are available,
especially for extremely tissue-specific genes, we simply searched for common gene name
prefixes in isochores <40% GC (Figure 2F). Gene families with at least four members in high-
AT isochores were overwhelmingly involved in chemosensation (*OR, TAAR, TAS2R, MS4*);
xenobiotic metabolism (e.g. *AMY1, UGT2, ADH*); and immune, defense, and barrier functions
(e.g. *KLR, IFN, DSC/DSG*). Human ORs were also shown previously to be located in AT-biased
isochores (52). Examples of high-GC isochores with diverse gene members and high-AT
isochores with repetitive gene members are shown in Figure 2A, B and Figure S2D,E. While
immunoglobulin parts do not appear in the MANE gene set, arrays of immunoglobulin V regions
are also highly AT-biased (Figure S2G). These analyses demonstrate that AT-biased regions of
the human genome contain tandem arrays of genes with outward-looking functions. We invite
readers to explore these patterns further on our TrackHub:
http://genome.ucsc.edu/s/mbrovkin/hg38.

190
Figure 2: AT-rich isochores in the human genome contain tandem arrays of genes with
outward-looking functions (A, B) UCSC Genome Browser screenshots showing GC%
trajectory (53), CpG islands (54), our isochore calls, and simplified gene models. Gene models
are colored according to k-means clusters described below. Gene name prefix diversity
(Shannon's H) is shown for the highlighted isochores. (C) Relationship between isochore GC%
and gene contents. Isochores shown in A, B are highlighted. Colors show how we binned
isochores into deciles according to GC%. Dashed line shows the mean GC content of the human
genome (41%). (D) Boxplots representing gene name diversity (Shannon's H) of gene-rich

isochores across GC% deciles shown in (C). Red points indicate the mean prefix diversity of the
decile; black lines show medians. Here and throughout, most groups are statistically different
from one another, except for adjoining groups; full statistical comparisons are presented in
Supplemental Table 3. (E) Comparison of number of genes in an isochore versus number of
different gene name prefixes represented in that isochore, for isochores of at least five genes.
Each dot is an isochore; isochores falling below the trend line contain clusters of genes with the
same prefix. Isochores are labeled by the most common gene name prefix in that isochore. (F)
Gene families with at least four members in isochores <40% GC. 25% of all genes are in
isochores less than 40% GC (black line). Red bars depict proportions of genes with that prefix
that are located in <40% GC isochores. Gene family prefixes shown in black text are enriched in
AT-rich isochores, while those shown in grey text (e.g. *KRTAP*, *TRIM*, *SCN*) have multiple
family members in AT-rich isochores but are not enriched there. Functions of these gene families
are marked at left, and total number of genes with that prefix in the MANE set are shown at
right.

213
Figure S2 Characterization of human genomic isochores. (A-C) Box and whisker plots
describe the relationship between isochore GC% and gene number (A), gene density (B) and
isochore length (C). Isochores are binned into deciles according to GC content with decile 10
representing high GC and decile 1 representing high AT. (D,E) UCSC Genome Browser
screenshots showing additional example isochores. Gene models are colored according to k-
means clusters described below. (D) This isochore is AT-rich and contains a gene bloom; all the

genes in this isochore have the same prefix, so prefix diversity (Shannon's H) is low. (E) This
isochore is GC-rich and contains genes from a variety of families, so diversity is high. (F,G)
Relationship between isochore length (F) and gene count (G) and gene prefix diversity. Isochores
are labeled by most common occurring gene prefix. (H) Full graph in Figure 2E including all
gene-containing isochores. Spearmann correlation values per isochore deciles are shown on the
right. (I) Residuals (i.e. distance of each point from regression line) of graphs in Figure 2E, S2H.
(J) The *IGH* locus, containing V, D, J, and common regions of human IgH. V, D, and J regions
are classified as "gene parts" and are not represented in the MANE set; however, the V repeats,
where transcription initiates, are in a single AT-rich isochore and lack CpG islands.
229
Categorizing human genes according to local patterns of AT/GC content
We show above that tandemly arrayed genes serving outward-looking functions are
enriched in AT-rich regions of the human genome, as they are in mouse (13). We sought next to
ask whether the regulatory and transcribed regions of genes, which occupy a fraction of genome
space, also vary in GC content across different kinds of genes, and whether GC content of local
gene features follow that of the isochore context. The null expectation of this analysis is different
from a statistical genetic versus a molecular point of view. From a statistical standpoint, the
expectation would be that GC% would co-vary between gene parts (e.g, flanking, promoter,
coding sequence) and their isochore context. From a molecular point of view, transcribed units
and regulatory regions would be expected to have a GC content aligned with their regulatory or
protein-coding function, and would not necessarily match their genomic location. We calculated
GC% in 50bp sliding windows along the transcriptional unit (transcription start site to
transcription end site, TSS-TES) and 1kb flanking regions for genes in the MANE set (51,53).
Our analysis here includes introns, but clustering on exons and flanking regions produced similar
results (Figure S3B). We used iterative k-means clustering to group the 18,640 MANE genes
into 3x3 sets (Figure 3A, S3A). The top-level clusters (1-, 2-, 3-) reflect overall differences in
AT content in different genes (Figure S3A), while the subclusters (1.1, 1.2, 1.3 etc, Figure 3A)
reflect variation in AT content of the promoter, transcriptional unit, and 3' region. To capture
both the broad isochore context of genes and their local sequence features, we use both the
isochore AT/GC metric and the local sequence-based k-means clustering throughout this study;
each gene in the MANE set is assigned uniquely to one home isochore and one k-means cluster
(isochore deciles 1-10, red-blue palette; k-means clusters 1.1-3.3, rainbow palette). Cluster and
isochore assignments and other gene-linked data are provided in Supplemental Tables 4 and 5.
The power of this approach is that it captures patterns of feature GC% in relation to one
another: For most gene categories, a sharp rise in GC content marks the approach of the TSS,
while the transcribed region and the region 3' of the TES share lower GC content. This GC rise
at the TSS clearly corresponds to the promoter. In this context, the paltry GC enrichment at the
promoters of genes in cluster 3.3 (and to a lesser extent 3.1) is extremely stark (Figure 3A).
Based on high-confidence annotation of transcription start sites, we showed previously
that mouse olfactory receptor promoters share this GC-poor pattern (13). At that time, the TSS's
of other highly tissue-specific genes had not been mapped. Current human annotations in the
MANE set are high-confidence, curated gene models. Nevertheless, many of the genes in cluster
3.3 are extremely tissue-specific (see below) and have less supporting mRNA data than more
widely expressed genes. We identified 240 genes in the MANE set (1.3%) that lack annotated 5'
UTRs, i.e. where the annotated transcription start site and translation start site are the same.
While these were indeed mostly contained in cluster 3.3 (150 of 1636 genes in 3.3, 9%), there

was no difference in promoter GC content between these suspect gene models and other genes in cluster 3.3 (data not shown). Indeed, our manual inspection of available RNA data for a subset of these genes suggests that the transcription start sites are correct, but that translation likely initiates at a downstream ATG.

We next examined how a gene's isochore GC context relates to the sequence content of its promoter and coding region. We found that patterns of local GC content of genes predicted the GC content of their home isochore, consistent with the statistical genetic null hypothesis, but very surprising considering the functional implications (Figure 3B). The GC-content of a gene with its flanking regions (gene extent with 25kb on each side) correlated closely with the GC content of its whole isochore (Figure S3C). Individually, promoter and coding sequence GC% were also positively correlated with isochore sequence content, but the correlation coefficients were weaker: A subset of genes in AT-rich isochores have GC-rich promoters or GC-rich coding sequences (Figure S3D, E).

Genes in clusters 3.1 and 3.3, lacking GC enrichment in their promoters, were highly enriched for the same functional categories as were genes in AT-rich isochores: chemosensation, xenobiosis, and defense/barriers. Indeed, as can be seen in Figure 1A, B and Figure S2D, sometimes entire arrays were members of cluster 3.3 (brown color). To systematically test this, we plotted the promoter GC content distribution of genes in categories we term "outward-looking" (chemosensation, defense, xenobiosis, barriers) versus "inward-looking" (e.g. transcription, kinase function, morphogens). Outward-looking genes have AT-rich promoters while inward-looking genes have GC-rich or average promoters (Figure 3C). We manually annotated common prefixes and enrichment of genes in cluster 3.3 (Figure 3D): This group included all the chemosensory families, many sets of digestive and detoxifying enzymes, and several receptor arrays in the immune system and skin. It also included clustered protocadherins, which share transcriptional regulation patterns with chemosensors. In accordance with the preponderance of tandemly arrayed genes found in cluster 3.3, we found that genes in this cluster were housed in fewer unique isochores and had lower name diversity than those in the other k-means clusters (Figure 3E, S3C).

Finally, we asked whether being located near paralogues could predict local sequence features (Figure 3F). Indeed, genes near 1-4 neighbors with the same prefix had more AT-rich promoters than genes not located near paralogous genes, and genes with more than four same-prefix neighbors had AT-elevated promoters, coding regions, and flanking regions compared to both genes in small clusters and singletons. The striking coordination of isochore, promoter, and coding sequence AT content in tandemly arrayed "outward-looking" gene families prompted us to investigate how this pattern relates to the evolution of tandem arrays.

301
Figure 3: Genes with outward-looking functions have high local AT content. (A) GC content
trajectory for human protein-coding genes in the MANE set. Genes were subdivided by iterative
k-means clustering. At top, the average GC content trajectory for each k-means cluster is shown

as a line graph. At bottom, each gene is a row and GC content across the transcriptional unit and
flanking regions is depicted from red (high AT) to blue (high GC). Rainbow colors assigned to
each k-means cluster here will be used throughout. (B) Relationship between k-means cluster
assignment and home isochore GC% for each gene in the MANE set. Red lines depict medians.
(C) GO term distribution by promoter GC content for genes in the MANE set. Genes with
immune, barrier, chemosensory, and xenobiotic functions have AT-skewed promoters. Genes
with developmental and intracellular functions have GC-skewed promoters. Grey shading shows
promoter GC content distribution of the whole MANE set. (D) Gene name prefixes enriched in
cluster 3.3. Families shown have at least four members in cluster 3.3; proportion of the family
located in this cluster is depicted in brown bars. Less than 10% of genes are in cluster 3.3 ("all").
(E) Gene prefix diversity (Shannon's H) is lowest in cluster 3.3. (F) Distribution of promoter,
intron, flanking sequence, and coding sequence GC% across genes which do not have paralogous
neighbors in their home isochore (gray, genes with 0 tandem neighbors), genes which exist in
small local duplications (red, genes with 1-4 tandem neighbors), and genes which exist in large
multigene arrays (brown, genes with 5 or more tandem neighbors). A subset of genes without
introns appear as 0's.
321

Figure S3: Relationship between GC content of local gene features and the home isochore.
(A-B) Heatmaps displaying GC% over 50bp sliding windows calculated across genes. Graphs in (A) include introns, graphs in (B) exclude introns. Clusters were determined by k-means. Summary line plots depict mean GC% across clusters. <10 genes switched clusters when introns were excluded. (C-F) 2D histograms depicting the relationship between (C) flanking, (D) promoter, (E) coding region, and GC percent of "home" isochore for each gene in the MANE set. (F) Relationship between promoter GC percent and coding sequence GC percent. "Flanking region" spans from 25kb upstream of TSS to 25kb downstream of TES. Correlation coefficient (R^2) and trend (red line) are shown. (G) Number of unique isochores housing genes in each k-means cluster. Genes in the more extreme k-means clusters are contributed by fewer isochores.

Increasing AT content during evolutionary expansion of tandem arrays

As shown above, we find that both the regional and local AT content is high in tandemly arrayed gene clusters in human. AT bias could have emerged as gene families expanded or could have been pre-existing and supported molecular mechanisms of gene duplication. To ask whether AT content rises with the number of paralogous genes in a tandem array, we sought to track copy-number-variable tandem arrays across mammals. Assessing the evolution of tandem arrays is difficult, as large proportions of local paralogues can be species-specific duplications (Figure S4C and (55–58)). Therefore, instead of seeking to identify true homologous genes across different mammalian species, we used synteny analysis to follow whole arrays over evolutionary time. We searched for large gene arrays in human that could be identified across diverse mammals using microsynteny, where conserved heterologous genes serve as "bookends" bounding the ends of the paralgous tandem array.

While copy-number-invariable gene arrays, such as the HOX clusters, were easy to track across all mammals, as expected, the copy-number-variable gene arrays that would be informative for this analysis showed frequent assembly errors, micro-inversions, and array invasions by other heterologous genes. For example, while we observed that the expanded KLR array of NK cell receptors in the fruit bat *Rousettus aegyptiacus* and pheromone-associated MUP array in *Mus musculus* each had sharply higher AT content than surrounding genomic regions, each array had a large assembly gap (9,59). While this limited the number (and, indeed, the extremity) of arrays that we were able to track, we identified six copy-number-variable arrays that were suitable for analysis: An OR array adjacent to the hemoglobin beta genes (60); the Cyp2ABGFST cluster of xenobiotic enzymes; the SERPINA cluster of defensive protease inhibitors; the "epidermal differentiation complex" (EDC), containing skin proteins in the LCE, S100, and SPRR families; and two clusters of Keratin-associated proteins (KRTAPs) which form epidermal appendages such as hair, nails, and claws. These six clusters have diverse median GC content as can be seen in Figure 4A-H. We also included the copy-number-invariable HOXA cluster for comparison.

For each of these clusters, we defined bookend genes as indicators of synteny that must be present for a particular species to be included in analysis. In mammals for which we could find these bookends on the same scaffold or chromosome, we computed the number of genes between bookends, spot-checking species whose counts were markedly higher than those of other species. The number of paralogues in each cluster is plotted across the mammalian clade in Figure S4C, showing the frequency of lineage-specific cluster expansions and contractions. Our full annotations of the contents of these clusters are provided in supplemental Table 6.

For each cluster in each species, we calculated the GC% between the bookend genes;
relationships between GC% and gene count appeared to be log-linear. We performed
phylogenetic least squares (PGLS) analysis to test for a relationship between GC content and
log(paralog number) while controlling for phylogenetic relatedness in the multi-species dataset
(Figure 4A-H). For the OR, EDC, and SERPINA clusters, AT content rose significantly with
paralogue number (PGLS *P < 0.05*), suggesting that AT content can rise as the number of
paralogs in tandem arrays grows. Certain arrays in certain species will have latent assembly or
annotation errors; however, for the HBB-OR array, we manually counted a subset of species in
parallel and saw the same trend (Figure S4A). The HOXA cluster showed variation in GC%
despite maintaining the same number of paralogs in the cluster over evolutionary time; this
variation appears to be predicted by evolutionary variation in the length of the cluster (i.e.
number of base pairs between bookends, not shown). We were able to follow the HBB-OR
cluster to non-mammalian amniotes, and found a sharp rise in GC content as the number of ORs
in the region melted to 0 (Figure S4A, B).
The raw GC% of each cluster was poorly correlated with variation in genome-wide GC
content across species (Figure 4I, J). However, each cluster type maintained a consistent
relationship to the overall GC% of the genome: Across diverse mammalian species, the OR
cluster and KRTAP cluster were almost always more AT-rich than the genome as a whole, while
the other five clusters were almost always more GC-rich than the genome as a whole (not
shown).
What portions of these genomic regions drive the variation in local GC content over
evolutionary time? To assess this, we developed a series of scripts we call TandemClipR (insert
github link once available), which divided each cluster in each species into CDS, intron,
promoter, and intergenic regions. To avoid the "false-TSS" problem described above, we
included only genes with annotated 5' UTRs in our promoter analyses. We found that the GC%
of each sub-region was positively correlated with the overall cluster GC% (Figure 4H-J). As we
described above, this is expected from a statistical point of view, but surprising from a molecular
point of view given that coding regions and promoters perform important molecular work. For
example, only some amino acids can be coded with high-GC codons. Variation in intergenic
regions contributed the most to cluster GC%, as expected based on their comprising a
preponderance of the sequence. Despite varying with cluster GC%, coding regions, introns, and
promoters had consistently higher GC content than the cluster as a whole, consistent with their
functional constraints (Figure 4H).
Finally, we asked how the GC% of sub-regions of the cluster were related to the number
of paralogues in the cluster (Figure S4D,E). For the clusters whose AT content rose with local
paralogue number, the AT content of each substituent portion of the sequence (promoters, coding
regions, introns, intergenic regions) also rose. The particular feature that correlated best with
paralogue number varied across gene families, and no individual feature was consistently more
correlated with paralog number than GC% of the whole cluster. In sum, we find that cluster AT
content can rise as paralogous clusters bloom over evolutionary time; remarkably, these trends
affect all the sequence components of the cluster, suggesting neutral or selective mechanisms
that act cluster-wide. We hypothesize that local gene contents, particularly paralogous clusters of
genes, can influence the emergence of isochores differing in GC content. Next, we provide a
model for how this could have come about.

412
Figure 4: AT content is correlated with tandem array expansion. (A-G) Comparison of
number of (A) OR genes in the Hemoglobin β (*HBB*) cluster, (B) LCE, SP100, and SRR genes
in the Epidermal Differentiation cluster, (C) CYP2A genes in the CYP2A-GFST cluster, (D)
SERPINA genes, (E) KRTAPs and KRTs in the Type I KRT locus, (F) KRTAPs in the high
tyrosine-glycine KRTAP cluster, and (G) the HOXA locus with cluster GC% across mammals.
All p-values report results of phylogenetic least squares analysis (PGLS). (H) Average GC%
across the cluster, intergenic, intronic, promoter, and coding sequence of each tandem array.
Each point represents one mammal species from panels A-G. (I) PGLS slope values and (J) R-
squared values of phylogeny-corrected correlation of feature GC% to cluster GC%. Asterixes
represent magnitude of PGLS p-values for each relationship, i.e. one asterixes represents a p-
value between 0.05 and 0.01, two represent a p-value between 0.01 and 0.001.

424
Figure S4: Data related to Figure 4 (A) Counts of gene number for each paralogous cluster
across amniotes analyzed (B) UCSC Genome Browser screenshot showing the hemoglobin β
cluster on human chromosome 11. As described previously, the *HBB* cluster is flanked by
olfactory receptor genes and these are bracketed by conserved single-copy genes, including

STIM1, *RRM1* and *FHIP1B* shown here, that are syntenic with the *HBB* cluster since before
mammals branched (60). (C) Analysis of gene number and GC% in the HBB-OR cluster across
mammals, reptiles, and birds. (D) R^2 values for the relationships between the GC% of each
cluster and the GC% of its constituent parts across mammalian species. (E) R^2 values for the
relationship between cluster or constituent part GC and the number of genes in the cluster across
mammalian species.
435
Accumulation of Functional Diversity and Divergence
As we show above, many types of outward-facing genes have extreme variation in
paralogue number across mammalian species (Figure S4C). Anecdotally, genes in these families
also exhibit extreme allelic diversity and copy number variations among humans, and
polymorphisms in these genes underlie human phenotypic variation in drug metabolism, sensory
perception, and immune response (1,11,55,61–66). Colloquially, outward-looking genes are so
diverse in copy number and sequence that a first step in GWAS is often to "throw out the ORs."
Previous reports, including ours, have speculated that partitioning inward- and outward-
looking genes into different parts of the genome could enable a higher ongoing mutation rate in
AT-rich, outward-looking genes; however, point mutation rate is in general positively correlated
with GC content because cytosines are especially mutation-prone (13,42,67,68). In the first
model, AT content would facilitate mutagenesis and diversification of genes in these families. In
the second model, relatively high point mutation drift in large gene families could have
contributed to their shift to higher AT content over evolutionary time.
To test between these possibilities, we first systematically examined the degree of coding
sequence variation in human genes grouped by AT/GC content or by degree of local tandem
gene duplication, using the gnomAD dataset of rare single nucleotide variants ascertained from
whole exome sequencing of >100,000 unrelated people (gnomAD v2.1.1, Figure 5A, B) (69).
The ratio of protein-altering versus synonymous variants is positively correlated with AT
content, with genes in AT-rich isochores and k-means cluster 3.3 highly enriched for potentially
functional variants (Figure 5A,B). Moreover, genes near paralogous neighbors had higher levels
of functional variants (Figure 5E,F). We note that use of rare variants profoundly understates the
allelic variety in outward-looking genes, which exhibit radical common variation and high rates
of copy number and structural variation. For example, any two humans are estimated to have
function-changing variation in 30% of their olfactory receptor genes (70,71).
Does the high polymorphism of genes in outward-looking tandem arrays result from
differential mutation or selection versus inward-looking genes? To examine mutations directly,
we used synonymous variants from gnomAD as a proxy. We see that AT-rich genes have *fewer*
synonymous variants across unrelated people than do GC-rich genes (Figure 5C, D, S5A-D).
This is consistent with point mutation rate being grossly driven by deamination of cytosine,
especially in the $C^{me}G$ context: AT-biased genes have essentially run low on CpG dinucleotides
to mutate (32–36,72,73). Therefore, we reject the hypothesis that AT-biased genes are
"prioritized for mutation;" rather, they are enriched for functional diversity relative to a low
ongoing mutation rate. We observe that olfactory receptor genes have higher rates of variant
calls than do other AT-rich genes (Figure S5F). This inflated rate could reflect an unknown
mutagenic process but could also result from incomplete knowledge of the full human "OR-
ome" and incorrect assignment of homology relationships.
The enrichment of functional variation in outward-looking genes relative to low levels of
synonymous variation could result from different selective processes acting on single- versus

multi-copy genes. Single-copy genes are uniquely responsible for a particular biological process,
while tandem arrays may distribute a particular process over a large set of family members (i.e.
subfunctionalization). Deleterious mutations to single members of such large gene families are
therefore more likely to be of scant phenotypic consequence. Indeed, we find that genes with
more tandem neighbors have higher rates of function-changing versus synonymous variants
(Figure 5E,F, S5E). To test how local and isochore GC content relate to the functional
dispensability of genes, we used the gnomAD metric of "loss-of-function intolerance" (pLI):
genes have high pLI if deleterious mutations are depleted from the population (69,74). Genes
predicted to be loss-of-function intolerant were enriched in GC-rich isochores, had GC-rich
promoters, and were absent from cluster 3.3 (Figure 5G,H, S5G); AT-skewed, outward-looking
genes had lower probabilities of being loss-of-function intolerant, i.e. they are relatively
dispensable.
To examine modern mutagenesis patterns in a different way, we sought to measure the
rate of *de novo* mutations that occur in genes in AT- versus GC-biased regions of the human
genome. Whole genome sequencing of two parents and a child (trios) enables detection of *de*
novo mutations (DNMs). We used a recent dataset that compiles DNMs from >11,000 trios,
nearly all those who have been sequenced to date (75). While these data remain sparse relative to
the size of the genome (~700,000 total DNMs), DNMs approximate a record of mutagenesis that
has yet to be operated on by external selection. Pooling DNMs across each isochore and across
transcriptional units (TSS to TES) within that isochore, we found that both genic and isochore-
wide DNMs were more common in higher-GC isochores (Figure 5I,J, S5H-I). This is consistent
with sequence-based predictions, prior findings, and our analysis of gnomAD synonymous
variants within genes (76,77). Together, comparison of *de novo* mutations in meiosis and single
nucleotide variants in unrelated humans both support the conclusion that despite their high
divergence and diversity, AT-biased genes experience fewer contemporary mutations than do
GC-biased genes, allowing us to reject the hypothesis that quarantining outward-looking genes in
AT-rich regions of the genome facilitates higher mutation rates. Instead, lack of purifying
selection on outward-looking gene blooms could be one factor that increases their AT content.

Figure 5: AT-rich genes have high functional diversity despite experiencing moderate mutation rates in the present. (A,B) Ratio of functional (missense plus loss of function) versus synonymous rare variants in the MANE gene set identified in gnomAD v2.1.1 exome sequencing of >100,000 unrelated individuals (69). Genes are binned by isochore decile (A) or k-means cluster (B), and dots indicate means. gnomAD rare variants are defined by < 0.1% allele frequency. (C, D) Raw counts of rare synonymous variants per gene in gnomAD v2.1.1 binned by isochore decile (C) or k-means cluster (D). (E,F) Functional (E) and synonymous (F) variant rates from gnomAD v2.1.1 for genes with or without paralogous neighbors. Box plots show median and mid-quartile distribution. (G,H) Cumulative frequency distribution plots of gnomAD pLI (likelihood that a gene is loss-of-function intolerant) relative to a gene's k-means cluster assignment (G) or promoter GC% (H) (69). (I,J) Number of *de novo* point mutations observed per kb across the genes (TSS to TES) within an isochore relative to isochore GC% (I) and isochore GC% binned by decile (J). ~700,000 DNM calls are pooled from all ~11,000 trios sequenced to date (75).

518
Figure S5: Raw rates of loss of function and missense variation. Raw gnomAD v2.1.1 counts
of missense (A, B) and loss-of-function (C, D) SNVs across MANE genes binned by isochore
GC% decile (A, C) or k-means cluster (B, D). (E) Missense and loss of function mutation
accumulation in genes of differing degrees of local tandem duplication. (F) Ratio of observed
over expected rates of synonymous variants, missense variants, and loss of function variants of
genes in k-means cluster 3.3, split by OR and non-OR genes. Observed/expected values are
calculated relative to the neutral mutation spectrum by gnomAD. (G) Cumulative frequency of
pLI scores for genes binned by their home isochore GC% decile. (H,I) Number of *de novo* point
mutations observed per kb in each isochore plotted relative to isochore GC% (H) and isochore
GC% binned by decile (I). ~700,000 DNM calls are pooled from all ~11,000 trios sequenced to
date (75).
530
Recombination and PRDM9 Binding
Recombination may be the primary influence on large-scale patterns of AT/GC content
due to GC-biased gene conversion, which elevates GC content. AT-biased chromosomal bands
are described as experiencing less recombination than GC-biased bands (20,26,30). We sought to
test how recombination rates relate to GC content of inward- versus outward-looking genes. We
therefore used whole genome sequencing data from human trios to measure recombination in
isochores of different GC contents and in their constituent genes (78).

Crossovers appeared rare within gene blooms (Figure 6A, S6B). We calculated a relative
crossover rate for each isochore and found that AT-rich isochores experienced less maternal and
paternal crossovers than GC-rich isochores, as has been previously observed, though maternal
crossovers were sharply diminished in the highest-GC isochores (Figure 6C,D) (15,78–80). We
noticed that these low-crossover, high-GC isochores were often at chromosome ends, where
maternal recombination has been shown to be low (81). To systematically examine
recombination relative to each gene along the chromosome, we generated a Manhattan plot of
crossover rate for each gene and its flanking regions (Figure 6B, S6A). This highlights the higher
recombination of genes located in GC-rich isochores, except for maternal recombination at
chromosome ends.
Recombination in paralogous clusters can induce dramatic insertions, deletions, and
chromosome rearrangements if paralogues errantly pair with one another (82). While clusters of
outward-looking paralogues are enriched in AT-rich regions, the conserved clusters of
paralogues located in GC-rich regions, such as Hox clusters, may also be risky to recombine. To
separate the influence of AT/GC content versus clustered-ness, we compared recombination rates
across clusters of different sizes (Figure 6F). However, most large clusters of genes were AT-
rich and had little recombination, making it difficult for us to separate which variable dominates.
While recombination is generally directed away from genes, some genes experienced crossovers.
We plotted the isochore and k-means cluster distribution of genes with the 10% highest internal
crossover rate (TSS-TES, Figure S6D, E). These genes were in GC-rich isochores and excluded
from AT-rich k-means cluster 3.3. Together, these analyses suggest that gene blooms located in
AT-rich regions of the genome experience low current crossover rates.
In many vertebrates, including humans, crossovers are seeded by binding of PRDM9 to
its target site (83–85). To test whether variation in observed recombination across AT/GC
categories is due to differential seeding, we examined PRDM9 binding data from human cells
(Figure 6E,G, S6F,G)(86). We observed a striking depletion of PRDM9 binding from AT-biased
gene clusters and isochores, in line with previous analyses (79). We note that many animals have
lost PRDM9, and in the absence of PRDM9, recombination is often seeded at CpG islands (87).
As described below, AT-biased gene families also lack CpG islands. Taken together, these
results suggest that AT-biased, tandemly arrayed gene clusters experience low rates of
recombination, and that this likely results from low rates of crossover initiation.

Figure 6: Crossovers are directed away from AT-rich isochores and genes. (A) UCSC
genome browser screenshot of human KRTAP cluster showing recombination rates (maternal
meiosis in red, paternal meiosis in blue) and PRDM9 binding calls (black). (B) Manhattan plot of
standardized maternal (above 0) and paternal (below 0) recombination rate for each gene with its
25kb flanking regions. Genes are colored according to the GC content of their home isochore
(Red: high AT. Blue: high GC). Scale bars: 10Mb. Chromosome ideograms reflect centromeres
(bright red), gaps (dark red) and Giemsa bands (grays). Recombination rates are low for genes
located in AT-rich isochores, except at chromosome ends, which are depleted for maternal
recombination. (C) Maternal and (D) paternal crossover rates in isochores binned by GC percent.
Crossover calls are from deCODE (78). (E) PRDM9 peak enrichment across isochores binned by

580 GC%. (F) Scatterplot of tandem neighbor counts per genes within the same isochore versus (F)
581 the sum of maternal and paternal standardized relative recombination and (G) sum PRDM9
582 enrichment.

583
Figure S6: (A) Manhattan plots of maternal and paternal standardized relative recombination
rates for all chromosomes, as described in Figure 6B. (B-C) UCSC Genome Browser screenshots
of (B) OR and MS4A loci, flanked by GC-rich isochores and (C) interspersed GC and AT-rich

isochores. (D,E) Counts of (D) isochore decile and (E) k-means cluster distribution of genes with
10% highest rate of maternal and paternal within-gene crossovers. (F,G) Counts of (F) isochore
decile and (G) k-means cluster distribution of genes with 10% highest rate of within-gene
PRDM9 binding.
591
Transcriptional regulation of outward- versus inward-looking genes
Our analyses above lead to the hypothesis that clusters of paralogues that are not subject
to purifying selection (i.e. "outward-looking genes") lose GC content as they bloom due to
reduced recombination and increased tolerance of point mutations. We further hypothesize that
the sequence content and context of these genes has been evolutionarily co-opted to produce
extreme tissue-specificity and/or variegation of their transcription. While we expect that
isochore-level AT/GC content influences genomic organization and histone mark flavors, which
would influence transcription indirectly, we also noticed that paralogous clusters of genes lacked
annotated CpG islands in their promoters (see CpG Island track, Figure 2A, B, Figure S2D)(54).
CpG dinucleotides are depleted from vertebrate genomes due to the mutability of methylated
cytosine; nevertheless, CpGs are relatively enriched in vertebrate promoters, and these "CpG
islands" frequently remain unmethylated (88). Previous analyses suggested that 50-70% of
mammalian genes have CpG island promoters (19,89,90). Nevertheless, by considering each
gene in its sequence context, we estimate that 90% of protein-coding genes have GC enrichment
directly upstream of the TSS (Figure 3A).
While CpG islands are calculated relative to the GC content of the region, we sought to
ask if it is even *possible* to have a CpG island in an AT-rich region. As in Figure 2, we separated
isochores of at least five genes by GC content, gene number, and prefix diversity, and then
calculated CpG island scores on a per-gene basis (Figure 7A,B). Surprisingly, genes located in
all types of isochores *could* have CpG islands in their promoters, but genes in large paralogous
arrays often did not. Highly conserved genes in arrays, like Hox and Histone arrays, retained
their islands regardless of the GC content of the isochores. Gene blooms lacking CpG islands
tended to be outward-looking, and almost all large, island-poor arrays were in AT-rich isochores.
We also noticed that the shape of islands around the TSS varied across our k-means clusters,
with some clusters having islands that were symmetrical relative to the TSS, and others having
islands that were polarized to the 3' side of the TSS (Figure S7A).
Because CpGs are only protected from methylation when they are located near other
CpG's, i.e. in islands, and because methylated CpG's are extremely mutation-prone, CpG loss
can be precipitous once it begins (32). We calculated observed promoter CpG sites compared to
the expected rate based on local sequence content and observed a bimodal distribution across
genes of all isochores, though the observed/expected CpG's elsewhere in the isochore were
predicted by GC content (Figure 7C,D, Figure S7A,B). Thus, though CpG-less promoters are
more common in high-AT isochores, islands are compatible with genes in any isochore context;
island loss appears specific to paralogous gene blooms (Figure 7E). Across a range of isochore
GC contents, genes near tandem neighbors had CpG-poor promoters compared to singletons
(Figure S7E). This promoter state also drives k-means clustering of genes in 3.1 and 3.3 (Figure
7D). Many genes in 3.1 and 3.3 have no more CpG's in their promoters than the genome-wide
average (~25% of expected CpGs). Further separating these k-means clustered genes into those
with paralogous neighbors and those without did not stratify promoter architecture, suggesting
that the k-means categories are already sensitive to the AT/GC sequence features delineating
genes in paralogous clusters (Figure S7D).

As we and others suggested previously in the mouse, CpG-less promoters are likely to be
regulated by non-canonical mechanisms that are independent of TATA Binding Protein (TBP)
(13,91). This could allow the unique and rare expression of these genes relative to their CpG-
containing brethren: their ground state is to be "off forever." While hemoglobin beta and
amylase genes, which we now know to be small clusters of paralogues, were shown to lack CpG
islands in their promoters in the 1980's, measurements of the relationships between tissue-
specificity and promoter architecture were performed before the transcription start sites and
promoters of tissue-specific genes were mapped (15,19,92). To test how AT/GC distribution in
genes relates to patterns of gene expression, we used GTEx data, which measures gene
expression in 54 tissue types taken from adult human donor cadavers (93). We set a threshold
(RPKM of 5) to binarize this quantitative data to "expression" or "no expression." In agreement
with Bird's hypothesis, this simple metric varies sharply across genes of different k-means
clusters or with differing promoter or home isochore GC content (Figure 7F-H)(13,15,19,92).
Genes that are GC-rich are often expressed in many or most tissues tested, while AT-biased
genes most often appear to be expressed nowhere or in one tissue. We note the many genes with
"no" expression in GTEx are specific to tissues not sampled by GTEx (e.g., olfactory receptor
genes in the olfactory epithelium). We infer that genes not detected in any tissue in GTEx data—
i.e. the preponderance of AT-rich genes—are highly tissue-, cell type-, time-, or condition-
dependent in their expression. As we have shown throughout this study, these exotically
transcribed, CpG-less genes are located in evolutionary dynamic clusters of paralogues and tend
to be housed in AT-rich isochores.
In the longest-lived cells in the body, post-mitotic neurons, tandemly arrayed gene
families have been shown to be clustered with one another in nuclear space and to be uniquely
protected from accumulation of CpH (Cp-nonG) methylation (47,94,95). These findings,
together with the overwhelming transcriptional repression of these gene families, suggest that
they might be sequestered in nuclear space away from the transcriptional machinery. Indeed, we
found that across 21 tissues sampled by Hi-C, AT-rich genes and genes located in AT-rich
isochores were likely to be located in transcription-suppressing "B" compartments (Figure S7F,
G)(96). Previous analyses have demonstrated that variation in GC content also predicts local
chromatin looping and association with the lamina and other nuclear structures (16,39,49,97).

Figure 7: Lack of CpG islands and restricted expression is a feature of tandemly arrayed AT-rich genes. (A) Promoter CpG island frequency (from (54)) in isochores of varying gene content. Same plots as in Figure 1E, recolored to highlight promoter characteristics. Most common gene name prefixes in the isochore are labeled. (B) Multigene score versus isochore GC% for isochores containing tandem duplicated genes. Color represents fraction of genes in the isochore with promoter CpG islands. (C-E) Distribution of promoter CpG rate for genes binned by (C) isochore GC% decile, (D) k-means cluster assignment, or (E) tandem duplication score. We counted CpG's from -750 to +250bp around the gene TSS and compared to the expected rate for a sequence of that GC content. (F-H) Distribution of tissue-level gene expression for genes binned by (F) isochore GC% decile, (G) their k-means cluster assignment, or (H) tandem duplication score. GTEx data from 54 human tissues was binarized to "expression" or "no expression" based on RPKM of 5. AT-rich genes and those in paralogous arrays are detected in few or no sampled GTEx tissues, while GC-rich genes are frequently detected in all sampled tissues. Black bars depict medians.

Figure S7: (A) Total CpG dinucleotide rate across isochores by their GC% content, split by
isochores containing protein-coding genes and isochores without protein-coding genes. (B)
Violin plots displaying total CpG rate across isochores, binned by decile. (C) Ridgeline plots
displaying GTEX tissue expression distribution for genes binned by promoter GC% decile. (D)
Distribution of promoter CpG rate of genes binned by k-means cluster assignment, split by

degree of tandem duplication. (E) Distribution of promoter CpG rate of genes binned by isochore
GC% decile, split by degree of tandem duplication. (F) CpG island density around the TSS (grey
line) for genes in each k-means cluster. CpG island density reflects strength of called CpG
islands from USCS unmasked CpG islands (54). Mean CpG rates across gene TSS in each
cluster are summarized in line plots, while heatmaps represent island calls around the TSS for
each gene. (G-I) Hi-C compartment assignment across 21 tissues (96) for isochores (G), or genes
in each isochore (H) or k-means cluster (I). "Always A" and "always B" means the gene was
assigned to that compartment in every sampled tissue.
694
Discussion
Animals make extensive and varied contacts with the external environment, both
engaging with foreign molecules and producing and excreting their own substances.
Specialization of these input-output functions plays a definitive role in animal lifestyle, and often
occurs in mammals via amplification and diversification of tandemly arrayed gene families
(10,12,13,98,99). Extensive gene losses are also common—for example, just as the vomeronasal
organ is vestigial in humans, human genes for vomeronasal receptors are no longer functional
(100,101). Here, we define a common genomic architecture in mammals for genes whose
products engage the external world: they are in tandem arrays, are found in AT-biased isochores,
and lack CpG islands in their promoters (Figure 1) (13,44). In humans today, we find that genes
in AT-rich tandem arrays experience low rates of point mutation and recombination, and tend
toward tissue-specific expression patterns.
707
Modeling the emergence of AT/GC sequence bias in outward-looking tandem arrays
The rapid turnover of genes in tandem arrays by birth-and-death evolution can complicate
efforts to reconstruct their evolutionary history. Using synteny, we were able to track paralogue
number changes for a set of polymorphic arrays in mammals (Figure 4). For arrays of olfactory
receptors, skin proteins, and defensive protease inhibitors, AT content increases with copy
number across mammals. This analysis suggests that high AT content need not be an ancestral
feature of gene blooms, but can emerge during array expansion. Using population genetic data
from humans, we test whether elevated rates of allelic diversity in outward-looking genes results
from distinct mutational or selective effects. We accept the argument of Lynch that AT/GC
content itself is unlikely to be directly operated on by selection, and instead focus on neutral and
selective events affecting the genes contained in sequence-biased ischores (27).
We find that genes in AT-biased tandem arrays experience low ongoing rates of point
mutation (Figure 5) and low rates of recombination (Figure 6). We suggest that excessive allelic
diversity in these regions could have arisen due to weakened selection on historical point
mutations. Because the most common point mutations replace C or G bases with T or A bases,
tolerance of point mutations in expanding tandem arrays could shift GC content down; low rates
of point mutation in the present would be due to the scarcity of mutable CpG dinucleotides
remaining in these clusters (38). Tandem arrays also appear depleted for recombination events
that can shift GC content back up (Figure 6). Together, tolerance of historical point mutation and
strengthened intolerance of recombination as gene families expand would tend to bias expanding
arrays toward higher AT content (Figure 1).
While deamination of cytosine in the CpG context dominates mutation rates, many other
neutral processes contribute to the overall mutation spectrum, and these too operate differently in
copy-number-variable tandem arrays. For example, AT-biased regions of the genome are late-

replicating, which is associated with higher rates of germline mutations, and genes in tandem
arrays tend not to be transcribed in the testis, which would exempt them from transcription-
coupled repair (42,102). Excess allelic variation could also result from paralogous gene
conversion. While paralogous gene conversion can be measured for paralogous pairs, in
extended arrays this phenomenon would be difficult to distinguish from copy number variation
without long-read data spanning the region (103). Similarly, genes in tandem arrays do not have
one-to-one homology relationships across species. Trivially, this means that their interspecific
divergence is high, but they would be left out of gene-wise measures of divergence that rely on
clear homology assignments.
Other mutagenic and selective forces may also contribute to the evolution of AT-
sequence bias. For example, the repetitive nature of these regions of the genome predisposes
them to problems, such as replication fork slippage, that require non-homologous end joining
(NHEJ) to resolve (104,105). RCC4-DNA ligase IV is primary ligase complex for NHEJ, and it
preferentially ligates poly-dT single-stranded DNA and long dT overhangs (106). Polymerase
mu, which is also involved in NHEJ, shares a similar bias towards both dT and dC, though
preferentially towards dT (107). These biases could encourage these regions of the genome to
adopting AT-rich sequences with each duplication, and thus each addition of repetitive material.
749
Implications for gene regulation
Genes located in AT-biased tandem arrays are typically silenced almost everywhere in
the body and expressed at extremely high levels at a specific place and time. Where and when
these genes are expressed, they perform the definitive work of the cell type. Many of these
outward-looking gene families exhibit some kind of exclusive expression, from the fetal to adult
switch in hemoglobin β expression (i.e. exclusion over time) to the one-receptor-per-neuron
pattern of olfactory receptor expression (i.e. exclusion over space). We expect that genes located
in high-AT isochores that lack CpG islands in their promoters are durably silenced by particular
mechanisms when they are not expressed (i.e. almost everywhere), and that their expression will
be activated by non-canonical mechanisms in the single condition where each is expressed. As
we and others suggested previously for mouse ORs, CpG-less promoters are likely to be
regulated by non-canonical mechanisms that are independent of TATA Binding Protein (TBP)
and the recently discovered basal CpG-island-binding factors BANP and BEND3
(13,91,108,109). As Bird hypothesized presciently in 1986, "When activated, they appear to be
bound to a complex of tissue specific factors which presumably accomplish what…islands can
achieve using ubiquitous, non-tissue specific factors. Given that there are usually rather few
CpGs near tissue specific genes…one would not expect to find CpG or methylation built into the
activation mechanism of genes of this type. (92)" One could argue that these genes do not have
promoters at all and rely completely on locus control regions to concentrate and deliver
transcription factors to the TSS (45,110,111). This atypical architecture appears to predispose
these genes to restricted expression relative to their CpG-containing brethren: their ground state
is to be "off forever."
Many or most molecular genetic events are sensitive to variation in AT/GC distribution:
AT content predicts compartmentalization of the genome in 3D space, replication timing, and
patterns of histone marks (41,112–116). Typically, AT-biased sequence is packaged as
heterochromatin and silenced. Work on olfactory receptors, clustered protocadherins, and
secreted liver proteins suggest that these gene families are expressed from the context of
constitutive heterochromatin, which appears to be present prior to expression and to be retained

on family members that are not expressed (117–121). CpG islands also function as molecular
beacons: they mark transcription start sites, serve as recombination hotspots in the absence of
PRDM9, and act as replication origins in meiosis (87,112,122). The accrual of high AT content
in gene arrays and the lack of CpG islands is therefore likely to exert a strong effect on the
molecular regulation of these genes. In ectodermal development, single-copy genes accrue CpH
methylation, perhaps passively, while AT-rich gene arrays remain devoid of this modification
(94). This suggests that AT-rich gene arrays are locked away from the ambient molecular stew of
the nucleus, perhaps over very long developmental time periods. Indeed, tandem arrays clump
together in the nucleus in post-mitotic neurons (47,95).
In addition to the extreme time and/or tissue specificity of most outward-looking gene
families, a fraction of these families exhibit stochastic expression such that each cell expresses
just one or a sparse subset of family members. Chemosensors, B- and T- cell receptors, NK cell
receptors, and clustered protocadherins all exhibit this restricted expression (119,123,124). As
we argued recently, sparse cell-wise expression patterns compartmentalize the effects of
mutations (119). These mechanisms are also likely to result in insensitivity to copy number
variation, as each cell chooses its own dose of family members for expression. Feedback
mechanisms that ensure cells can "choose again" if they originally pick a pseudogene further
buffer potential deleterious effects of mutations (125,126). Combined with the sheer numbers of
family members that a particular gene function is distributed across, these expression
mechanisms could predispose these genes to selective drift.
798
Role for recombination in diversification versus maintenance of gene arrays
Local sequence diversity and recombination rates are usually positively correlated
(reviewed in (127)). In contrast, we find that AT-biased gene families exhibit high diversity and
divergence despite low recombination. Comparison of the human and chimpanzee genomes
found two distinct types of high-divergence regions: Genome-wide, chromosome ends are GC-
rich and have high divergence and recombination; in chromosome interiors, however,
recombination is more modest overall, and divergence is higher in G-bands, which are AT-rich
(20). As Holmquist argued previously based on much more limited data, we show here that these
G-bands contain very different types of genes than do Q-bands (15,48).
Overall GC content is theorized to be a record of past gene conversion, with high-GC
regions having experienced high historical recombination (31). If this is the case, then AT-bias in
tandem arrays could reflect historical depletion of recombination in these regions, while also
dampening recombination rates in the present (Figure 6). Modeling suggests that once variation
in AT/GC content starts to emerge, it can be self-reinforcing via positive feedback (32). There
remains conflict between the mode by which these gene arrays are thought to have bloomed—i.e.
via gene duplication through ectopic exchange during recombination—and their current
depletion for recombination events. Other modes of duplication, including replication slippage
and transposition, may also be at work in expanding these arrays, and duplication mechanisms
could themselves influence GC content (128).
Ectopic exchange in repetitive gene regions can have benign or catastrophic
consequences. Induction of copy number variation within a gene array may be of small
phenotypic consequence, as the jobs these genes perform are by nature distributed across many
family members. In contrast, ectopic exchange that deletes a cluster or induces recombination
between clusters can result in catastrophic chromosome rearrangements (82). Retrotransposition
or ectopic exchange mediated by repetitive elements can seed new gene clusters elsewhere in the

genome (129,130), and gene families with more than one cluster genome-wide are likely to be
particularly dangerous for genome stability. Indeed, mammalian chromosome evolution appears
to have been shaped by ectopic exchange between OR clusters, to the extent that ORs are often
positioned near chromosome ends (131–139). Finally, even if structural variation in outward-
looking tandem arrays is benign within an individual, it can lead to hybrid incompatibility and
can initiate or reinforce reproductive isolation that leads to speciation (140–142). Recent
modeling work has sought to characterize the tradeoffs between the structural fragility of gene
blooms and the potential positive effects of allelic diversification (143).
Given the genomic danger of these tandem arrays, why have gene family members
remained *in cis* with one another? An extreme example is the "milk and teeth" locus on human
chromosome 4. The casein genes in this locus evolved via tandem duplication of enamel genes at
the root of the mammalian tree; the enamel genes themselves evolved from *follicular dendritic*
cell secreted protein in bony fish (12,144). Astonishingly, these genes have remained syntenic.
Why would this be the case, given that they're expressed in three separate body systems and that
such tandem arrays are genomically dangerous? We propose that as in the case of maintenance
of Hox gene synteny, the regulatory elements of these genes remain tangled with one another,
such that relocation of array members elsewhere in the genome would divorce them from cis-
regulatory elements that they depend on for expression (145–147). Recent research on enhancer
evolution in animals suggests that enhancer tangling can result in the preservation of synteny
over ~700 million years (148). In other cases, as in B Cell Receptor, hemoglobin, clustered
protocadherin, interferon, and chemosensor arrays, family members share and compete for the
same regulatory elements (111,111,149–152). This mutual dependence would again increase the
phenotypic consequences of recombination events that break synteny by separating genes in
large families from locus control regions they depend on for expression.
Array incompatibility between individuals of a species and the necessity of remaining co-
located with regulatory elements that may be tangled with or shared by other gene family
members could cause tandem arrays to behave like supergenes—multigene regions inherited as
an allelic unit. We suspect that depletion of CpG islands and PRDM9 sites from tandemly
arrayed genes protects the genome from the danger of errantly recombining these duplicative
regions. Nevertheless, recombination and gene duplication or deletion still sometimes occur in
these regions—their crossover rate even today is non-zero—and the marginal fitness effects of
resulting copy number variants could allow products of these meiosis to be preserved in the
population. As gene arrays get larger, point mutation tolerance could shift their GC content
downward, putting the brakes on recombination as they become ever more unwieldy. Overall,
recombination in these regions would be dampened, while differential tolerance of local
duplications versus gross rearrangements could allow an increase in local allelic diversity.
860
Implications for chromosome organization
Repetitive elements have shaped chromosomal evolution since the dawn of eukaryotes.
The linear genome is proposed to have arisen from erroneous meiotic recombination between
Group II introns which invaded the circular genome to create the t-loop precursors to stable
telomeres (153). Similarly, dispersion and expansion of ORs and other large tandem gene arrays
have shaped mammalian chromosome evolution. Tandem arrays of ORs represent ancestral
breakpoints of chromosomal synteny between mice, rats, and humans (138,154). A large OR
cluster is found at the end of the q-arm of chr1 in humans but not in mice. In addition to ORs,
large gene families including zinc finger (*ZNF*) and immunoglobulin heavy chain (*IGH*) genes

are observed at chromosome ends across eukaryotes (155). In the modern human population,
unequal crossovers between OR clusters are a source of recurrent and pathological
rearrangement hotspots (156).
While we also observe these AT-rich isochores *near* chromosome ends, terminal
isochores are often some of the most GC-rich in the genome and can contain heterogeneous
single-copy genes (157). Indeed, the largest OR cluster at the end of the q-arm of chromosome 1
in humans is followed by a higher GC% isochore containing ZNF genes. This strong end-GC%
accumulation appears to arise paternally: genes in high GC% isochores at chromosome ends are
enriched for paternal crossovers and relatively depleted of maternal crossovers. Overall, paternal
crossovers are biased towards chromosome ends (81,158). Chromatin organization of pachytene
spermatocytes is implicated in this phenomenon. Spermatocytes have shorter synaptonemal
complexes compared to oocytes, and, futher, subtelomeric regions do not require PRDM9 for
crossovers, however, how these factors contribute to paternal crossover end-bias remains
incompletely understood (159,160). Potentially, recombination-based alternative lengthening of
telomeres (ALT) in spermatocytes biases hotspots towards chromosome ends (161).
Over evolutionary time, as ectopic recombination places high-AT tandem arrays at
chromosome ends, high paternal rates of gBGC at the ends of chromosomes would generate new
isochores of increasing GC% comprising newly evolving genes (162,163).
888
Is mutation biased or random with respect to gene function?
Recent mutation accumulation studies have suggested that *de novo* mutations could occur
with different frequencies in different kinds of genes or in genic versus non-genic locations
(164). We and others also argued previously that segregation of mutation-tolerant versus
mutation-intolerant genes into AT- versus GC-biased regions of the genome could allow
differential mutation rates on different classes of genes (13,67,68). However, our analyses of
synonymous versus functional variant rate and of *de novo* mutation rate in AT- versus GC-biased
genes suggest the opposite: that AT-biased genes experience fewer mutations in living humans
than do GC-biased genes. This is in line with neutral, sequence-based expectations (42). While
CpG prevalence dominates the mutation spectrum, other mutational and repair processes that
differentially affect AT- versus GC-biased regions of the genome almost certainly contribute to
the overall pattern of diversity in inward- versus outward-looking genes. In particular, AT-rich
regions of the genome are late-replicating, and tandemly arrayed genes are excluded from
transcription-coupled repair during spermatogenesis. Each of these patterns could increase the
mutation rate in outward-looking genes. Late replication can worsen the loss of cytosines, while
lack of TCR would be expected to increase the rate of A>G (T>C) mutations (42,102).
While mutagenic or repair processes specific to gene blooms could contribute to their
overall mutation spectrum, we expect that for most, allelic diversity and differential AT/GC
content in inward- versus outward-looking genes result from differential selection trajectory over
evolutionary time. One attractive model is that as a gene cluster expands in size and the function
of that gene family is partitioned over more and more members, purifying selection becomes
weaker and weaker on individual family members (Figure 1). Because the most common point
mutations are C->T and especially CpG->TpG, evolutionary tolerance of point mutations would
shift GC content down. On the other hand, purifying selection and higher recombination rate
would both preserve the GC content of singleton genes.
914
Matching sequence content for genes and their isochore environments

Throughout this study, we show that the local AT/GC content of genes correlates closely
with that of their isochore environment (e.g. Figure 2B, S2B-G). We found this pattern
perplexing. For example, while higher purifying selection on single-copy genes can help to
explain their higher GC content, we would expect most variants in the non-coding portions of an
isochore to be phenotypically neutral. Because gene conversion acts over longer chromosomal
distances, differential recombination could affect the sequence content of genes and their
environment together. This pattern could also result from background/linked selection, which is
known to vary in strength across the genome (165,166). Because function-changing variants are
physically linked to local variants that don't alter phenotype, differential purifying selection on
mutations in single-copy versus multi-copy genes would affect the strength of background
selection in the neighborhood and inheritance of linked neutral variants. Background selection
will operate over shorter distances in regions with higher recombination (i.e. GC-rich isochores),
but because multiple inward-looking, single-copy genes are co-located in the same isochore,
there may be little nearby that is exempt from linked selection. In this way, purifying selection
that results in maintenance of high GC content in single-copy genes would also preserve the high
GC content of their isochore neighborhood. Finally, variation in repetitive element distribution
could also contribute to the AT/GC content of isochores housing outward-looking versus inward-
looking genes. Indeed, increased LINE density in chemosensory gene families has been proposed
to contribute to their regulation (167).
The matching sequence content of genes and their isochore neighborhoods would seem to
facilitate coherent patterns of histone marks across entire isochore units and their organization in
nuclear space. On the other hand, genes with AT- versus GC- rich coding sequences use distinct
codons, which could affect their translation rates given variation in the prevalence of various
tRNAs. Further analysis will be required to assess whether amino acid distribution varies for
proteins coded by AT-rich versus GC-rich sequences.
Finally, while we can find genes with GC-rich promoters in all kinds of isochores (Figure
S3F), we never find genes with AT-rich promoters in GC-rich isochores. While we favor the
model shown in Figure 1, where isochore-level AT content rises during gene blooms due to the
parallel actions of protein coding drift and suppressed recombination, we cannot exclude (and are
indeed fascinated by) the possibility that the distinct regulatory characteristics that allow LCR-
mediated expression could be the keystone factor tying outward-looking genes to AT-rich
isochores. However, in the absence of other evidence, we think that LCR-driven transcription is
a kludge that allows expression of paralogous clusters that failed to maintain their CpG's, rather
than CpG-less promoters emerging via positive selection to allow regulation by LCRs.
950
Is this genomic architecture specific to mammals?
While isochore structure is not unique to mammals, it is not a universal feature across
animal clades, and the AT/GC variation observed in mammals is extreme (27). We are curious
whether stem mammals evolved molecular mechanisms that facilitated the evolution of gene
arrays. These could include both systems that maintain these arrays as constitutive
heterochromatin when they are not being expressed and unique transcriptional mechanisms that
activate them, often in a stochastic or highly restricted manner, in their target tissues. One
candidate factor that mediates long-range enhancer-promoter interactions in multiple arrayed
families is Ldb1 (45,168). Social insects have also massively expanded their olfactory receptor
gene repertoire in cis; in the ant, this is accompanied by increased AT content (169). Have

convergent mechanisms for stochastic expression facilitated olfactory receptor repertoire
expansion in insects?
Other clades may have evolved distinct mechanisms to organize repetitive genes or gene
pieces: In *Diptera*, repetitive arrays are often organized as alternative splicing hubs (170–173).
Reptiles and birds exhibit "microchromosomes" which have distinct GC content from the rest of
the genome and can house arrays of rapidly evolving, outward-looking genes such as venoms
(174). Trypanosome arrays of surface VSGs are located in subtelomeric regions (175). For
mammals, the "isochore solution" balances diversity in gene arrays with genomic integrity.
969

970 **Author Contributions**
971 Conceptualization, MVB, MAC, EJC; Methodology, MVB, MAC, MLH, EJC; Investigation,
972 MVB, MAC, MLH, EJC; Formal Analysis, MVB, MAC, MLH; Visualization, MVB; Data
973 curation, MAC; Writing – Original Draft, MVB, MAC, EJC; Writing – Review & Editing,
974 MVB, MAC, MLH, EJC; Funding Acquisition, EJC; Supervision, EJC.
975

Acknowledgements
Thanks to Rachel Duffié, Sebastian Zöllner, David Lyons, and members of the Clowney lab for
discussion and comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by the Rita Allen
Foundation Milton Cassel Scholarship and the Alfred P Sloan Research Scholarship in
Neuroscience to EJC. EJC is a McKnight Scholar and a Pew Biomedical Scholar. MVB was
supported by the NIH Cellular and Molecular Biology Training Grant T32-GM007315. MAC
was supported by the NIH Early Stage Training in the Neurosciences Training Grant T32-
NS076401.

Declaration of interests
The authors declare no competing interests.
987

Descriptions of supplemental files
Supplemental Table 1: Isochore calls in the hg38 human genome assembly.
Supplemental Table 2: Isochore calls in the hg19 human genome assembly.
Supplemental Table 3: Results of all statistical analyses presented here.
Supplemental Table 4: Genewise data, including isochore assignment, k-means cluster, local
sequence characteristics, variant rates.
Supplemental Table 5: Description of data in Supplemental Table 4.
Supplemental Table 6: GC contents of selected gene families and their annotated features (ie:
CDS, introns, intergenic regions).
Supplemental Table 7: List of genomes searched with Tandem ClipR.
998

999 **Methods**
1000

Describing isochores
To call isochores, we implemented a genomic segmentation algorithm called GC-Profile
(50) using halting parameter (number of segmentation iterations) of t_0 275 and minimum segment
length of 3000 bp. Gaps less than 1% of the input sequence were filtered out, generating 4328
distinct isochores in hg38 (Supplemental Table 1). Isochores were ranked by average GC%, with

rank 1 having the highest and 4328 having the lowest. We also performed this analysis in hg19
(Supplemental Table 2). Isochores are reported in Supplemental Tables 1-2.
1008
Statistical analyses
We performed Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric ANOVA for each group of comparisons
(Supplemental Table 3). We then used Dunn's pairwise analysis to compare individual groups
with one another (Supplemental Tables 3). We use phylogenetic generalized least squares
(PGLS) regression as implemented in caper (176) to test for correlations between genomic
characteristics across vertebrate species while controlling for the evolutionary non-independence
of the multi-species dataset. We used timetree.org (177) to produce our species phylogeny for
these analyses, where the tree was imported and pruned to the subset of species for a given
comparison using the ape package (178). In PGLS, lambda was optimized by 0 and 1 by
maximum likelihood.
1019
GC content calculations
Genes from the Matched Annotation dataset from the NCBI and EMBL-EBI (MANE)
Select dataset (51) were downloaded from the UCSC Genome Browser. Isochores were matched
to genes using the coordinates of the transcription start site. GC content across gene features,
including promoters (-750 to +250bp flanking TSS), flanking regions (+/- 25kb), coding exons,
exons and UTRs, and introns were separately calculated from FASTA sequences using bedTools
(179).
To generate 9 k-means clustesr, we used gc5BaseBw from the UCSC Genome Browser
(53) to calculate GC% scores across MANE genes with +/- 1kb flanks. We generated 3-kmeans
clusters of genes, which were further clustered into 3-kmeans clusters each using deepTools
plotHeatmap (180). Cluster assignment and quantification of other parameters for each gene are
reported in Supplemental Table 4.
1032
Characterizing types of genes
To characterize the types of genes residing in isochores of varying GC, we used 2
categories of descriptors: GO terms and gene prefixes. To identify GO terms associated with
genes in each isochore GC decile, we used the R package, clusterProfiler (version 4.2.2)(181).
This helped us streamline identification of key terms that appeared in each decile. With this list,
we identified GO terms that were most significantly enriched in each decile with a depth of at
least 30 genes. Using AmiGO (182), an online database of GO identifiers, we pulled the list of
genes associated with our selected group of significant GO terms and plotted GC content across
each term. The terms we chose are listed in the table below.

Shortened Term (from Fig 2)	Full GO Term Description	GO ID
wnt signaling	wnt signaling pathway	GO:0016055
kinase activity	kinase activity	GO:0016301
transcription	transcription, DNA-templated	GO:0006351
defense	immune response	GO:0006955
xenobiosis	xenobiotic metabolic process	GO:0006805

| keratinization | keratinization | GO:0031424 |
| chemosensation | detection of a chemical stimulus | GO:0009593 |

1042

We wanted an alternative to GO analysis for assessing diversity across isochores and k-
means gene clusters. Since the prefixes of well-annotated genes (like the ones from the MANE
dataset) are shared across genes within the same gene family, we used this as a means of
assessing diversity with more specificity than one would achieve through GO analysis. The
process of assigning gene prefixes is as follows:
1. Convert old names into new nomenclature.
• Go to the HUGO Gene Nomenclature Committee's (HGNC)(183) website and the
1050   list of gene symbols from the MANE set into their "Multi-symbol checker" (the
1051   link provided will take you there directly). This will ensure we have the most up-
1052   to-date names for each of our genes (ie: some which may have been labeled as
1053   'FAM' may have a new symbol to go with the rest of the gene family).
1054   • Match names in the MANE set to names labeled "Approved symbols" by HGNC,
1055   and replace those symbols with the HUGO names.
2. Replace numbers with "_". We can't remove all numbers because there are several genes
that have more letters after numbers that aren't important for our purposes (ie: CSN2A
will become CSN_A).
3. Remove anything after the first instance of "_" (ie: CSN_A will become CSN). The goal
of this step is to keep the first part of the prefix, removing letters and numbers that
indicate subfamilies.
4. While it isn't common, some genes require us to know those numbers to know what they
do (most commonly, enzymes involved in modifying carbohydrates). Largely, these
genes start with a single letter, followed by numbers, then more letters. Thus, to fix these
genes, we pull out the genes that have 1 letter after steps 4 and 5.
5. Look through each of those genes that start with only one letter, then decide how best to
group them.
6. View gene prefixes in alphabetical order and search for prefixes that are likely to be
families, then rename (ie: KCNT and KCNQ are both potassium channels, so we grouped
these together).
Once we had a list of gene prefixes, we calculated a Shannon's H diversity metric for each
isochore based on the prefix probabilities in each isochore (proportions + log2(1/proportions) =
diversity metric). Larger values are indicative of more diversity. Similarly, we calculated a
Shannon's H diversity metric for each k-means cluster.
1075

De novo *mutations*
De novo mutations (DNMs) were compiled by (75) from seven family-based whole
genome sequencing (WGS) datasets, encompassing a total of 679,547 single nucleotide variants
(SNVs), which comprise data from both neurotypical and neurodivergent individuals. We
remapped the dataset to hg38 using LiftOver in UCSC Genome Browser. To calculate genomic
DNM density, we counted the number of DNMs occurring within the coordinates listed in the
GC calculation section above. To calculate DNM density, we pooled genic DNMs within each
isochore and divided by the sum of the region of interest's size, i.e. we identified all the genes in

an isochore, summed the DNMs between their transcription start and termination sites, then
divided by the summed length of those genic regions.
1086
Allelic variants
We used the gnomAD v2.1.1 dataset of single nucleotide allelic variants (69). The
authors defined rare single nucleotide variants (<0.1% allele frequency) from 125,748 exomes
and 15,708 whole genomes and predicted whether variants within coding regions are likely to be
functionally synonymous, missense, or loss-of-function. Here, we used observed synonymous,
missense, and loss-of-function mutation rates. We ported variant calls to MANE genes in hg38
using the gene symbol and Ensembl transcript IDs. In Figure 5, we also use the calculated pLI
score from gnomAD, which describes the likelihood that a gene is loss-of-function intolerant in
humans.
1096
Recombination
Crossover data for hg38 was acquired from deCODE where the authors used whole-
genome sequence (WGS) of trios and were able to refine crossover boundaries for 247,942
crossovers in 9423 paternal meioses and 514,039 crossovers in 11,750 maternal meioses (78). Of
note, the data we used here is restricted to autosomes. To calculate crossover density, we
assigned crossovers to a region of interest based on the median of the crossover coordinates. We
normalized counts within a region by dividing by the genomic average for that sex. PRDM9
binding data from HEK293T cells transfected with the PRDM9 reference allele was acquired
from (86). We selected the top 10% of PRDM9 peaks based on enrichment scores to account for
weak PRDM9 binding sites associated with overexpression in the system, as noted by the
authors. Like with crossovers, we calculated PRDM9 binding site density across genes as the
summed enrichment scores across genic regions within an isochore, mapping by the midpoint of
the binding coordinates.
1110
Gene Regulatory Information
To determine tissue specificity of gene expression, RNA-sequencing data was sourced
from Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project (V8, released in August 2019), containing
17,382 samples collected from 54 tissues from 948 donors (93). For each gene in the MANE set,
we counted the number of tissues in which expression was at least 5 transcripts per million
(TPM).
To measure A/B compartment occupancy of genes across tissues, AB compartments were
sourced from published Hi-C data from 21 tissues and cell types (96). MANE genes were lifted
over into hg19 to match A/B compartment domain calls in hg19. Isochores called in hg19 were
assigned to a compartment by matching the isochore's midpoint to the midpoint of the closest
compartment. Genes were assigned to a compartment by matching the transcription start site to
the midpoint of the nearest compartment, as most genes did not fall into a single compartment
(~90%). Further, we counted the occurrences of compartments A and B for each isochore and
gene. These counts were binned into always A (21 counts of A), mostly A (14-20 counts of A or
0-6 counts of B), equally A or B (7-13 counts of A or B), mostly B (0-6 counts of A or 14-20
counts of B), and always B (21 counts of B).
To identify genes with CpG islands in promoter regions, we downloaded the CpG Island
track (unmasked) from the UCSC Genome Browser (54). The ratio of observed vs. expected
CpG dinucleotides was converted to a bigwig coverage file and plotted across gene TSS's (+/-

2.5kb) in 9 k-means clusters using deepTools plotHeatmap. The average score of CpG islands
within -750bp and +250 bp of a gene TSS were calculated using bedTools.
1132
Gene Bloom Evolution with Tandem ClipR
To access and analyze syntenic tandem gene blooms across species, we created a pipeline
we call TandemClipR that defines tandem arrays based on orthologous "bookend" genes.
Bookends define syntenic array bounding positions and are not members of the bloomed family.
First, we used the biomaRt R package (184) to define the human genome as the reference mart,
and then created a table of bookending ortholog chromosome names, starts, and stops using the
'getLDS' function and the dec2021 ensembl archive as a source. We tabulated these ortholog
positions in all 193 vertebrate species in the archive (See Supplemental Tables 6 and 7). If both
orthologs were on the same scaffold, indicating a contiguous assembly of the tandem array, we
used the retrieved coordinates to subset the gff3 annotation file to the focal region using the
subsetByOverlaps() function in the GenomicRanges package (185). Filters were applied when
imported annotations to retain only "gene", "mRNA","CDS","exon","five_prime_UTR", and
"three_prime_UTR" annotations.
The resulting gff3 files were used to analyze feature GC content across each tandem array
based on sequences in the Ensembl "toplevel" assemblies. Namely, we used command-line tools
to subset the gff3 annotations into focal features (genes, exons, five_prime_UTR), and used
while awk and bedtools merge and subtract (179) were used to produced genic, intergenic,
exonic, intronic, and whole cluster bedfiles defining these regions. Additionally, bedfiles
defining the promoter region of each gene were produced by defining a window 750bp upstream
and 250bp downstream of the transcription start site. We fed these bedfiles to bedtools nuc to
calculate GC content for each feature, which were counted and aggregated into average GC% for
final analyses. We spot-checked gene counts in NCBI's Genome Data Viewer and noticed that
there were a few cases in which counts varied between recent assemblies. For example, the lion
HBB-OR cluster is much shorter in the assembly we used compared to the most recent assembly.
However, our manual counts of the HBB-OR array in a subset of species produced similar trends
as the automated annotation. To further verify that one of these assembly/annotation errors did
not sway the overall trend, we ran each PGLS analysis iteratively, removing one species at a
time, and found that PGLS p-values of the whole were largely reflected in each iteration.
1161

References
1. Charkoftaki G, Wang Y, McAndrews M, Bruford EA, Thompson DC, Vasiliou V, et al.
Update on the human and mouse lipocalin (LCN) gene family, including evidence the
mouse Mup cluster is result of an "evolutionary bloom." Human Genomics. 2019 Feb
19;13(1):11.

2. Feyereisen R. Evolution of insect P450. Biochem Soc Trans. 2006 Dec;34(Pt 6):1252–5.

3. Nelson DR, Goldstone JV, Stegeman JJ. The cytochrome P450 genesis locus: the origin and
evolution of animal cytochrome P450s. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2013 Feb
19;368(1612):20120474.

4. Ohno, Susumu. Evolution by gene duplication. [Internet]. Springer; 1970 [cited 2021 Nov 9].
Available from:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/?term=evolution%20by%20gene%20duplication
%20ohno%201970

5. Demuth JP, De Bie T, Stajich JE, Cristianini N, Hahn MW. The evolution of mammalian
gene families. PLoS One. 2006 Dec 20;1:e85.

6. Giorgianni MW, Dowell NL, Griffin S, Kassner VA, Selegue JE, Carroll SB. The origin and
diversification of a novel protein family in venomous snakes. PNAS. 2020 May
19;117(20):10911–20.

7. Holding ML, Strickland JL, Rautsaw RM, Hofmann EP, Mason AJ, Hogan MP, et al.
Phylogenetically diverse diets favor more complex venoms in North American pitvipers.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021 Apr 27;118(17):e2015579118.

8. Johnson RN, O'Meally D, Chen Z, Etherington GJ, Ho SYW, Nash WJ, et al. Adaptation
and conservation insights from the koala genome. Nat Genet. 2018 Aug;50(8):1102–11.

9. Pavlovich SS, Lovett SP, Koroleva G, Guito JC, Arnold CE, Nagle ER, et al. The Egyptian
Rousette Genome Reveals Unexpected Features of Bat Antiviral Immunity. Cell. 2018 May
17;173(5):1098-1110.e18.

10. Perry GH, Dominy NJ, Claw KG, Lee AS, Fiegler H, Redon R, et al. Diet and the evolution
of human amylase gene copy number variation. Nat Genet. 2007 Oct;39(10):1256–60.

11. Sun X, Zhang Z, Sun Y, Li J, Xu S, Yang G. Comparative genomics analyses of alpha-
keratins reveal insights into evolutionary adaptation of marine mammals. Frontiers in
Zoology. 2017 Aug 2;14(1):41.

12. Kawasaki K, Lafont AG, Sire JY. The evolution of milk casein genes from tooth genes
before the origin of mammals. Mol Biol Evol. 2011 Jul;28(7):2053–61.

13. Clowney EJ, Magklara A, Colquitt BM, Pathak N, Lane RP, Lomvardas S. High-throughput
mapping of the promoters of the mouse olfactory receptor genes reveals a new type of
mammalian promoter and provides insight into olfactory receptor gene regulation. Genome
Res. 2011 Aug;21(8):1249–59.

14. Corneo G, Ginelli E, Soave C, Bernardi G. Isolation and characterization of mouse and
guinea pig satellite deoxyribonucleic acids. Biochemistry. 1968 Dec;7(12):4373–9.

15. Holmquist GP. Chromosome bands, their chromatin flavors, and their functional features.
Am J Hum Genet. 1992 Jul;51(1):17–37.

16. Bickmore WA. Patterns in the genome. Heredity. 2019 Jul;123(1):50–7.

17. Filipski J. Evolution of DNA Sequence Contributions of Mutational Bias and Selection to the
Origin of Chromosomal Compartments. In: Obe G, editor. Advances in Mutagenesis
Research [Internet]. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 1990 [cited 2021 Feb 26]. p. 1–54.

(Advances in Mutagenesis Research). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-
75599-6_1

18. Korenberg JR, Rykowski MC. Human genome organization: Alu, lines, and the molecular
structure of metaphase chromosome bands. Cell. 1988 May 6;53(3):391–400.

19. Schug J, Schuller WP, Kappen C, Salbaum JM, Bucan M, Stoeckert CJ. Promoter features
related to tissue specificity as measured by Shannon entropy. Genome Biology. 2005 Mar
29;6(4):R33.

20. Waterson RH, Lander ES, Wilson RK, The Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis
Consortium. Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and comparison with the human
genome. Nature. 2005 Sep;437(7055):69–87.

21. Niimura Y, Gojobori T. In silico chromosome staining: Reconstruction of Giemsa bands
from the whole human genome sequence. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2002 Jan
22;99(2):797–802.

22. Costantini M, Clay O, Auletta F, Bernardi G. An isochore map of human chromosomes.
Genome Res. 2006 Apr 1;16(4):536–41.

23. Cohen N, Dagan T, Stone L, Graur D. GC Composition of the Human Genome: In Search of
Isochores. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2005 May 1;22(5):1260–72.

24. Cozzi P, Milanesi L, Bernardi G. Segmenting the Human Genome into Isochores. Evol
Bioinform Online. 2015 Nov 25;11:253–61.

25. Lander ES, Linton LM, Birren B, Nusbaum C, Zody MC, Baldwin J, et al. Initial sequencing
and analysis of the human genome. Nature. 2001 Feb 15;409(6822):860–921.

26. Duret L, Galtier N. Biased gene conversion and the evolution of mammalian genomic
landscapes. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet. 2009;10:285–311.

27. Lynch, Michael. The origins of genome architecture [Internet]. Indiana University Press;
2007 [cited 2021 Nov 9]. Available from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/101296442

28. Bernardi G, Olofsson B, Filipski J, Zerial M, Salinas J, Cuny G, et al. The mosaic genome of
warm-blooded vertebrates. Science. 1985 May 24;228(4702):953–8.

29. Glémin S, Arndt PF, Messer PW, Petrov D, Galtier N, Duret L. Quantification of GC-biased
gene conversion in the human genome. Genome Res. 2015 Aug 1;25(8):1215–28.

30. Duret L, Arndt PF. The Impact of Recombination on Nucleotide Substitutions in the Human
Genome. PLOS Genetics. 2008 May 9;4(5):e1000071.

31. Pouyet F, Mouchiroud D, Duret L, Sémon M. Recombination, meiotic expression and human
codon usage. Przeworski M, editor. eLife. 2017 Aug 15;6:e27344.

32. Fryxell KJ, Zuckerkandl E. Cytosine deamination plays a primary role in the evolution of
mammalian isochores. Mol Biol Evol. 2000 Sep;17(9):1371–83.

33. Hershberg R, Petrov DA. Evidence that mutation is universally biased towards AT in
bacteria. PLoS Genet. 2010 Sep 9;6(9):e1001115.

34. Hildebrand F, Meyer A, Eyre-Walker A. Evidence of selection upon genomic GC-content in
bacteria. PLoS Genet. 2010 Sep 9;6(9):e1001107.

35. Lynch M. Rate, molecular spectrum, and consequences of human mutation. Proceedings of
the National Academy of Sciences. 2010 Jan 19;107(3):961–8.

36. Simmen MW. Genome-scale relationships between cytosine methylation and dinucleotide
abundances in animals. Genomics. 2008 Jul 1;92(1):33–40.

37. Mugal CF, Arndt PF, Holm L, Ellegren H. Evolutionary Consequences of DNA Methylation
on the GC Content in Vertebrate Genomes. G3 (Bethesda). 2015 Jan 15;5(3):441–7.

38. Fryxell KJ, Moon WJ. CpG Mutation Rates in the Human Genome Are Highly Dependent
on Local GC Content. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2005 Mar 1;22(3):650–8.

39. Jabbari K, Chakraborty M, Wiehe T. DNA sequence-dependent chromatin architecture and
nuclear hubs formation. Sci Rep. 2019 Oct 10;9(1):14646.

40. Ramani V, Shendure J, Duan Z. Understanding Spatial Genome Organization: Methods and
Insights. Genomics, Proteomics & Bioinformatics. 2016 Feb 1;14(1):7–20.

41. Woodfine K, Fiegler H, Beare DM, Collins JE, McCann OT, Young BD, et al. Replication
timing of the human genome. Hum Mol Genet. 2004 Jan 15;13(2):191–202.

42. Ségurel L, Wyman MJ, Przeworski M. Determinants of Mutation Rate Variation in the
Human Germline. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics. 2014;15(1):47–70.

43. Armelin-Correa LM, Gutiyama LM, Brandt DYC, Malnic B. Nuclear compartmentalization
of odorant receptor genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014 Feb 18;111(7):2782–7.

44. Clowney EJ, LeGros MA, Mosley CP, Clowney FG, Markenskoff-Papadimitriou EC, Myllys
M, et al. Nuclear aggregation of olfactory receptor genes governs their monogenic
expression. Cell. 2012 Nov 9;151(4):724–37.

45. Monahan K, Horta A, Lomvardas S. LHX2- and LDB1-mediated trans interactions regulate
olfactory receptor choice. Nature. 2019;565(7740):448–53.

46. Tan L, Xing D, Daley N, Xie XS. Three-dimensional genome structures of single sensory
neurons in mouse visual and olfactory systems. Nature Structural & Molecular Biology.
2019 Apr;26(4):297–307.

47. Tan L, Ma W, Wu H, Zheng Y, Xing D, Chen R, et al. Changes in genome architecture and
transcriptional dynamics progress independently of sensory experience during post-natal
brain development. Cell. 2021 Feb 4;184(3):741-758.e17.

48. Holmquist GP, Filipski J. Organization of mutations along the genome: a prime determinant
of genome evolution. Trends Ecol Evol. 1994 Feb;9(2):65–9.

49. Jabbari K, Bernardi G. An Isochore Framework Underlies Chromatin Architecture. PLOS
ONE. 2017 Jan 6;12(1):e0168023.

50. Gao F, Zhang CT. GC-Profile: a web-based tool for visualizing and analyzing the variation
of GC content in genomic sequences. Nucleic Acids Res. 2006 Jul 1;34(Web Server
issue):W686–91.

51. Morales J, Pujar S, Loveland JE, Astashyn A, Bennett R, Berry A, et al. A joint NCBI and
EMBL-EBI transcript set for clinical genomics and research. Nature. 2022
Apr;604(7905):310–5.

52. Glusman G, Yanai I, Rubin I, Lancet D. The complete human olfactory subgenome. Genome
Res. 2001 May;11(5):685–702.

53. Clawson H. GC Percent in 5-Base Windows (gc5BaseBw). Unpublished.
https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-
bin/hgc?hgsid=950293831_VmX9SYAwpTKoTme1yOSQX58aR0aR&c=chr16&l=48043
557&r=48045592&o=48043557&t=48045592&g=gc5BaseBw&i=gc5BaseBw. Accessed
6/21/22 [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Jun 21]. Available from: https://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-
bin/hgc?hgsid=950293831_VmX9SYAwpTKoTme1yOSQX58aR0aR&c=chr16&l=48043
557&r=48045592&o=48043557&t=48045592&g=gc5BaseBw&i=gc5BaseBw

54. Micklem G, Hillier LW. CpG Islands. Unpublished.
http://genomewiki.ucsc.edu/index.php/CpG_Islands. Accessed 6/21/22. [Internet]. 2006
[cited 2022 Jun 21]. Available from: http://genomewiki.ucsc.edu/index.php/CpG_Islands

55. Niimura Y, Nei M. Extensive Gains and Losses of Olfactory Receptor Genes in Mammalian
Evolution. PLOS ONE. 2007 Aug 8;2(8):e708.

56. Niimura Y, Matsui A, Touhara K. Extreme expansion of the olfactory receptor gene
repertoire in African elephants and evolutionary dynamics of orthologous gene groups in 13
placental mammals. Genome Res. 2014 Sep 1;24(9):1485–96.

57. Khan I, Maldonado E, Vasconcelos V, O'Brien SJ, Johnson WE, Antunes A. Mammalian
keratin associated proteins (KRTAPs) subgenomes: disentangling hair diversity and
adaptation to terrestrial and aquatic environments. BMC Genomics. 2014 Sep 10;15(1):779.

58. Walker MB, King BL, Paigen K. Clusters of Ancestrally Related Genes That Show Paralogy
in Whole or in Part Are a Major Feature of the Genomes of Humans and Other Species.
PLoS One. 2012 Apr 26;7(4):e35274.

59. Sheehan MJ, Campbell P, Miller CH. Evolutionary patterns of major urinary protein scent
signals in house mice and relatives. Molecular Ecology. 2019;28(15):3587–601.

60. Hardison RC. Evolution of Hemoglobin and Its Genes. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med.
2012 Dec;2(12):a011627.

61. Thomas JH. Rapid birth-death evolution specific to xenobiotic cytochrome P450 genes in
vertebrates. PLoS Genet. 2007 May 11;3(5):e67.

62. Tan HM, Low WY. Rapid birth-death evolution and positive selection in detoxification-type
glutathione S-transferases in mammals. PLOS ONE. 2018 Dec 26;13(12):e0209336.

63. Nei M, Niimura Y, Nozawa M. The evolution of animal chemosensory receptor gene
repertoires: roles of chance and necessity. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2008 Dec;9(12):951–
63.

64. Schwartz JC, Gibson MS, Heimeier D, Koren S, Phillippy AM, Bickhart DM, et al. The
evolution of the natural killer complex; a comparison between mammals using new high-
quality genome assemblies and targeted annotation. Immunogenetics. 2017 Apr;69(4):255–
69.

65. Semple F, Dorin JR. β-Defensins: Multifunctional Modulators of Infection, Inflammation
and More? JIN. 2012;4(4):337–48.

66. Shelton JF, Shastri AJ, Fletez-Brant K, Stella Aslibekyan, Auton A. The UGT2A1/UGT2A2
locus is associated with COVID-19-related loss of smell or taste. Nat Genet. 2022
Feb;54(2):121–4.

67. Chuang JH, Li H. Functional bias and spatial organization of genes in mutational hot and
cold regions in the human genome. PLoS Biol. 2004 Feb;2(2):E29.

68. Grimwood J, Gordon LA, Olsen A, Terry A, Schmutz J, Lamerdin J, et al. The DNA
sequence and biology of human chromosome 19. Nature. 2004 Apr 1;428(6982):529–35.

69. Karczewski KJ, Francioli LC, Tiao G, Cummings BB, Alföldi J, Wang Q, et al. The
mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. Nature. 2020
May;581(7809):434–43.

70. Mainland JD, Keller A, Li YR, Zhou T, Trimmer C, Snyder LL, et al. The missense of smell:
functional variability in the human odorant receptor repertoire. Nat Neurosci. 2014
Jan;17(1):114–20.

71. Trimmer C, Keller A, Murphy NR, Snyder LL, Willer JR, Nagai MH, et al. Genetic variation
across the human olfactory receptor repertoire alters odor perception. PNAS. 2019 May
7;116(19):9475–80.

72. Nachman MW, Crowell SL. Estimate of the Mutation Rate per Nucleotide in Humans.
Genetics. 2000 Sep 1;156(1):297–304.

73. Sved J, Bird A. The expected equilibrium of the CpG dinucleotide in vertebrate genomes
under a mutation model. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1990 Jun;87(12):4692–6.

74. Lek M, Karczewski KJ, Minikel EV, Samocha KE, Banks E, Fennell T, et al. Analysis of
protein-coding genetic variation in 60,706 humans. Nature. 2016 Aug;536(7616):285–91.

75. Rodriguez-Galindo M, Casillas S, Weghorn D, Barbadilla A. Germline de novo mutation
rates on exons versus introns in humans. Nat Commun. 2020 Jul 3;11(1):3304.

76. Francioli LC, Polak PP, Koren A, Menelaou A, Chun S, Renkens I, et al. Genome-wide
patterns and properties of *de novo* mutations in humans. Nature Genetics. 2015
Jul;47(7):822–6.

77. Jónsson H, Sulem P, Kehr B, Kristmundsdottir S, Zink F, Hjartarson E, et al. Parental
influence on human germline de novo mutations in 1,548 trios from Iceland. Nature. 2017
Sep 28;549(7673):519–22.

78. Halldorsson BV, Palsson G, Stefansson OA, Jonsson H, Hardarson MT, Eggertsson HP, et
al. Characterizing mutagenic effects of recombination through a sequence-level genetic
map. Science. 2019 Jan 25;363(6425).

79. Jabbari K, Wirtz J, Rauscher M, Wiehe T. A common genomic code for chromatin
architecture and recombination landscape. PLOS ONE. 2019 Mar 13;14(3):e0213278.

80. Kong A, Thorleifsson G, Gudbjartsson DF, Masson G, Sigurdsson A, Jonasdottir A, et al.
Fine-scale recombination rate differences between sexes, populations and individuals.
Nature. 2010 Oct;467(7319):1099–103.

81. Lee YS, Chao A, Chen CH, Chou T, Wang SYM, Wang TH. Analysis of human meiotic
recombination events with a parent-sibling tracing approach. BMC Genomics. 2011 Aug
26;12(1):434.

82. Uhrberg M. The KIR gene family: life in the fast lane of evolution. European Journal of
Immunology. 2005;35(1):10–5.

83. Baudat F, Buard J, Grey C, Fledel-Alon A, Ober C, Przeworski M, et al. PRDM9 is a major
determinant of meiotic recombination hotspots in humans and mice. Science. 2010 Feb
12;327(5967):836–40.

84. Myers S, Bowden R, Tumian A, Bontrop RE, Freeman C, MacFie TS, et al. Drive against
hotspot motifs in primates implicates the PRDM9 gene in meiotic recombination. Science.
2010 Feb 12;327(5967):876–9.

85. Parvanov ED, Petkov PM, Paigen K. Prdm9 controls activation of mammalian
recombination hotspots. Science. 2010 Feb 12;327(5967):835.

86. Altemose N, Noor N, Bitoun E, Tumian A, Imbeault M, Chapman JR, et al. A map of human
PRDM9 binding provides evidence for novel behaviors of PRDM9 and other zinc-finger
proteins in meiosis. Przeworski M, editor. eLife. 2017 Oct 26;6:e28383.

87. Baker Z, Schumer M, Haba Y, Bashkirova L, Holland C, Rosenthal GG, et al. Repeated
losses of PRDM9-directed recombination despite the conservation of PRDM9 across
vertebrates. de Massy B, editor. eLife. 2017 Jun 6;6:e24133.

88. Smith ZD, Meissner A. DNA methylation: roles in mammalian development. Nat Rev Genet.
2013 Mar;14(3):204–20.

89. Mohn F, Schübeler D. Genetics and epigenetics: stability and plasticity during cellular
differentiation. Trends Genet. 2009 Mar;25(3):129–36.

90. Deaton AM, Bird A. CpG islands and the regulation of transcription. Genes Dev. 2011 May
15;25(10):1010–22.

91. Michaloski JS, Galante PAF, Malnic B. Identification of potential regulatory motifs in
odorant receptor genes by analysis of promoter sequences. Genome Res. 2006
Sep;16(9):1091–8.

92. Bird AP. CpG-rich islands and the function of DNA methylation. Nature. 1986 May
15;321(6067):209–13.

93. GTEx Consortium. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project. Nat Genet. 2013
Jun;45(6):580–5.

94. Lister R, Mukamel EA, Nery JR, Urich M, Puddifoot CA, Johnson ND, et al. Global
Epigenomic Reconfiguration During Mammalian Brain Development. Science. 2013 Aug
9;341(6146):1237905.

95. Winick-Ng W, Kukalev A, Harabula I, Zea-Redondo L, Szabó D, Meijer M, et al. Cell-type
specialization is encoded by specific chromatin topologies. Nature. 2021
Nov;599(7886):684–91.

96. Schmitt AD, Hu M, Jung I, Xu Z, Qiu Y, Tan CL, et al. A Compendium of Chromatin
Contact Maps Reveals Spatially Active Regions in the Human Genome. Cell Reports. 2016
Nov 15;17(8):2042–59.

97. Naughton C, Avlonitis N, Corless S, Prendergast JG, Mati IK, Eijk PP, et al. Transcription
forms and remodels supercoiling domains unfolding large-scale chromatin structures. Nat
Struct Mol Biol. 2013 Mar;20(3):387–95.

98. Christmas MJ, Kaplow IM, Genereux DP, Dong MX, Hughes GM, Li X, et al. Evolutionary
constraint and innovation across hundreds of placental mammals [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2023
[cited 2023 Mar 22]. p. 2023.03.09.531574. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.03.09.531574v1

99. Hughes GM, Boston ESM, Finarelli JA, Murphy WJ, Higgins DG, Teeling EC. The Birth
and Death of Olfactory Receptor Gene Families in Mammalian Niche Adaptation.
Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2018 Jun 1;35(6):1390–406.

100. Witt M, Hummel T. Vomeronasal Versus Olfactory Epithelium: Is There a Cellular Basis
for Human Vomeronasal Perception? In: International Review of Cytology [Internet].
Academic Press; 2006 [cited 2021 Aug 11]. p. 209–59. Available from:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0074769606480049

101. Zhang J, Webb DM. Evolutionary deterioration of the vomeronasal pheromone transduction
pathway in catarrhine primates. PNAS. 2003 Jul 8;100(14):8337–41.

102. Xia B, Yan Y, Baron M, Wagner F, Barkley D, Chiodin M, et al. Widespread
Transcriptional Scanning in the Testis Modulates Gene Evolution Rates. Cell. 2020 Jan
23;180(2):248-262.e21.

103. Harpak A, Lan X, Gao Z, Pritchard JK. Frequent nonallelic gene conversion on the human
lineage and its effect on the divergence of gene duplicates. PNAS. 2017 Nov
28;114(48):12779–84.

104. Caridi PC, Delabaere L, Zapotoczny G, Chiolo I. And yet, it moves: nuclear and chromatin
dynamics of a heterochromatic double-strand break. Philosophical Transactions of the
Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2017 Aug 28;372(1731):20160291.

105. Jimeno S, Mejías-Navarro F, Prados-Carvajal R, Huertas P. Chapter Four - Controlling the
balance between chromosome break repair pathways. In: Donev R, editor. Advances in
Protein Chemistry and Structural Biology [Internet]. Academic Press; 2019 [cited 2023 Mar
9]. p. 95–134. (DNA Repair; vol. 115). Available from:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187616231830066X

106. Gu J, Lu H, Tsai AG, Schwarz K, Lieber MR. Single-stranded DNA ligation and XLF-
stimulated incompatible DNA end ligation by the XRCC4-DNA ligase IV complex:
influence of terminal DNA sequence. Nucleic Acids Res. 2007;35(17):5755–62.

107. Davis BJ, Havener JM, Ramsden DA. End-bridging is required for pol μ to efficiently
promote repair of noncomplementary ends by nonhomologous end joining. Nucleic Acids
Res. 2008 May;36(9):3085–94.

108. Grand RS, Burger L, Gräwe C, Michael AK, Isbel L, Hess D, et al. BANP opens chromatin
and activates CpG-island-regulated genes. Nature. 2021 Jul 7;1–5.

109. Zhang J, Zhang Y, You Q, Huang C, Zhang T, Wang M, et al. Highly enriched BEND3
prevents the premature activation of bivalent genes during differentiation. Science. 2022
Mar 4;375(6584):1053–8.

110. Monahan K, Schieren I, Cheung J, Mumbey-Wafula A, Monuki ES, Lomvardas S.
Cooperative interactions enable singular olfactory receptor expression in mouse olfactory
neurons. Elife. 2017 21;6.

111. Li Q, Peterson KR, Fang X, Stamatoyannopoulos G. Locus control regions. Blood. 2002
Nov 1;100(9):3077–86.

112. Pratto F, Brick K, Cheng G, Lam KWG, Cloutier JM, Dahiya D, et al. Meiotic
recombination mirrors patterns of germline replication in mice and humans. Cell. 2021 Aug
5;184(16):4251-4267.e20.

113. Xie WJ, Meng L, Liu S, Zhang L, Cai X, Gao YQ. Structural Modeling of Chromatin
Integrates Genome Features and Reveals Chromosome Folding Principle. Sci Rep
[Internet]. 2017 Jun 6 [cited 2018 Jul 27];7. Available from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5460185/

114. Costantini M, Musto H. The Isochores as a Fundamental Level of Genome Structure and
Organization: A General Overview. J Mol Evol. 2017 Mar 1;84(2):93–103.

115. Dekker J. GC- and AT-rich chromatin domains differ in conformation and histone
modification status and are differentially modulated by Rpd3p. Genome Biology. 2007 Jun
18;8(6):R116.

116. Wang Z, Willard HF. Evidence for sequence biases associated with patterns of histone
methylation. BMC Genomics. 2012 Aug 2;13(1):367.

117. Magklara A, Yen A, Colquitt BM, Clowney EJ, Allen W, Markenscoff-Papadimitriou E, et
al. An epigenetic signature for monoallelic olfactory receptor expression. Cell. 2011 May
13;145(4):555–70.

118. Toyoda S, Kawaguchi M, Kobayashi T, Tarusawa E, Toyama T, Okano M, et al.
Developmental Epigenetic Modification Regulates Stochastic Expression of Clustered
Protocadherin Genes, Generating Single Neuron Diversity. Neuron. 2014 Apr 2;82(1):94–
108.

119. Williams DL, Sikora VM, Hammer MA, Amin S, Brinjikji T, Brumley EK, et al. May the
Odds Be Ever in Your Favor: Non-deterministic Mechanisms Diversifying Cell Surface
Molecule Expression. Front Cell Dev Biol. 2021;9:720798.

120. Balan S, Iwayama Y, Ohnishi T, Fukuda M, Shirai A, Yamada A, et al. A loss-of-function
variant in SUV39H2 identified in autism-spectrum disorder causes altered H3K9
trimethylation and dysregulation of protocadherin β-cluster genes in the developing brain.
Mol Psychiatry. 2021 Dec;26(12):7550–9.

121. Nicetto D, Donahue G, Jain T, Peng T, Sidoli S, Sheng L, et al. H3K9me3-heterochromatin
loss at protein-coding genes enables developmental lineage specification. Science. 2019 Jan
18;363(6424):294–7.

122. Antequera F, Bird A. CpG islands as genomic footprints of promoters that are associated
with replication origins. Current Biology. 1999 Sep 9;9(17):R661–7.

123. Horowitz A, Strauss-Albee DM, Leipold M, Kubo J, Nemat-Gorgani N, Dogan OC, et al.
Genetic and environmental determinants of human NK cell diversity revealed by mass
cytometry. Sci Transl Med. 2013 Oct 23;5(208):208ra145.

124. Wilk AJ, Blish CA. Diversification of human NK cells: lessons from deep profiling. J
Leukoc Biol. 2018 Apr;103(4):629–41.

125. Dalton RP, Lyons DB, Lomvardas S. Co-opting the unfolded protein response to elicit
olfactory receptor feedback. Cell. 2013 Oct 10;155(2):321–32.

126. Hetz C, Zhang K, Kaufman RJ. Mechanisms, regulation and functions of the unfolded
protein response. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology. 2020 Aug;21(8):421–38.

127. Smukowski CS, Noor M a. F. Recombination rate variation in closely related species.
Heredity. 2011 Dec;107(6):496–508.

128. Jeffreys AJ, Cotton VE, Neumann R, Lam KWG. Recombination regulator PRDM9
influences the instability of its own coding sequence in humans. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.
2013 Jan 8;110(2):600–5.

129. Casola C, Betrán E. The Genomic Impact of Gene Retrocopies: What Have We Learned
from Comparative Genomics, Population Genomics, and Transcriptomic Analyses?
Genome Biology and Evolution. 2017 Jun 1;9(6):1351–73.

130. Lane RP, Young J, Newman T, Trask BJ. Species specificity in rodent pheromone receptor
repertoires. Genome Res. 2004 Apr;14(4):603–8.

131. Trask BJ, Friedman C, Martin-Gallardo A, Rowen L, Akinbami C, Blankenship J, et al.
Members of the olfactory receptor gene family are contained in large blocks of DNA
duplicated polymorphically near the ends of human chromosomes. Human Molecular
Genetics. 1998 Jan 1;7(1):13–26.

132. Linardopoulou EV, Williams EM, Fan Y, Friedman C, Young JM, Trask BJ. Human
subtelomeres are hot spots of interchromosomal recombination and segmental duplication.
Nature. 2005 Sep;437(7055):94–100.

133. Mefford HC, Linardopoulou E, Coil D, van den Engh G, Trask BJ. Comparative
sequencing of a multicopy subtelomeric region containing olfactory receptor genes reveals
multiple interactions between non-homologous chromosomes. Hum Mol Genet. 2001 Oct
1;10(21):2363–72.

134. Freeman JL, Perry GH, Feuk L, Redon R, McCarroll SA, Altshuler DM, et al. Copy
number variation: new insights in genome diversity. Genome Res. 2006 Aug;16(8):949–61.

135. Newman T, Trask BJ. Complex Evolution of 7E Olfactory Receptor Genes in Segmental
Duplications. Genome Res. 2003 May 1;13(5):781–93.

136. Kim J, Farré M, Auvil L, Capitanu B, Larkin DM, Ma J, et al. Reconstruction and
evolutionary history of eutherian chromosomes. PNAS. 2017 Jul 3;114(27):E5379–88.

137. Rouquier S, Taviaux S, Trask BJ, Brand-Arpon V, van den Engh G, Demaille J, et al.
Distribution of olfactory receptor genes in the human genome. Nat Genet. 1998
Mar;18(3):243–50.

138. Yue Y, Haaf T. 7E olfactory receptor gene clusters and evolutionary chromosome
rearrangements. Cytogenet Genome Res. 2006;112(1–2):6–10.

139. Young JM, Endicott RM, Parghi SS, Walker M, Kidd JM, Trask BJ. Extensive copy-
number variation of the human olfactory receptor gene family. Am J Hum Genet. 2008
Aug;83(2):228–42.

140. Paudel Y, Madsen O, Megens HJ, Frantz LAF, Bosse M, Crooijmans RPMA, et al. Copy
number variation in the speciation of pigs: a possible prominent role for olfactory receptors.
BMC Genomics. 2015 Apr 22;16(1):330.

141. Rogers RL. Chromosomal Rearrangements as Barriers to Genetic Homogenization between
Archaic and Modern Humans. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2015 Dec 1;32(12):3064–
78.

142. North HL, Caminade P, Severac D, Belkhir K, Smadja CM. The role of copy-number
variation in the reinforcement of sexual isolation between the two European subspecies of
the house mouse. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.
2020 Aug 31;375(1806):20190540.

143. Otto M, Zheng Y, Wiehe T. Recombination, selection, and the evolution of tandem gene
arrays. Genetics. 2022 Apr 23;iyac052.

144. Qu Q, Haitina T, Zhu M, Ahlberg PE. New genomic and fossil data illuminate the origin of
enamel. Nature. 2015 Oct 1;526(7571):108–11.

145. Mann RS. Why are Hox genes clustered? Bioessays. 1997 Aug;19(8):661–4.

146. Darbellay F, Bochaton C, Lopez-Delisle L, Mascrez B, Tschopp P, Delpretti S, et al. The
constrained architecture of mammalian Hox gene clusters. Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences. 2019 Jul 2;116(27):13424–33.

147. Montavon T, Soshnikova N, Mascrez B, Joye E, Thevenet L, Splinter E, et al. A regulatory
archipelago controls Hox genes transcription in digits. Cell. 2011 Nov 23;147(5):1132–45.

148. Wong ES, Zheng D, Tan SZ, Bower NL, Garside V, Vanwalleghem G, et al. Deep
conservation of the enhancer regulatory code in animals. Science. 2020 Nov
6;370(6517):eaax8137.

149. Markenscoff-Papadimitriou E, Allen WE, Colquitt BM, Goh T, Murphy KK, Monahan K,
et al. Enhancer interaction networks as a means for singular olfactory receptor expression.
Cell. 2014 Oct 23;159(3):543–57.

150. Roy AL, Sen R, Roeder RG. Enhancer–promoter communication and transcriptional
regulation of Igh. Trends in Immunology. 2011 Nov 1;32(11):532–9.

151. Ribich S, Tasic B, Maniatis T. Identification of long-range regulatory elements in the
protocadherin-α gene cluster. PNAS. 2006 Dec 26;103(52):19719–24.

152. Yokota S, Hirayama T, Hirano K, Kaneko R, Toyoda S, Kawamura Y, et al. Identification
of the cluster control region for the protocadherin-beta genes located beyond the
protocadherin-gamma cluster. J Biol Chem. 2011 Sep 9;286(36):31885–95.

153. de Lange T. A loopy view of telomere evolution. Frontiers in Genetics [Internet]. 2015
[cited 2022 Jun 20];6. Available from:
https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fgene.2015.00321

154. Zody MC, Garber M, Adams DJ, Sharpe T, Harrow J, Lupski JR, et al. DNA sequence of
human chromosome 17 and analysis of rearrangement in the human lineage. Nature. 2006
Apr;440(7087):1045–9.

155. Riethman H, Ambrosini A, Castaneda C, Finklestein J, Hu XL, Mudunuri U, et al. Mapping
and Initial Analysis of Human Subtelomeric Sequence Assemblies. Genome Res. 2004 Jan
1;14(1):18–28.

156. Giglio S, Broman KW, Matsumoto N, Calvari V, Gimelli G, Neumann T, et al. Olfactory
Receptor–Gene Clusters, Genomic-Inversion Polymorphisms, and Common Chromosome
Rearrangements. Am J Hum Genet. 2001 Apr;68(4):874–83.

157. Jensen-Seaman MI, Furey TS, Payseur BA, Lu Y, Roskin KM, Chen CF, et al. Comparative
Recombination Rates in the Rat, Mouse, and Human Genomes. Genome Res. 2004 Apr
1;14(4):528–38.

158. Hultén M. Chiasma distribution at diakinesis in the normal human male. Hereditas.
1974;76(1):55–78.

159. Pratto F, Brick K, Khil P, Smagulova F, Petukhova GV, Camerini-Otero RD.
Recombination initiation maps of individual human genomes. Science. 2014 Nov
14;346(6211):1256442.

160. Tease C, Hultén MA. Inter-sex variation in synaptonemal complex lengths largely
determine the different recombination rates in male and female germ cells. CGR.
2004;107(3–4):208–15.

161. Antunes DMF, Kalmbach KH, Wang F, Dracxler RC, Seth-Smith ML, Kramer Y, et al. A
single-cell assay for telomere DNA content shows increasing telomere length

heterogeneity, as well as increasing mean telomere length in human spermatozoa with advancing age. J Assist Reprod Genet. 2015 Nov 1;32(11):1685–90.

162. Capra JA, Hubisz MJ, Kostka D, Pollard KS, Siepel A. A model-based analysis of GC-biased gene conversion in the human and chimpanzee genomes. PLoS Genet. 2013;9(8):e1003684.

163. Huttener R, Thorrez L, in't Veld T, Granvik M, Snoeck L, Van Lommel L, et al. GC content of vertebrate exome landscapes reveal areas of accelerated protein evolution. BMC Evolutionary Biology. 2019 Jul 16;19(1):144.

164. Monroe JG, Srikant T, Carbonell-Bejerano P, Becker C, Lensink M, Exposito-Alonso M, et al. Mutation bias reflects natural selection in Arabidopsis thaliana. Nature. 2022 Feb;602(7895):101–5.

165. McVicker G, Gordon D, Davis C, Green P. Widespread Genomic Signatures of Natural Selection in Hominid Evolution. PLOS Genetics. 2009 May 8;5(5):e1000471.

166. Murphy D, Elyashiv E, Amster G, Sella G. Broad-scale variation in human genetic diversity levels is predicted by purifying selection on coding and non-coding elements [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 1]. p. 2021.07.02.450762. Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.07.02.450762v2

167. Kambere MB, Lane RP. Exceptional LINE density at V1R loci: the Lyon repeat hypothesis revisited on autosomes. J Mol Evol. 2009 Feb;68(2):145–59.

168. Schoenfelder S, Fraser P. Long-range enhancer–promoter contacts in gene expression control. Nat Rev Genet. 2019 Aug;20(8):437–55.

169. McKenzie SK, Fetter-Pruneda I, Ruta V, Kronauer DJC. Transcriptomics and neuroanatomy of the clonal raider ant implicate an expanded clade of odorant receptors in chemical communication. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2016 Dec 6;113(49):14091–6.

170. Armitage SAO, Freiburg RY, Kurtz J, Bravo IG. The evolution of Dscam genes across the arthropods. BMC Evol Biol. 2012 Apr 13;12:53.

171. Labrador M, Corces VG. Extensive Exon Reshuffling Over Evolutionary Time Coupled to Trans-Splicing in Drosophila. Genome Res. 2003 Oct 1;13(10):2220–8.

172. Goeke S, Greene EA, Grant PK, Gates MA, Crowner D, Aigaki T, et al. Alternative splicing of lola generates 19 transcription factors controlling axon guidance in Drosophila. Nat Neurosci. 2003 Sep;6(9):917–24.

173. Venables JP, Tazi J, Juge F. Regulated functional alternative splicing in Drosophila. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012 Jan;40(1):1–10.

174. Schield DR, Card DC, Hales NR, Perry BW, Pasquesi GM, Blackmon H, et al. The origins
and evolution of chromosomes, dosage compensation, and mechanisms underlying venom
regulation in snakes. Genome Res. 2019 Apr;29(4):590–601.

175. Berriman M, Ghedin E, Hertz-Fowler C, Blandin G, Renauld H, Bartholomeu DC, et al.
The genome of the African trypanosome Trypanosoma brucei. Science. 2005 Jul
15;309(5733):416–22.

176. Orme D, Freckleton R, Thomas G, Petzoldt T, Fritz S, Isaac N, et al. caper: Comparative
Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Mar 22].
Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/caper/index.html

177. Kumar S, Stecher G, Suleski M, Hedges SB. TimeTree: A Resource for Timelines,
Timetrees, and Divergence Times. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2017 Jul
1;34(7):1812–9.

178. Paradis E, Schliep K. ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary
analyses in R. Bioinformatics. 2019 Feb 1;35(3):526–8.

179. Quinlan AR, Hall IM. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. Bioinformatics. 2010 Mar 15;26(6):841–2.

180. Ramírez F, Ryan DP, Grüning B, Bhardwaj V, Kilpert F, Richter AS, et al. deepTools2: a
next generation web server for deep-sequencing data analysis. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016 Jul
8;44(Web Server issue):W160–5.

181. Wu T, Hu E, Xu S, Chen M, Guo P, Dai Z, et al. clusterProfiler 4.0: A universal enrichment
tool for interpreting omics data. The Innovation. 2021 Aug 28;2(3):100141.

182. Carbon S, Ireland A, Mungall CJ, Shu S, Marshall B, Lewis S, et al. AmiGO: online access
to ontology and annotation data. Bioinformatics. 2009 Jan 15;25(2):288–9.

183. Tweedie S, Braschi B, Gray K, Jones TEM, Seal RL, Yates B, et al. Genenames.org: the
HGNC and VGNC resources in 2021. Nucleic Acids Research. 2021 Jan 8;49(D1):D939–
46.

184. Durinck S, Spellman PT, Birney E, Huber W. Mapping identifiers for the integration of
genomic datasets with the R/Bioconductor package biomaRt. Nat Protoc. 2009;4(8):1184–
91.

185. Lawrence M, Huber W, Pagès H, Aboyoun P, Carlson M, Gentleman R, et al. Software for
Computing and Annotating Genomic Ranges. PLOS Computational Biology. 2013 Aug
8;9(8):e1003118.

1651
1652