Massive genome reduction occurred prior to the origin of coral algal symbionts

Sarah Shah[1], Katherine E. Dougan[1], Yibi Chen[1], Rosalyn Lo[1], Gemma Laird[1], Michael D. A. Fortuin[1], Subash K. Rai[2], Valentine Murigneux[2], Anthony J. Bellantuono[3], Mauricio Rodriguez-Lanetty[4], Debashish Bhattacharya[5,*], Cheong Xin Chan[1,*]

[1]The University of Queensland, School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, Australian Centre for Ecogenomics, Brisbane, 4072 QLD, Australia.

[2]The University of Queensland, Genome Innovation Hub, Brisbane, 4072 QLD, Australia.

[3]Florida International University, Department of Biological Sciences, Biomolecular Science Institute, Miami, FL 33099, USA.

[4]Florida International University, Department of Biological Sciences, Miami, FL 33099, USA.

[5]Rutgers University, Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, New Brunswick, NJ, 08901, USA

*Corresponding authors: Debashish Bhattacharya (d.bhattacharya@rutgers.edu) and Cheong Xin Chan (c.chan1@uq.edu.au)

Abstract

Dinoflagellates in the Family Symbiodiniaceae (Order Suessiales) represent diverse, predominantly symbiotic lineages that associate with taxa such as corals and jellyfish. Their ancestor is believed to have been free-living, and the establishment of symbiosis (i.e., symbiogenesis) is hypothesised to have occurred multiple times during Symbiodiniaceae evolution. Among Symbiodiniaceae taxa, the genus *Effrenium* is an early diverging, free-living lineage that is phylogenetically positioned between two robustly supported groups of genera within which symbiotic taxa have emerged. The lack of symbiogenesis in *Effrenium* suggests that the ancestral features of Symbiodiniaceae may have been retained in this lineage. Here we present *de novo* assembled genomes and associated transcriptome data from three isolates of *Effrenium voratum*. We compared the *Effrenium* genomes (1.2-1.9 Gbp in size) and gene features with those of 16 Symbiodiniaceae taxa and other outgroup dinoflagellates. Surprisingly, we find that genome reduction predates the origin of Symbiodiniaceae and is not primarily explained by their symbiotic lifestyle. We postulate that adaptation to an extreme habitat (e.g., as in *Polarella glacialis*) or life in oligotrophic conditions resulted in the Suessiales ancestor having a haploid genome size $\leq$ 2Gbp, which is retained (or smaller) among all extant algae in this lineage. Our data reveal that the free-living lifestyle distinguishes *Effrenium* from symbiotic Symbiodiniaceae vis-à-vis longer introns, more-extensive mRNA editing, fewer (~30%) lineage-specific gene families, and lower (~10%) level of pseudogenisation. These results demonstrate how genome reduction and the adaptation to symbiotic versus free-living lifestyles intersect, and have driven the diversification and genome evolution of Symbiodiniaceae.

Introduction

Dinoflagellate algae in the Family Symbiodiniaceae comprise taxa that form symbioses with diverse marine organisms. Of particular importance to modern coral reefs, these dinoflagellates provide photosynthates *via* fixed carbon and essential nutrients to corals while resident in these cnidarians. The Symbiodiniaceae ancestor is believed to have been free-living (LaJeunesse et al. 2018) with members of this group forming symbiotic associations with corals as early as 230 million years ago (MYA) (Frankowiak et al. 2021). Symbiogenesis, or the establishment of a symbiotic relationship between two or more taxa (Guerrero et al. 2013), can drastically influence their evolution, adaptation, and speciation as observed in obligate parasites and diverse symbiotic taxa (Stephen et al. 2005; Morrison et al. 2007; Opperman et al. 2008; Kwan et al. 2012; McCutcheon and Moran 2012). This is termed the resident genome syndrome and was previously hypothesized to explain the observed patterns of Symbiodiniaceae genome evolution (González-Pech et al. 2019).

Based on current divergence time estimates for Symbiodiniaceae, the split between the basal genera (*Symbiodinium* and *Philozoon*) and the rest of the family occurred 166 MYA, whereas the more-recently branching symbiotic lineages diversified ~109 MYA (LaJeunesse et al. 2018). If the emergence of symbiogenesis coincides with the earliest fossil evidence from 230 MYA (Frankowiak et al. 2021), then different Symbiodiniaceae lineages would have arose and diversified during major global geological events. These events include the switch from aragonite to calcite seas (~190 MYA (Vulpius and Kiessling 2017)), the breakup of Pangea (150-230 MYA (Schettino and Turco 2009)), the diversification or extinction of potential hosts, e.g., the extinction of rudists 66 MYA (Stanley and van de Schootbrugge 2018; de Winter et al. 2020), and the overall change in coral morphology from the Triassic (201-252 MYA) to the Cretaceous (66-145 MYA) (Veron 2011; Pandolfi and Kiessling 2014). More recent examples include the rapid radiation of the genus *Cladocopium* 4-6 MYA due to geographic isolation (Thornhill et al. 2014) and the co-diversification of *Symbiodinium fitti* and their coral hosts (Turnham et al. 2021).

As described above, symbiogenesis is expected to impact the genome evolution of symbionts to varying extents within a broad spectrum of "facultativeness" that reflects the nature of the host association (i.e., with obligate free-living and obligate symbiont at opposing extremes) and underpins evolutionary processes such as genome streamlining,

genetic drift, expansion/contraction of mobile elements, pseudogenization, gene loss, and

varying mutation rates (González-Pech et al. 2019). Previous studies investigating the effects

of symbiogenesis on Symbiodiniaceae genomes have focused almost entirely on symbiotic

genera, with the polar-dwelling, highly specialized *Polarella glacialis* (Stephens et al. 2020),

a sister of Symbiodiniaceae and within the same Order Suessiales, providing the only free-

living outgroup.

Haploid genome sizes of Symbiodiniaceae taxa and *P. glacialis* thus far have been

estimated at < 2 Gbp based on available sequencing data (Li et al. 2020; Stephens et al. 2020;

González-Pech et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2022), and < 5Gbp based on DNA staining and qPCR

of marker sequences (LaJeunesse et al. 2005; Saad et al. 2020). Estimates based on DNA

staining are generally larger than those based on sequencing data, likely due to the

permanently condensed chromosomal structures of dinoflagellates that result in the

overestimation of DNA content (Rizzo 1991, 2003). The diverse dinoflagellate taxa external

to the Symbiodiniaceae are predominantly free-living and, in comparison, have massive

genome sizes, e.g., 4.8 Gbp estimated from sequencing data for the bloom-forming

Prorocentrum cordatum (Dougan et al. 2022b), and 200 Gbp based on DNA staining for

Alexandrium tamarense (Hou and Lin 2009).

Among Symbiodiniaceae taxa, *Effrenium* is the early-diverging, exclusively free-

living genus. The sole species, *E. voratum*, is globally distributed in temperate and

subtropical waters (Jeong et al., 2014; LaJeunesse et al., 2018). Attempts to establish a

symbiotic relationship between *E. voratum* and the anemone *Exaiptasia pallida* have been

unsuccessful (Xiang et al. 2013; Gabay et al. 2018). Current understanding of

Symbiodiniaceae evolutionary history suggests that *E. voratum* diverged 147 MYA from the

basal, largely symbiotic genera of *Symbiodinium* and *Philozoon*, and prior to the other later-

diverging symbiotic genera (LaJeunesse et al. 2018). Whereas genomes of other free-living

species such as *Symbiodinium natans* (Hansen and Daugbjerg 2009) have been generated,

these taxa belong to genera that also include symbiotic species and thus might have

experienced a symbiotic lifestyle at some point in their history. We expect the genus

Effrenium to have remained unaffected by the influence of symbiogenesis, and thus have

retained the ancestral free-living lifestyle (and genome features) of Symbiodiniaceae.

In this study, we present *de novo* assembled genome and transcriptome data for three

isolates of *E. voratum*. Incorporating publicly available genome-scale data from 16

Symbiodiniaceae taxa plus four free-living taxa external to the Symbiodiniaceae in a

comparative genomic analysis, we examine genomic features in *E. voratum*, including mobile

elements, gene structures, gene-families, and pseudogenisation to gain insights into ancestral

features of Symbiodiniaceae, and more broadly, Suessiales genome evolution.

Results and Discussion

Genome-size reduction pre-dated divergence of Order Suessiales and Family Symbiodiniaceae

Using a mix of short- and long-read sequencing data (Supplementary Table S1), we generated

de novo genome assemblies for three isolates of *E. voratum* (assembly sizes 1.1-1.3 Gb), with

estimated haploid genome sizes of 1.2-1.9 Gb (Supplementary Table S2, Supplementary

Figure S1), completeness (BUSCO recovery 67.2-77.2%), and number of predicted genes

(32,102-39,878) (Table 1, Supplementary Tables S3 and S4) comparable to the other

Symbiodiniaceae genomes (Shoguchi et al. 2013; Robbins et al. 2019; Stephens et al. 2020;

González-Pech et al. 2021; Nand et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2022; Dougan et al. 2022a). We

obtained all available genomic data from 23 dinoflagellate taxa: 19 from Symbiodiniaceae

(Order Suessiales), two sister taxa of *P. glacialis* (Order Suessiales), and two distantly related

free-living dinoflagellate taxa, *Prorocentrum cordatum* (Order Prorocentrales) and

Amphidinium gibbosum (Order Amphidiniales). The 21 Suessiales taxa were grouped into:

(a) the earlier-branching, largely symbiotic genus *Symbiodinium* (S1), (b) the three

exclusively free-living *E. voratum* isolates (Ev), (c) the later-branching symbiotic

Symbiodiniaceae lineages (S2), and (d) the free-living outgroup *P. glacialis* (Po) sister to

Family Symbiodiniaceae (Supplementary Table S3).

The most striking feature of genome evolution among Suessiales is the marked

reduction in genome size that occurred in the common ancestor of this lineage. Whereas free-

living dinoflagellates external to the Suessiales have genomes that range widely in size from

ca. 5-200 Gbp, and the parasitic *Amoebophrya ceratii* has a highly reduced genome at 0.1

Gbp, all Suessiales genomes have a much narrower size range from 0.7-2.0 Gbp, estimated

using sequencing data (Figure 1). This is accompanied by a ~40% loss in gene families prior

to the diversification of Suessiales, when compared to their closest dinoflagellate relatives

(node N1 in Figure 1). This pattern is reminiscent of the red algae (Rhodophyta), whose

common ancestor underwent massive genome reduction, precipitating the loss of canonical

eukaryotic features such as flagella-based motility, phytochromes, and autophagy

(Bhattacharya et al. 2018). These algae split into two monophyletic lineages, the

extremophilic Cyanidiophytina that specialized to life in hot spring environments, and the

species-rich mesophilic lineages (e.g., red seaweeds) that inhabit a variety of aquatic

environments (Bhattacharya et al. 2018). Most red algae have therefore smaller genomes

when compared to the green lineage and have adapted to diverse habitats through gene family

evolution and horizontal gene transfer. In an analogous fashion in dinoflagellates, it appears

that the Suessiales common ancestor underwent significant genome reduction, likely due to

life in extreme habitats (e.g., the psychrophilic *Polarella glacialis*). This streamlining of the

gene inventory may have played an important role in driving symbiotic associations with

cnidarians that offered nutrient-rich and protected habitats within the animal tissues. The

facultative lifestyle was likely retained in most Symbiodiniaceae because it offers the benefit

of sexual reproduction during the free-living stage. The most substantial recovery from

genome streamlining is offered by whole genome duplication, which has occurred in the

Durusdinium lineage (Dougan et al. 2022a).

Genome features of *E. voratum* versus early- and later-diverging symbiotic lineages

Genome sequences of the three *E. voratum* isolates share high similarity with 96% sequence

identity over 93% of bases (Figure 2A). Repetitive regions containing protein-coding genes

were highly conserved relative those of other Suessiales (the Order containing

Symbiodiniaceae and the earlier branching sister *P. glacialis*). We identified 98,344 core *k*-

mers ($k = 23$; all possible 23-base sequences) that are common in genomes of all Suessiales

taxa following Lo et al. (2022), and recovered 95% of core 23-mers in repetitive regions of *E.*

voratum (Supplementary Figure S2; see Methods). Among the three *E. voratum* genome

datasets, we recovered 5-32 putative mitochondrial genome sequences in each dataset that

encode the marker genes of *cob*, *cox1* and/or *cox3* (Supplementary Table S5), and 6-32

putative plastid genome sequences in each dataset that encode the 16S/23S rRNA or one of

the 11 plastid-encoded genes (Barbrook et al. 2014), including a putative empty minicircle

sequence (Supplementary Table S6).

Given the history of genome reduction, we investigated the traits that may

differentiate *Effrenium* from the symbiotic lineages of Symbiodiniaceae. We studied genome

size, intron evolution, gene family evolution, pseudogenisation, RNA editing, and

phylogenetic signals in Ev, S1 and S2, relative to the outgroup Po. The GC content of coding

regions varied among the Symbiodiniaceae lineages (Figure 2B) and were significantly lower

in S2 (mean 54.2%; $p < 0.05$) relative to Ev (61.0%) and S1 (57.7%); in intronic regions, the

mean GC is 44.6% (S2), 50.1% (Ev) and 50.4% (S1), whereas that of whole-genome

sequences is 45.8% (S2), 50.7% (Ev), and 50.6% (S1). GC-rich genome sequences confer

bendability to DNA helices (Vinogradov 2003) and may prevent cell freezing or desiccation

(Šmarda et al. 2014). Variation of GC content in dinoflagellate genomes does not appear to

correlate to lifestyle; among the free-living species external to Symbiodiniaceae, genomes of

P. glacialis and *A. gibbosum* displayed a mean GC content of 46.4%, similar to S2, whereas

genome of *Pr. cordatum* has the highest GC content described thus far for any dinoflagellate,

at 59.7% (Dougan et al. 2022b). Intracellular bacteria have a mutational bias towards low

genomic GC content, e.g. ~20% (Hershberg and Petrov 2010), but intracellular eukaryotes

display both low and high extreme GC content patterns, ranging as low as 24% in the malaria

parasite *Plasmodium falciparum* (Nikbakht et al. 2014) to 67% in the green algal symbiont

Chlorella variabilis in the ciliate *Paramecium* (Blanc et al. 2010). The lower GC content in

S2 genomes than the S1 counterparts underscores the dynamic nature of genomic GC content

in intracellular eukaryotes.

Mobile elements, particularly transposable elements (TEs), can influence genomic

architecture and base composition, and have been used to reconstruct the evolutionary history

of many species (Osanai-Futahashi et al. 2008; Rayan et al. 2016; Cai et al. 2021). Although

facultative Symbiodiniaceae symbionts (i.e., S1 and S2) are expected to contain a larger

proportion of mobile elements in their genomes compared to free-living (Ev) lineages

(González-Pech et al. 2019), no significant difference among the groups was observed in the

overall abundance (Supplementary Table S7, Supplementary Figure S3A) or conservation of

TEs (Supplementary Figure S3B). Although more-contiguous genome assemblies generally

contained more conserved repeats (Kimura substitution values centred around 3 for *D.*

trenchii CCMP2556, *C. goreaui* SCF055, the three *E. voratum* isolates, *S. natans*

CCMP2548, and *S. tridacnidorum* CCMP2592) compared to the others (i.e., values centred

around 20), we note divergent repeats (Kimura values centred around 25) in the chromosome-

scale assembly of *S. microadriaticum* CCMP2467 (Supplementary Figure S3B). This result

suggests a potential technical bias in the recovery of mobile elements. Despite this issue,

based on the proportions for distinct types of mobile elements in each group, we found

significantly ($p < 0.05$) more long interspersed nuclear elements (LINEs) in S1 (3.9%)

compared to Ev (1.8%) and to S2 (1.9%), with the proportion of the outgroup Po at 8%

(Figure 2C). This result suggests that S1 likely retained ancestral LINEs, lending support to

the notion of loss of LINEs after the diversification of basal Symbiodiniaceae genera

(González-Pech et al. 2021).

Introner elements (IEs) are a type of mobile element consisting of inverted and direct

repeat motifs found at 5′- and 3′-end of introns in diverse eukaryotes (Worden et al. 2009;

van der Burgt et al. 2012; Huff et al. 2016; Gozashti et al. 2022). Recent research on

dinoflagellates revealed that IEs are more abundant in free-living (implicating 10-12% of

genes) than in symbiotic/parasitic species (0.8-6.0% of genes) (Farhat et al. 2021; Dougan et

al. 2022b). Although not as high as in other free-living dinoflagellates, the Ev genomes

exhibit more IE-containing genes (5%) than do the S1 (4%) and S2 genomes (3%) (Figure

2D). IEs have been postulated to be non-autonomous and their mobility is dependent on

transposases encoded in dinoflagellate genomes (Farhat et al. 2021). We recovered

transposase protein sequences from most of the Symbiodiniaceae genomes in this study

(Supplementary Table S8), suggesting a capacity for IEs to be mobile.

Significantly ($p < 0.05$) longer genes were observed in Ev (mean 20 Kb) than S1 (8

Kb) and S2 (11 Kb) (Figure 2E), primarily driven by longer intron sizes (introns make up, on

average, 92% of a gene [Figure 2F]; sizes peak at 1 Kb [Figure 2G]) and higher intron density

per gene (mean of 18 for Ev, 14 for S1, 14 for S2) (Figure 2H). The driving mechanism for

this trend may reflect one of two evolutionary scenarios: (a) intron expansion in Ev, or (b)

intron contraction in S1/S2. In examples of the first scenario, TE-mediated insertions drive

intron expansion and are biased toward the 5′ ends of genes to prevent disrupting functional

elements (McCoy and Fire 2020), yielding larger intron sizes at 5′ ends; we did not observe

this in Ev (Figure 2I). In the second scenario, which has been observed in

endosymbiotic/parasitic organisms, the reduction of intron size and density occurs as a result

of genome reduction and/or streamlining induced by spatial confinement in the host organism

or cell (Wang et al. 2020a; Cai et al. 2021). Considering the evolutionary history of

Symbiodiniaceae, intron contraction in S1/S2 taxa due to their symbiotic lifestyle is more

plausible than invoking intron expansion in Ev. Large introns observed in Po (mean 1.4 Kb)

(Figure 2G), albeit at a lower intron density per gene (Figure 2H), lend further support to this

notion.

Symbiogenesis shaped evolution of gene families and post-transcriptional processing in

Symbiodiniaceae

To examine the effect of symbiotic lifestyle on protein family evolution in Symbiodiniaceae,

we first inferred 53,173 homologous protein families from all 811,611 protein sequences

predicted from the 21 Suessiales genomes (see Methods). Most protein families (47,353 of

53,173 [89%]) were shared among the four groups (S1+S2+Ev+Po); relative to functions

annotated in all families, these families were enriched in functions such as cellular motility,

biosynthetic processes for rRNA, antibiotics, and glycosides (Supplementary Table S9).

There were more lineage-specific protein families in S1 (6,389) and S2 (4,056) than in Ev

(1,734), and the two symbiotic groups (S1+S2) shared 3,357 protein families not found in the

other groups (Figure 3). The high number of protein families found only in symbiotic

lineages split by over 40 million years hints at convergent evolution from adapting to a

symbiotic lifestyle. These protein families were enriched for diverse functions including

signalling, apoptosis, protein splicing, photosynthesis, cell adhesion, and various transferase

activities (Figure 3). Incidentally, Po shared more protein families with symbiotic lineages

(1,290; S1+S2+Po) than with Ev (221; Ev+Po); these families were enriched in functions

such as autophagy and microtubule organization.

Facultative symbionts in Symbiodiniaceae are expected to display higher levels of

pseudogenisation, a major feature of the resident genome syndrome (González-Pech et al.

2019). To investigate this, we identified putative pseudogenes in the Symbiodiniaceae

genomes (Supplementary Table S10) following González-Pech et al. (2021). We defined the

level of pseudogenisation, Ψ, as a ratio of the number of putative pseudogenes to the number

of putative functional genes per homologous family; see Methods. We compared Ψ

independently for Ev (Ψ_{Ev}) against that for S1 (Ψ_{S1}), S2 (Ψ_{S2}), and the combined S1 and S2

(Ψ_{S1+S2}), then identified protein families that exhibited significant difference ($p < 0.05$) of this

value. More protein families displayed $\Psi_{S1} > \Psi_{Ev}$ (336) and $\Psi_{S2} > \Psi_{Ev}$ (273; Figure 4A),

compared to $\Psi_{S1} < \Psi_{Ev}$ (300) and $\Psi_{S2} < \Psi_{Ev}$ (126; Figure 4B). There were nine-fold more

protein families exhibiting $\Psi_{S1+S2} > \Psi_{Ev}$ (229; Figure 4A) than the opposite (25; Figure 4B);

these pseudogenes were associated with a wide range of functions, including cell cycle

processes and stimuli response (Figures 4C and 4D). The protein families that displayed

significantly higher Ψ in the symbiotic lineages were mostly mutually exclusive from the

3,357 families that putatively experienced convergent evolution (only 16–23 families were

represented in Ψ_{S1}, Ψ_{S2}, Ψ_{S1+S2}). We found negligible technical biases in the clustering of

homologous sequences that may affect our inference of pseudogenes, i.e., protein families

displaying Ψ remained stable at different clustering parameters (Supplementary Figure S4;

see Methods). These results suggest that in addition to convergent evolution in the symbiotic

lineages, these lineages of Symbiodiniaceae have experienced a greater extent of

pseudogenisation than did Ev.

268   Editing of mRNAs is a known mechanism in Symbiodiniaceae for increasing

variability in protein isoforms (Liew et al. 2017). To assess mRNA editing in *E. voratum*, we

focused on RCC1521 for which the genome assembly is the most contiguous among the three

we generated, and compared the rates and types of mRNA editing against a representative

from S1 (*S. microadriaticum* CCMP2467 (Liew et al. 2017)) and S2 (*D. trenchii* CCMP2556

(Dougan et al. 2022a)) for which the relevant data were available. We identified 45,009

unique mRNA edited sites in *E. voratum*, about 13-fold and 4-fold more than those in *S.

microadriaticum* and *D. trenchii*, respectively (Supplementary Table S11). A larger

proportion of genes in *E. voratum* (9,158, 28.5%) contained mRNA edits, compared to *S.

microadriaticum* (774, 1.6%) and *D. trenchii* (4,227, 7.6%), although the distributions of

substitution types are similar among the three species (Supplementary Figure S5A-D). Most

edits in *D. trenchii* and *E. voratum* (> 60%) were located within exons (Supplementary

Figure S5E), whereas in *S. microadriaticum* edits were evenly split between exons and

introns, although this may be due to the more-fragmented genome assembly of Liew et al.

(2017). As also observed in *S. microadriaticum* (Liew et al. 2017)*,* there was a slight bias for

edits to occur toward 5′ ends of genes (within the first ~10% of gene length, $p < 0.05$;

Supplementary Figure S5F) and the edits tended to be located within 1 Kb of each other

(versus expected distribution, $p < 0.05$; Supplementary Figure S5G). The high level of

mRNA editing in Ev is consistent with the observation in another free-living dinoflagellate,

Pr. cordatum (42,969 edited sites; 32,067 within 10,169 [12%] genes) (Dougan et al. 2022b).

Together with our observation of fewer Ev-specific protein families than those specific to S1

or S2 (Figure 2), these results suggest a more pronounced role of mRNA editing in generating

functional diversity in free-living versus symbiotic dinoflagellate taxa, to potentially

compensate for fewer specialised gene functions in the former. The correlation and impact of

this RNA editing with the final protein products remains to be investigated by incorporating

experimental proteome data.

Impact of symbiogenesis on phylogenetic signal of non-coding regions

Our alignment-based phylogenetic trees inferred using multiple protein families (Figure 1),

the standard molecular marker of 18S rDNA (Figure 5A), and the ITS2 (Supplementary

Figure S6A) were consistent with previously established phylogenies (LaJeunesse et al. 2018;

Stephens et al. 2018; Shi et al. 2021). We then analysed the phylogenetic signal of whole-

genome sequence data using a k-mer-based alignment-free (AF) approach (see Methods),

focusing on distinct genome-sequence regions following Lo et al. (2022). Interestingly, the

inferred AF phylogenies of introns (Fig. 5B), repetitive regions (Supplementary Figure S6B),

repeat-masked whole-genome sequences (Fig. 5C), and entire whole-genome sequences

(Supplementary Figure S6C) placed Ev as the basal group, branching earlier than S1/S2. In

comparison, the AF phylogenies for coding regions (i.e., coding sequences [CDS; Fig. 5D]

and protein sequences [Supplementary Figure S6D]) were largely congruent with the 18S

rDNA phylogeny (Fig. 5A), placing S1 as earlier branching than Ev. The branching orders of

Ev vs S1/S2 in AF trees were supported by a robust jackknife support of $\geq 96\%$ based on 100

subsampled replicates (Figure 5B-D; see Methods). This trend is consistent with visualisation

of the AF distances as a phylogenomic network (Supplementary Figure S6E), in which *E.*

voratum was more closely related to *P. glacialis* based on intron sequences, and to

Symbiodinium spp. based on CDS.

The incongruence between phylogenies of coding and non-coding regions with robust

support of the distinct clades clearly indicate differential selective pressure acting on these

two regions in Symbiodiniaceae genomes, as demonstrated in an earlier study (Lo et al.

2022), against the backdrop of incomplete lineage sorting, horizontal gene transfer,

hybridization, or convergent GC-biased gene conversion (Pessia et al. 2012; Jarvis Erich et

al. 2014; Chan et al. 2020). In addition, this result may also reflect by the retainment of

ancestral non-coding regions in the *E. voratum* genomes, and/or the loss of some non-coding

regions in symbiotic lineages due to genome streamlining.

Symbiogenesis differentially affected early- versus late-branching symbiotic lineages of Symbiodiniaceae

Following a possible genome reduction in the free-living ancestor of the Suessiales, some lineages may have developed symbiogenesis with a range of hosts, giving rise to the Symbiodiniaceae Family. Common and distinct genomic features we observed between early and late-branching symbiotic lineages of Symbiodiniaceae suggest an interplay between the geological eras during which they arose, and the corresponding coral morphology and ocean chemistry (Figure 6). Ancestral Symbiodiniaceae started inhabiting stony corals presumably as early as 230 MYA in the late Triassic (Frankowiak et al. 2021) and may have driven the Norian-Rhaetian reef bloom (Kiessling et al. 2009). These early Scleractinian corals (e.g., *Retiophyllia*) tended to be uniserial, i.e., possessing one corallite per branch, and phaceloid with thick walls (Coates and Jeremy 1987; Stanley 2003), and thus were less efficient at harvesting light (Enríquez et al. 2017). The ability of the early-diverging extant *Symbiodinium* to thrive under high or variable light (LaJeunesse et al. 2018) may be a trait inherited from their ancestor living in these ancient corals. Because these early Symbiodiniaceae adapted to different hosts, they likely underwent genome streamlining (González-Pech et al. 2019), experienced high pseudogenisation and a reduction in mRNA editing and intron sizes (Figure 6), as observed here and in other studies (Liew et al. 2017; González-Pech et al. 2021). Although these trends were also observed in the later-branching symbionts, *Symbiodinium* uniquely retained ancestral LINE repeats (Figure 2C) which were lost in later-branching Symbiodiniaceae including *E. voratum*.

E. voratum is estimated to have diverged ~147 MYA in the late Jurassic (LaJeunesse et al. 2018). We did not find evidence for genome streamlining in *E. voratum*, but instead found genomic hallmarks reminiscent of earlier-branching free-living lineages external to Family Symbiodiniaceae, e.g., more IE-containing genes, larger intron size than in S1 and S2. Given that *Effrenium* is also the sole genus within the Family that is exclusively free-living, we postulate that this lineage has not been impacted by symbiogenesis, in contrast to S1 or S2. Since the lineage diverged from S1, global events such as the breakup of Pangea (Schettino and Turco 2009; Bulois et al. 2018) and the Cretaceous-Paleogene mass extinction occurred, alongside changes in coral reef biomass (Figure 6). Without additional evidence from fossil records or ancient DNA (oldest evidence of Suessiales is *P. glacialis* from just 9,000 years ago (De Schepper et al. 2019)), we cannot pinpoint a specific geological event or

352 biological explanation for why or how *Effrenium* may have eluded symbiosis with potential

353 hosts.

354   At the estimated time when S2 lineages diversified (~109 MYA), shallow-water

corals were described to be multiserial, flatter, and more efficient at harvesting light

(Enríquez et al. 2017), coinciding with a rise in ocean temperature (i.e., "greenhouse Earth",

when no continental glaciers exited), and a switch in ocean chemistry from an aragonite sea

to a calcite sea, which would have made it difficult for corals to build their aragonite

skeletons (Pandolfi and Kiessling 2014) (Figure 6). In contrast, bivalve rudists that could

build aragonite or calcite shells (Steuber and Löser 2000) radiated and flourished (Veron

2011; Stanley and van de Schootbrugge 2018). They likely harboured photosymbionts (de

Winter et al. 2020), presumably ancestral Symbiodiniaceae, given that extant

Symbiodiniaceae (e.g., *S. tridacnidorum*) can inhabit modern bivalves (Shoguchi et al. 2018).

Although genomes of S2 exhibit lower GC content than those of S1, our results clearly

indicate that both S1 and S2 underwent genome streamlining, which led to convergent

evolution of protein families associated to diverse functions essential to forming symbiotic

association with the host, such as cell signalling, apoptosis, and photosynthesis (Figure 3).

We posit that symbiogenesis drove genome evolution in Symbiodiniaceae and elicited

common features such as pseudogenisation, lowered mRNA editing and intron contraction,

but some features (such as LINE retention and GC content) were affected differently in

earlier vs later-branching symbiotic lineages.

Concluding remarks

Our results support a phase of genome reduction that occurred in the Suessiales ancestor.

Therefore, the Symbiodiniaceae have smaller genome sizes than most free-living

dinoflagellates. The mixture of obligate free-living to facultative lifestyles among

Symbiodiniaceae has resulted in divergent paths of genome evolution. Our results

demonstrate the retention of ancestral Symbiodiniaceae genome features in *E. voratum* (in

contrast to symbiotic lineages) despite multiple emergences of symbiogenesis over the past

200 million years, and how symbiogenesis could drive convergent evolution between the

earlier and later-branching symbiotic lineages. These observations support the notion that *E.*

voratum (and by extension the genus *Effrenium*) eluded symbiogenesis in its evolutionary

history. Therefore, *Effrenium* presents a useful free-living outgroup for studying the structural

and functional genome features of symbiotic Symbiodiniaceae, and the implications of these

features on ecology and evolution, including but not limited to host specificity and the

"facultativeness" of symbiotic association.

Methods

E. voratum cultures

388   Cell cultures of *E. voratum* RCC1521, rt-383, and CCMP421 were provided by the

389   LaJeunesse Lab in Pennsylvania State University, U.S.A. They were incubated using Daigo's

390   IMK medium at 25°C under light-dark cycles of 14:10 hours. RCC1521 and rt-383 were

391   maintained at the University of Queensland, CCMP421 at Florida International University.

Extraction of genomic DNA

To extract genomic DNA (gDNA) for RCC1521 and rt-383, cells were pelleted by spinning

the culture at 300 *g* (5 min, room temperature [RT]). Then the cell pellet was resuspended in

100-500 μL (higher volumes for more cells) prewarmed (at 60°C) lysis buffer (100mM Tris-

HCl, 20mM EDTA, 4% CTAB (w/v), 1.4 NaCl, 1% 360,000 g·mol^{-1} PVP (w/v), 2% β-

mercaptoethanol). This mixture was transferred to liquid nitrogen pre-chilled mortar pestle

and ground to a fine powder and high molecular weight (HMW) gDNA was extracted as

described in Rai (2022). Briefly, Proteinase K (200 μL of stock at 20 mg/mL) was added,

multiple rounds of chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (24:1 v/v) extractions were performed, the

CTAB-DNA pellet was washed using ethanol, RNase A (4 μL of stock at 20 mg/mL) was

added, and HMW gDNA was captured by incubating with 7.5 M ammonium acetate. The

final HMW gDNA was resuspended in Tris-HCl (10 mM, pH 8) prewarmed at 50 °C, then

was stored at -20°C until sequencing.

E. voratum CCMP421 cells were pelleted and snap frozen in liquid nitrogen and

ground along with glass beads (diameter 425-600 μm), and the 2×CTAB method described in

Stephens et al. (2020) was followed. Briefly, the ground powder was transferred into a lysis

buffer (100 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 20 mM EDTA pH 8, 1.4 M NaCl, 2% w/v CTAB), mixed

with RNAse A (final concentration 20 μg/mL) and incubated at 37°C (30 min), and then with

Proteinase K (final concentration 120 μg/mL) at 65°C (2h). The standard extractions using

phenol-chloroform-isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1 v/v; centrifuged at 14,000 g, 5 min, RT) and

chloroform-isoamyl alcohol (24:1 v/v; centrifuged at 14,000 g, 5 min, RT) were then

performed. The DNA was precipitated using chilled isopropanol (18,000 g, 5 min, 4°C),

washed using chilled 70% ethanol, then stored in Tris-HCl (10 mM, pH 8) until sequencing.

Extraction of total RNA

To extract total RNA from *E. voratum* RCC1521 for Iso-Seq sequencing, cell pellets were

lysed via five freeze-thaw cycles with 425-600 μm diameter glass beads added to cell pellet,

dipped in liquid nitrogen, vortexed, and thawed at 37°C), and then the QIAGEN RNeasy kit

was used following the plant tissue protocol. To increase transcriptome diversity, we

extracted more RNA using a different method. Total RNA was extracted for RNA-Seq

(RCC1521 and rt-383) and Iso-Seq (from rt-383) following Acosta-Maspons et al. (2019)

with slight modifications. Cells were first pelleted by centrifugation (300 g, 5 min). The cell

pellet was suspended in 100–500 μL lysis buffer (100mM Tris-HCl, 25 mM EDTA, 2%

CTAB w/v, 2M NaCl, 0.75 g/L spermidine trihydrochloride, 4% β-mercaptoethanol). This

mixture was transferred to a mortar and pestle that were prechilled in liquid nitrogen, and

ground to a fine powder. The powder was swirled with liquid nitrogen and transferred to a

Falcon tube (15 mL) standing in dry ice, then the liquid nitrogen was allowed to evaporate.

Lysis buffer (5 mL; prewarmed at 65°C) was added, mixed by vortexing, and the tube was

kept on ice for subsequent steps. An equal volume of chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (24:1 v/v)

was mixed in; the mixture was divided into aliquots (2mL) in Eppendorf tubes and

centrifuged (10,000 g, 10 min, 4°C). The clear supernatants were transferred to new tubes

(2mL each) before the extraction with chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (24:1 v/v) was repeated.

Nucleic acids were precipitated using LiCl (final concentration 2M) overnight at 4°C, and

centrifuged (17,000 g, 30 min, 4°C). The resulting pellet was resuspended in the SSTE buffer

(50 μL; 1 M NaCl, 0.5% SDS w/v, 10mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 1mM EDTA; prewarmed at 65°C);

the samples were not set on ice to avoid undesirable precipitates. Further chloroform:isoamyl

alcohol (24:1 v/v) extraction was performed (centrifuged 10,000 g, 10 min, 4°C), and the

RNA pellet was precipitated using an equal volume of 2-propanol (incubated 10 min at RT,

then centrifuged at 17,000 g, 10 min, 4°C). The pellet was washed with 80% ethanol (500

μL), dislodged by pulse vortexing (2 s), and the tube centrifuged (17,000 g, 5 min, 4°C); this

step was repeated. The final pellet was air-dried (10 min) in a fume hood, resuspended

nuclease-free water (25 μL), and stored at -80°C.

Generation of genome data

For short-read sequencing, the libraries for RCC1521 and rt-383 were prepared using the

Illumina TruSeq Nano kit with 350 bp targeted inserts following standard protocol, and then

sequenced on the NovaSeq 6000 platform at Australian Genome Research Facility

(Melbourne, Australia). For CCMP421, the genomic DNA library was prepared using the

Chromium Genome Reagent Kit v2 Chemistry following the manufacturer's protocol (Step 2

GEM generation and barcoding onwards) and then sequenced on the NovaSeq 6000 platform

at Florida International University.

For Nanopore long-read sequencing of RCC1521 and rt-383, the ligation kit SQK

LSK-109 was used following standard protocol. Each library was sequenced on a MinION

flow cell and rt-383 gDNA was further sequenced using a PromethION flow cell at the

Genome Innovation Hub (GIH), the University of Queensland (Brisbane, Australia). The

sequence reads were base-called using guppy v4.0.11 as part of the MinKNOW software

v20.06.18, with the minimum read quality filter of 7.

For PacBio long-read sequencing of RCC1521 and rt-383, the gDNA of RCC1521

(unsheared, for continuous long-read [CLR] library) and rt-383 (sheared in 15-20 Kb

fragments with Pippin Prep (Sage Science), for HiFi library) were used for library preparation

using the SMRTbell Express Template Prep Kit 2.0 following the manufacturer's protocol.

The RCC1521 and the rt-383 libraries were sequenced on the PacBio Sequel II platform,

respectively at the University of Washington PacBio Sequencing Services (Settle, WA, USA)

and at the University of Queensland Sequencing Facility (Brisbane, Australia). The CLR

reads for RCC1521 were acquired using the PacBio BAM2fastx toolkit, whereas the HiFi

CCS reads for rt-383 were obtained using the CCS module of the SMRT Link pipeline v8.0.

Generation of transcriptome data

Transcriptome data were generated for RCC1521 and rt-383. Illumina RNA-Seq libraries

were generated using polyA-selection with the Dynabeads mRNA purification Kit and the

Illumina Stranded mRNA Prep following standard protocols. Sequencing was performed on

the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform at the Australian Genome Research Facility

(Melbourne, Australia). PacBio Iso-Seq libraries were prepared using the NEBNext® Single

Cell/Low Input cDNA Synthesis and Amplification Module (New England BioLabs) and the

SMRTbell Express Template Prep Kit 2.0 following standard protocol and sequenced on the

PacBio Sequel II at the University of Queensland Sequencing Facility.

Transcriptome assembly and processing

For RNA-Seq data from RCC1521 and rt-383, adapters and unique molecular identifiers were

removed using Illumina's bcl2fastq v2.20.0.422, and the reads were trimmed (for polyG and

polyA) and filtered using fastp v0.20.0 (*-A -L 35 -g -x --cut_front --cut_window_size 4 --*

cut_mean_quality 15). The processed reads were assembled using Trinity v2.9.1 (Grabherr et

al. 2011) in both "de novo" (*--SS_lib_type RF --trimmomatic*) and "genome-guided" modes;

for the latter, RNA-Seq reads were first mapped to the assembled genome using HISAT2

(Kim et al. 2019) before Trinity was run using *--SS_lib_type RF --genome_guided_bam --*

genome_guided_max_intron 70000. We assessed the completeness of the each transcript set

using BUSCO v5.1.2 (Simão et al. 2015) against the alveolata_odb10 database

(Supplementary Table S1).

Iso-Seq transcripts do not require assembly. The raw Iso-Seq sequences of RCC1521

and rt-383 underwent CCS generation and demultiplexing using the standalone modules CCS

v4.2.0 and Lima v1.11.0. The rest of the IsoSeq processing steps (i.e., refining, clustering

isoforms, and polishing) were conducted using the IsoSeq pipeline v3.3.0, resulting in a final

set of high-quality transcripts.

Estimation of genome size from sequencing data

Illumina short reads were used for estimating genome size based on k-mers. First, the reads

from each genome dataset were processed to remove potential adapters (for 10X linked-reads

of CCMP421, specifically the first 23 bases) and polyG tails using fastp v0.20.0 (Chen et al.

2018). Jellyfish v2.3.0 (Marçais and Kingsford 2011) was used to obtain k-mers of sizes 17-

31. The k-mer distribution was then plotted for each k, and the genome size was estimated as

the sum of observed k-mers divided by the mean coverage (corresponding to the peak of the

curve), averaged from the different k-mer sizes (Supplementary Table S2). The ploidy of the

genome datasets was assessed using GenomeScope2 (Ranallo-Benavidez et al. 2020) based

on 21-mer distribution and a better fit was observed using a haploid (p=1) model in all three

cases. Genome size estimations of other dinoflagellates (Supplementary Table S12) were

taken from Rizzo et al. (1982), Hou and Lin (2009), Sano and Kato (2009), and Kohli et al.

(2015).

***De novo* genome assembly**

De novo genome assemblies were generated for RCC1521 and rt-383 adopting a hybrid-data

approach, combining Illumina (short reads), PacBio (long reads), and Nanopore (long reads)

data using MaSuRCA (Zimin et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2020b) v4.0.1 for RCC1521, and v3.4.2

for rt-383, with the built-in CABOG as the final assembler; the key distinction between these

two versions of MaSuRCA is the six-fold decrease in run-time in v4.0.1 relative to that for

v3.4.2, with negligible impact on the yielded assemblies. For CCMP421, the *de novo* genome

assembly was generated from 10X Genomics linked-read sequencing data using Supernova

v2.1.1 (Weisenfeld et al. 2017).

RCC1521 and rt-383 assemblies were further scaffolded with L_RNA_scaffolder

(Xue et al. 2013), using IsoSeq transcripts and *de novo* assembled transcripts from RNA-Seq

(above). For CCMP421, linked-read distance information was first used to refine the

assembly with ARBitR v0.2 (*-m 27k -s 10k*) (Hiltunen et al. 2020) prior to scaffolding with

L_RNA_scaffolder (Xue et al. 2013). Due to the low quality of the publicly available

transcriptome data of CCMP421 (i.e., MMETSP1110 (Johnson et al. 2019) with only 54%

mapped to the corresponding assembled genome; Supplementary Table S13), we used the *de*

novo assembled transcripts from RCC1521 and rt-383 to scaffold the CCMP421 genome

assembly via L_RNA_scaffolder.

To ensure high quality of each genome assembly, we identified and removed potential

contaminant sequences of bacterial or archaeal sources following a decision tree based on

analysis using BlobTools v1.1 (Zimin et al. 2017) as described in earlier studies of algal

genomes (Iha et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2022); this step yielded the final assembly for each

isolate. For each assembly, we assessed data completeness using BUSCO v5.1.2 (Simão et al.

2015) against the alveolata_odb10 database. Genome-sequence similarity among the three *E.*

voratum isolates was assessed using nucmer implemented in the MUMmer package

v4.0.0beta2 (*--mum*) (Marçais et al. 2018).

Identification of mitochondrial and plastid genome sequences

We identified putative mitochondrial and plastid genome sequences from the three isolates of

E. voratum. To search for mitochondrial scaffolds, we followed Stephens et al. (2020) by

adopting BLASTn v2.10.0+ (Altschul et al. 1990) search against the assembled genomes,

using the protein-coding sequences of *B. minutum* mitochondrial genes as queries (GenBank

accessions LC002801.1 and LC002802.1; $E \leq 10^{-10}$). We used BEDtools merge (Quinlan and

Hall 2010) to merge overlapping BLAST hits of the same gene *(-s -o collapse -c 1,2,3,4,5,6)*,

then used BEDtools intersect *(-wa -wb)* to check for overlaps with the predicted gene

annotations. Genome scaffolds with BLAST hits that did not have any other predicted genes

were considered putative mitochondrial genomes. We manually annotated the genes on the

putative genome scaffolds using Artemis (Carver et al. 2011) with translation table 4.

To identify plastid genome fragments that are known to be shorter and may not be

recovered in a hybrid genome assembly combing long- and short-read sequence data, we

performed an independent short-read only genome assembly for each isolate using CLC

Genomics Workbench v21.0.4 (Supplementary Table S14). We used BLASTn search ($E \leq$

10^{-10}) using protein-coding sequences of plastid-encoded genes for *Cladocopium* sp. C3

(GenBank accessions HG515015.1-HG515028.1) as query, and annotated the putative

genome scaffolds in Artemis (translation table 11). To look for empty minicircles, we first

determined the core region of all plastid genome scaffolds. We masked coding regions of the

scaffolds using BEDtools *maskfasta* and did pairwise BLASTn searches. The region that was

common to most scaffolds was considered the core region. We then used this as query in

BLASTn searches among unannotated *E. voratum* short-read genome scaffolds. A scaffold

was considered empty if they did not have any hits in the NCBI nr database (November

2020). Finally, we looked for evidence of circularisation in all of the recovered organellar

genome scaffolds using nucmer (*--mum -l 0*) and mummerplot (*--layout -- png*) from

MUMmer 4.0.0beta2 (Marçais et al. 2018) to self-align the genome sequences and visualise

the alignments.

Ab initio prediction of protein-coding genes

To predict protein-coding genes, we used an integrated, multi-method workflow customised

for dinoflagellates (Chen et al. 2022) incorporating transcriptome and protein evidence

(pipeline available at

https://github.com/TimothyStephens/Dinoflagellate_Annotation_Workflow). We first

predicted repetitive elements from the genome assembly, followed by gene predictions based

on a) the genome only, b) protein sequence similarity, and c) mRNA transcripts.

De novo repeat families were predicted from the genome assembly using

RepeatModeler v2.0.1 (Flynn et al. 2020), and these repeats were added to the Dfam database

(dfam.org; downloaded June 2019) to guide RepeatMasker v4.1.0 (Smit et al. 2017) in

repeat-masking the genome assembly. Next, GeneMark-ES v4.65 (Lomsadze et al. 2005) was

used for *ab initio* gene prediction on the masked genome assembly. Protein-based gene

prediction was performed using MAKER v2.31.10 (*protein2genome*) (Cantarel et al. 2008)

modified to recognize dinoflagellate alternative splice sites. It integrated the custom repeat

library from the repeat analysis step, and BLASTn/x (Camacho et al. 2009) searches were

performed against the combined protein sequence database of SwissProt (released March

2020) and the Suessiales sequences, hereby "Suessiales_pep", listed in Table S7 of Chen et

al. (2022).

For transcript-based gene prediction, Iso-Seq transcripts where available (i.e., for

RCC1521 and rt-383) were mapped on the corresponding genome assembly using minimap2

v2.18 (Li 2018) for which the code was modified to recognize dinoflagellate alternative

splice sites, using options *--secondary=no -ax splice:hq -uf --splice-flank=no.* The assembled

transcripts from RNA-Seq (both *de novo* and genome-guided) for each isolate were mapped

to the corresponding genome assembly using BLAT (Kent 2002); for CCMP421, *de novo*

assembled transcripts from RCC1521 and rt-383, plus the assembly of these reads guided by

the CCMP421 genome, were used in this step (due to poor quality of the publicly available

CCMP421 transcriptome data; see Supplementary Tables S1 and S13). The resulting GFF3

files were input into PASA v2.4.1 (*--IMPORT_CUSTOM_ALIGNMENTS_GFF3 --*

transcribed_is_aligned_orient -C -R --MAX_INTRON_LENGTH 70000) (Haas et al. 2003)

which was modified to recognize dinoflagellate alternative splice sites.

The PASA-predicted genes were filtered in the following steps: they were searched

against the combined RefSeq (release 98) and the Suessiales_pep database using BLASTp

v2.2.26 (e-value < 10^{-20}, both query and subject coverage > 80%) (Camacho et al. 2009),

putative transposon sequences were removed via running HHBLITS v3.3.0 (Remmert et al.

2012) and TransposonPSI v1.0.0 (Haas 2010) against the UniRef30_3030_03 database from

Uniclust (uniclust.mmseqs.com) (Mirdita et al. 2017), redundant sequences were removed

using CD-HIT v4.8.1 (*-c 0.75 -n 5*) (Li and Godzik 2006), and the script

Prepare_golden_genes_for_predictors.pl from the JAMg pipeline

(https://github.com/genomecuration/JAMg) was used to produce a highly curated set of

"golden genes". These golden genes were used to guide the *ab initio* gene prediction tools

SNAP (Korf 2004) and AUGUSTUS v3.4.0 (Stanke et al. 2006) on the repeat-masked

genome assembly. Gene models from the five tools (MAKER, GeneMark-ES, PASA, SNAP,

AUGUSTUS) were integrated using EVidenceModeler v1.1.1 (Haas et al. 2008). Finally, the

resulting gene models were refined to correct exon boundaries, add UTRs, and incorporate

gene models from alternative splicing using the *Load_Current_Gene_Annotations.dbi* and

Launch_PASA_pipeline.pl from the PASA pipeline (Campbell et al. 2006; Haas 2008)

iteratively for three rounds to yield the final gene models.

We assessed the completeness of the predicted protein sequences using BUSCO

v5.1.2 (Simão et al. 2015) against the alveolata_odb10 database in "protein" mode. Genes

with transcript support were identified by aligning transcripts for each isolate to their

predicted coding sequences using BLASTn (e-value $< 10^{-5}$, percent identity ≥ 90 %, subject

cover ≥ 50 %).

Functional annotation of predicted genes

Functions of the predicted protein sequences were annotated based on BLASTp searches (e-

value $< 10^{-5}$ and query/subject cover ≥ 50 %) against the SwissProt (2022_01) database.

Then, those that had no hits were searched against TrEMBL (2022_01) database; the function

of the top protein hit was assumed to the putative function of the query protein. The UniProt

IDs were converted to Gene Ontology (GO) terms via the UniProtKB ID mapping tool

(https://www.uniprot.org/id-mapping) in December 2022.

Inferring phylogenetic tree based on multiple sequence alignment

To infer phylogenies for the 18S rDNA and ITS2 marker sequences, we first recovered 18S

and ITS2 sequences from the three genome assemblies of *E. voratum* using BLASTn.

Reference sequences for the 18S rDNA were downloaded from

https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.1717129 (79 sequences) (LaJeunesse et al. 2018) and ITS2

from SymPortal (https://symportal.org; "published post-MED sequences" of 8,409 sequences

downloaded 10 September 2021) (Hume et al. 2019), respectively. For each marker sequence

set, multiple sequence alignment was generated using MAFFT v7.471 in *mafft-linsi* mode

(Katoh and Standley 2013), trimmed using trimAl v1.4.rev15 *(-automated1)* (Capella-

Gutiérrez et al. 2009), from which a maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree was inferred

using IQ-TREE v2.1.3 *(-nm 2000 -bb 2000 -m MFP)* (Nguyen et al. 2015).

To reconstruct a reference species tree of dinoflagellates based on strictly orthologous

protein sequences, we incorporated 1,603,073 predicted protein sequences from 33

dinoflagellate taxa, comprising 21 Suessiales taxa (including the three *E. voratum* isolates in

this study) and 12 other taxa external to Suessiales (Supplementary Table S12) (John et al.

2019; Johnson et al. 2019; Beedessee et al. 2020). These sequences were clustered into

homologous sets using OrthoFinder v2.5.4 (Emms and Kelly 2019), from which a species

tree was estimated from strictly orthologous sets.

Alignment-free phylogenetic inference and core *k*-mers

We used an alignment-free approach to infer phylogenetic relationships from (a) whole-

genome sequences (WGS) and from distinct genomic regions of (b) repeat-masked WGS, (c)

coding sequences (CDS), (d) introns, (e) annotated repeats, and (f) predicted protein

sequences. Each of these distinct regions were extracted from assembled genome sequences

using *gff3_file_to_feature_files.pl* implemented in PASA (Haas et al. 2003). We followed Lo

et al. (2022) to identify optimal *k*-mer length (*k*) for each of these datasets. Briefly, for each

dataset, *k*-mers at varied length *k* were enumerated using Jellyfish v2.3.0 (Marçais and

Kingsford 2011); for all datasets, odd-numbered *k* between 13 and 27 were used, except for

the repeats dataset (odd-numbered *k* values between 13 and 51 were used) and protein

sequences (odd-numbered *k* values between 3 and 9 were used). For each dataset except the

protein sequences, the optimal *k* was determined based on the cumulative proportion of

unique *k*-mers and the cumulative proportion of distinct *k*-mers, at the point when

distributions of both proportions reached a plateau (Supplementary Figure S7); *k* value

determined this way was found to yield the greatest distinguishing power for phylogenetic

analysis (Greenfield and Roehm 2013). For protein sequences, we inferred alignment-free

phylogenies (see below) from each *k* and chose the *k* with a topology that best matched the

18S rDNA alignment-based tree as implemented in Lo et al. (2022). The optimal k was

identified as 23 for WGS and repeat-masked WGS, 19 for CDS, 21 for introns, 51 for

annotated repeats, and 9 for protein sequences. Jellyfish v2.3.0 was used to extract k-mers at

the corresponding optimal k length for each dataset, with the option -C used to enforce

strand-specific directionality for the intron and CDS datasets.

To infer alignment-free (AF) phylogenies based on k-mers (i.e. using the optimal k for

each corresponding dataset identified above), we derived pairwise distance based on D_2^S

statistic (Reinert et al. 2009) following Chan et al. (Chan et al. 2014), using *d2ssect*

(https://github.com/bakeronit/d2ssect). These pairwise distances were then used to infer a

phylogenetic tree using *neighbor* implemented in PHYLIP v3.698 (Felsenstein 2005). For

each tree, we assessed node support based on jackknife analysis of 100 "pseudo-replicates"

following Bernard et al. (2016). In each pseudo-replicate, 40% of the data, in iteratively

subsampled 100-bp regions at random, were deleted using the Python script *jackknife.py* from

which an AF tree was inferred; the R script *Jackknife.r* was then used to calculate jackknife

support value in percentage, among the pseudo-replicate trees, for each node in the original

AF tree. These scripts are available at https://github.com/chanlab-genomics/alignment-free-

tools.

To identify core k-mers (Bernard et al. 2018) that are shared by all 21 Suessiales

genomes used in this study, we used the optimal $k = 23$ for the WGS dataset. Using the

extracted 23-mers from the entire WGS dataset as input, core 23-mers were identified using

the bash command *comm* (-12). BEDtools (Quinlan and Hall 2010) *intersect* was used to find

regions of overlap between the core k-mers and different genomic features.

Analysis of gene family evolution

To examine the gene family evolution between *E. voratum* and the earlier-/later-branching

symbiotic lineages of Symbiodiniaceae, we grouped 21 Suessiales protein sequence datasets

into three groups: Ev, S1, and S2 (Supplementary Table S3), with Po (*P. glacialis*

CCMP1383 and CCMP2088) as the outgroup. The 811,661 protein sequences from the 21

Suessiales taxa were clustered into homologous families using OrthoFinder v2.5.4 (Emms

and Kelly 2019). We then subset the shared/exclusive protein families among the different

groups (Ev, S1, S2, and Po). GO enrichment was performed using the topGO package in R

(algorithm = "elim", statistic = "fisher") (Alexa & Rahnenfuhrer 2021) for six comparisons:

(a) shared genes in Ev+Po (test set) versus all genes in Ev+Po (background), (b) shared genes

in S1+S2 versus all genes in S1 and S2, (c) shared genes in S1+S2+Po versus all genes in S1,

S2, and Po, (d) shared genes in S1+S2+Ev+Po versus all genes in the 21 taxa, (e) exclusive

genes to S1 versus all S1 genes, and (f) exclusive genes to Ev versus all Ev genes.

Identification of pseudogenes

Pseudogenes were identified following the method described in González-Pech et al. (2021)

based on tBLASTn search using the predicted protein sequences as query against the

corresponding genome sequences for which the predicted gene model sequences were

masked. Matched regions ($\geq$ 75% identity) were considered fragments of pseudogenes, and

fragments at no more than 1 Kb apart and in the same orientation were considered

collectively as a pseudogene.

In this analysis, we focused on 752,954 protein sequences from the 19 Suessiales taxa,

specifically excluding *S. natans* and *S. pilosum* from S1 to avoid signatures of free-living

lifestyle in these taxa interfering with potential signatures of symbiogenesis. The protein

sequences were first clustered into homologous families using OrthoFinder v2.5.4 (Emms

and Kelly 2019). We define the extent of pseudogenization, Ψ, as the ratio of the number of

putative pseudogenes to the number of putative functional genes in a homologous family. We

determined this value independently for Ev (Ψ_{Ev}) against that for S1 (Ψ_{S1}), S2 (Ψ_{S2}), and the

combined S1 and S2 (Ψ_{S1+S2}); a protein family with $\Psi_{S1} > \Psi_{Ev}$ indicates a greater extent of

pseudogenisation in S1 than in Ev. We then ran a one-way ANOVA test and Tukey's test

using the R package *rstatix* (https://cran.r-project.org/package=rstatix) to assess correlation

among the Ψ values of Ev, S1, S2, and the combined S1+S2 groups.

To assess the robustness of our approach to the inflation parameter (*I*) in single-

linkage clustering within OrthoFinder that modulates granularity (i.e., sizes and numbers) of

the resulting protein families, we ran OrthoFinder independently using *I* = 1.1, 1.3, 1.7 and

2.0 in addition to the default value of 1.5, and performed the analysis of pseudogenisation per

above.

Analysis of mRNA editing

For the analysis of mRNA editing, we focused on *E. voratum* RCC1521, and the

representative genomes for S1 (*S. microadriaticum* CCMP2467) and S2 (*D. trenchii*

CCMP2556), for which high-quality genome and transcriptome data are available. Editing of

mRNAs was identified using JACUSA2 (Piechotta et al. 2017), based on observed nucleotide

variants in the mapping of transcripts onto the genome, relative to the mapping of genome

sequence reads onto the genome. First, gDNA reads were mapped on each genome using

BWA-mem v0.7.17-r1198 (Li and Durbin 2009) using default settings. Then, for each

genome, RNA-Seq reads were mapped using HISAT2 v2.2.0 *(--rna-strandness RF)* (Kim et

al. 2019) to the assembled genome sequences with a HGFM HISAT2 index (*hisat2-build --*

exon --ss) informed by the annotated splice sites. To generate the index, the gene annotation

file in GFF3 was converted to the GTF format using Gffread (Pertea and Pertea 2020), and

splice site and exon locations extracted with the *hisat2_extract_splice_sites.py* and

hisat2_extract_exons.py scripts. Iso-Seq reads, where available, were mapped using

minimap2 v2.18 (Li 2018) for which the code was modified to recognize alternative splice

sites of dinoflagellates, with options *--splice-flank=no –secondary=no -ax splice:hq -uf –*

junc-bed.

Duplicate mappings were removed from the gDNA BAM files using Picard

MarkDuplicates (*ASSUME_SORTED=true REMOVE_DUPLICATES=true*

CREATE_INDEX=TRUE VALIDATION_STRINGENCY=LENIENT). The MD field

documenting mismatched and deleted bases was added to the gDNA BAM files with

samtools calmd (*-b*), as required as input for JACUSA2. JACUSA2 analysis was performed

on the gDNA, RNA-Seq, and Iso-Seq BAM files using option *-a D,Y,H* to remove false

positives caused by read starts/ends, indels, splice sites, and homopolymers. Due to the

different strand directionality, *-P2 RF-FIRSTSTRAND* was specified for the runs

incorporating RNA-Seq data, and *-P2 FR-SECONDTRAND* for the runs using Iso-Seq data.

The results from JACUSA2 were overlayed using BEDtools intersect (Quinlan and Hall

2010) at *-s -wo* with predicted genes (including isoforms), and the edited sites were

visualized using JACUSA2helper (https://github.com/dieterich-lab/JACUSA2helper).

We followed Liew et al. (2017) to assess 5′ bias in the location of RNA editing and

the propensity for edits to occur together. We calculated the frequency of the locations of

each edit with respect to the features they were in (exon, intron, gene), normalized by the
length of each feature. For each edit, its distance (in bp) to the closest upstream edit, and that
to the closest downstream edit where all within the same gene, were determined. The average
of these two values was used as the per-edit observed distance to neighbouring edits.

Analysis of introner elements

746 To identify introner elements (IEs), we used Pattern Locator (Mrázek and Xie 2006) to search
747 for the patterns described in Farhat et al. (2021): inverted repeats of 8-20 nucleotides within
748 30 bases of the 5′ and 3′ ends of each intron, flanked by direct repeats of 3-5 nucleotides. We
749 first used Seqkit (Shen et al. 2016) to obtain the first and last 30 bases at each end of introns,
750 then used Pattern Locator to identify the IEs.

Data availability statement

752 The assembled genome, predicted gene models and proteins, and the identified organellar
753 genome sequences from this study are available at https://doi.org/10.48610/1f0377a.

Competing interests

755 Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, SS, KED, DB and CXC; methodology, SS, KED, YC, SKR, AJB, VM
and CXC; formal analysis, SS, KED, YC, RL, GL, MDAF, and VM; investigation, SS, KED;
resources, SS, SKR, AJB, MRL, CXC, writing—original draft preparation, SS; writing—
review and editing, SS, KED, DB, and CXC; visualisation, SS; supervision, KED, DB, CXC;
funding acquisition, MRL, DB and CXC. All authors have read and agreed to the published
version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research was supported by the University of Queensland Research Training Program
scholarship (SS and YC), the Australian Research Council grant DP19012474 awarded to

CXC and DB, the University of Queensland Genome Innovation Hub Collaborative Research

grant awarded to CXC, and the NSF-IOS CAREER (1453519) grant awarded to MRL. DB

was also supported by NSF grant NSF-OCE 1756616 and a NIFA-USDA Hatch grant

(NJ01180).

Acknowledgements

771 This project is supported by high-performance computing facilities at the National

772 Computational Infrastructure (NCI) National Facility systems through the NCI Merit

773 Allocation Scheme (Project d85) awarded to CXC, the University of Queensland Research

774 Computing Centre, and computing facility at the Australian Centre for Ecogenomics, School

775 of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences at the University of Queensland.

References

Acosta-Maspons A, González-Lemes I, Covarrubias AA. 2019. Improved protocol for
isolation of high-quality total RNA from different organs of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L.
BioTechniques. 66:96-98.

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search
tool. Journal of Molecular Biology. 215:403-410.

Barbrook AC, Voolstra CR, Howe CJ. 2014. The chloroplast genome of a *Symbiodinium* sp.
clade C3 isolate. Protist. 165:1-13.

Beedessee G, Kubota T, Arimoto A, Nishitsuji K, Waller RF, Hisata K, Yamasaki S, Satoh
N, Kobayashi Ji, Shoguchi E. 2020. Integrated omics unveil the secondary metabolic
landscape of a basal dinoflagellate. BMC Biology. 18:139.

Bernard G, Chan CX, Ragan MA. 2016. Alignment-free microbial phylogenomics under
scenarios of sequence divergence, genome rearrangement and lateral genetic transfer.
Scientific Reports. 6:28970.

Bernard G, Greenfiled P, Ragan MA, Chan CX, Claesson MJ. 2018. *k*-mer similarity,
networks of microbial genomes, and taxonomic rank. mSystems. 3:e00257-18.

Bhattacharya D, Qiu H, Lee J, Su Yoon H, Weber APM, Price DC. 2018. When less is more:
red algae as models for studying gene loss and genome evolution in eukaryotes. Critical
Reviews in Plant Sciences. 37:81-99.

Blanc G, Duncan G, Agarkova I, Borodovsky M, Gurnon J, Kuo A, Lindquist E, Lucas S,
Pangilinan J, Polle J, et al. 2010. The *Chlorella variabilis* NC64A genome reveals adaptation
to photosymbiosis, coevolution with viruses, and cryptic sex. The Plant Cell. 22:2943-2955.

Bulois C, Pubellier M, Chamot-Rooke N, Delescluse M. 2018. Successive rifting events in
marginal basins: the example of the Coral Sea region (Papua New Guinea). Tectonics. 37:3-
29.

Cai L, Arnold BJ, Xi Z, Khost DE, Patel N, Hartmann CB, Manickam S, Sasirat S, Nikolov
LA, Mathews S, et al. 2021. Deeply altered genome architecture in the endoparasitic
flowering plant *Sapria himalayana* Griff. (Rafflesiaceae). Current Biology. 31:1002-
1011.e1009.

Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009.
BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics. 10:421.

Campbell MA, Haas BJ, Hamilton JP, Mount SM, Buell CR. 2006. Comprehensive analysis
of alternative splicing in rice and comparative analyses with *Arabidopsis*. BMC Genomics.
7:327.

Cantarel BL, Korf I, Robb SMC, Parra G, Ross E, Moore B, Holt C, Sánchez Alvarado A,
Yandell M. 2008. MAKER: an easy-to-use annotation pipeline designed for emerging model
organism genomes. Genome Research. 18:188-196.

Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated
alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics. 25:1972-1973.

Carver T, Harris SR, Berriman M, Parkhill J, McQuillan JA. 2011. Artemis: an integrated
platform for visualization and analysis of high-throughput sequence-based experimental data.
Bioinformatics. 28:464-469.

Chan CX, Bernard G, Poirion O, Hogan JM, Ragan MA. 2014. Inferring phylogenies of
evolving sequences without multiple sequence alignment. Scientific Reports. 4:6504.

Chan KO, Hutter CR, Wood PL, Grismer LL, Brown RM. 2020. Larger, unfiltered datasets
are more effective at resolving phylogenetic conflict: introns, exons, and UCEs resolve
ambiguities in golden-backed frogs (Anura: Ranidae; genus *Hylarana*). Molecular
Phylogenetics and Evolution. 151:106899.

Chang FH. 1983. Winter phytoplankton and microzooplankton populations off the coast of
Westland, New Zealand, 1979. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research.
17:279-304.

Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. 2018. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor.
Bioinformatics. 34:i884-i890.

Chen Y, Shah S, Dougan KE, van Oppen MJH, Bhattacharya D, Chan CX. 2022. Improved
Cladocopium goreaui genome assembly reveals features of a facultative coral symbiont and
the complex evolutionary history of dinoflagellate genes. Microorganisms. 10:1662.

Coates AG, Jeremy BCJ. 1987. Clonal growth, algal symbiosis, and reef formation by corals.
Paleobiology. 13:363-378.

De Schepper S, Ray JL, Skaar KS, Sadatzki H, Ijaz UZ, Stein R, Larsen A. 2019. The
potential of sedimentary ancient DNA for reconstructing past sea ice evolution. The ISME
Journal. 13:2566-2577.

de Winter NJ, Goderis S, Van Malderen SJM, Sinnesael M, Vansteenberge S, Snoeck C,
Belza J, Vanhaecke F, Claeys P. 2020. Subdaily-scale chemical variability in a *Torreites*
sanchezi rudist shell: implications for rudist paleobiology and the Cretaceous day-night cycle.
Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology. 35:e2019PA003723.

Dougan KE, Bellantuono AJ, Kahlke T, Abbriano RM, Chen Y, Shah S, Granados-Cifuentes
C, van Oppen MJH, Bhattacharya D, Suggett DJ, et al. 2022a. Whole-genome duplication in
an algal symbiont serendipitously confers thermal tolerance to corals. bioRxiv.

Dougan KE, Deng Z-L, Wöhlbrand L, Reuse C, Bunk B, Chen Y, Hartlich J, Hiller K, John
U, Kalvelage J, et al. 2022b. Multi-omics analysis reveals the molecular response to heat
stress in a "red tide" dinoflagellate. bioRxiv.

Emms DM, Kelly S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative
genomics. Genome Biology. 20:238.

Enríquez S, Méndez ER, Hoegh-Guldberg O, Iglesias-Prieto R. 2017. Key functional role of
the optical properties of coral skeletons in coral ecology and evolution. Proceedings of the
Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 284:20161667.

Farhat S, Le P, Kayal E, Noel B, Bigeard E, Corre E, Maumus F, Florent I, Alberti A, Aury J-
M, et al. 2021. Rapid protein evolution, organellar reductions, and invasive intronic elements
in the marine aerobic parasite dinoflagellate *Amoebophrya* spp. BMC Biology. 19:1.

Felsenstein J. 2005. PHYLIP (Phylogeny Inference Package). Department of Genome
Sciences, University of Washington, U.S.A. Available from:
https://evolution.gs.washington.edu/phylip.html

Flynn JM, Hubley R, Goubert C, Rosen J, Clark AG, Feschotte C, Smit AF. 2020.
RepeatModeler2 for automated genomic discovery of transposable element families.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 117:9451.

Frankowiak K, Roniewicz E, Stolarski J. 2021. Photosymbiosis in Late Triassic scleractinian
corals from the Italian Dolomites. PeerJ. 9:e11062.

Gabay Y, Weis VM, Davy SK. 2018. Symbiont identity influences patterns of symbiosis
establishment, host growth, and asexual reproduction in a model cnidarian-dinoflagellate
symbiosis. The Biological Bulletin. 234:1-10.

González-Pech RA, Bhattacharya D, Ragan MA, Chan CX. 2019. Genome evolution of coral
reef symbionts as intracellular residents. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 34:799-806.

González-Pech RA, Stephens TG, Chen Y, Mohamed AR, Cheng Y, Shah S, Dougan KE,
Fortuin MDA, Lagorce R, Burt DW, et al. 2021. Comparison of 15 dinoflagellate genomes
reveals extensive sequence and structural divergence in family Symbiodiniaceae and genus
Symbiodinium. BMC Biology. 19:73.

Gozashti L, Roy SW, Thornlow B, Kramer A, Ares M, Corbett-Detig R. 2022. Transposable
elements drive intron gain in diverse eukaryotes. Proceedings of the National Academy of
Sciences. 119:e2209766119.

Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, Adiconis X, Fan L,
Raychowdhury R, Zeng Q, et al. 2011. Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq
data without a reference genome. Nature Biotechnology. 29:644.

Greenfield P, Roehm U. 2013. Answering biological questions by querying *k*-mer databases.
Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience. 25:497-509.

Grossman EL, Joachimski MM. 2022. Ocean temperatures through the Phanerozoic
reassessed. Scientific Reports. 12:8938.

Guerrero R, Margulis L, Berlanga M. 2013. Symbiogenesis: the holobiont as a unit of
evolution. International Microbiology. 16:133-143.

Haas BJ. 2008. Analysis of alternative splicing in plants with bioinformatics tools. In: Reddy
ASN, Golovkin M, editors. Nuclear pre-mRNA Processing in Plants. Berlin, Heidelberg:
Springer Berlin Heidelberg. p. 17-37.

Haas BJ. 2010. TransposonPSI. Broad Institute. Available from:
https://sourceforge.net/projects/transposonpsi/

Haas BJ, Delcher AL, Mount SM, Wortman JR, Smith RK, Jr., Hannick LI, Maiti R,
Ronning CM, Rusch DB, Town CD, et al. 2003. Improving the *Arabidopsis* genome
annotation using maximal transcript alignment assemblies. Nucleic Acids Research. 31:5654-
5666.

Haas BJ, Salzberg SL, Zhu W, Pertea M, Allen JE, Orvis J, White O, Buell CR, Wortman JR.
2008. Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the
Program to Assemble Spliced Alignments. Genome Biology. 9:R7.

Hansen G, Daugbjerg N. 2009. *Symbiodinium natans* sp. nov.: a "free-living" dinoflagellate
from tenerife (Northeast-Atlantic Ocean). Journal of Phycology. 45:251-263.

Hershberg R, Petrov DA. 2010. Evidence that mutation Is universally biased towards AT in
bacteria. PLOS Genetics. 6:e1001115.

Hiltunen M, Ryberg M, Johannesson H. 2020. ARBitR: an overlap-aware genome assembly
scaffolder for linked reads. Bioinformatics. 37:2203-2205.

Hou Y, Lin S. 2009. Distinct gene number-genome size relationships for eukaryotes and non-
eukaryotes: gene content estimation for dinoflagellate genomes. PLOS ONE. 4:e6978.

Huff JT, Zilberman D, Roy SW. 2016. Mechanism for DNA transposons to generate introns
on genomic scales. Nature. 538:533-536.

Hume BCC, Smith EG, Ziegler M, Warrington HJM, Burt JA, LaJeunesse TC, Wiedenmann
J, Voolstra CR. 2019. SymPortal: A novel analytical framework and platform for coral algal
symbiont next-generation sequencing ITS2 profiling. Molecular Ecology Resources.
19:1063-1080.

Iha C, Dougan KE, Varela JA, Avila V, Jackson CJ, Bogaert KA, Chen Y, Judd LM, Wick R,
Holt KE, et al. 2021. Genomic adaptations to an endolithic lifestyle in the coral-associated
alga *Ostreobium*. Current Biology. 31:1393-1402.

Jarvis Erich D, Mirarab S, Aberer Andre J, Li B, Houde P, Li C, Ho Simon YW, Faircloth
Brant C, Nabholz B, Howard Jason T, et al. 2014. Whole-genome analyses resolve early
branches in the tree of life of modern birds. Science. 346:1320-1331.

Jeong HJ, Lee SY, Kang N, Yoo Y, Lim AS, Lee MJ, Yih W, Yamashita H, LaJeunesse T.
2014. Genetics and morphology characterize the dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium voratum*, n. sp.,
(Dinophyceae) as the sole representative of *Symbiodinium* Clade E. The Journal of
Eukaryotic Microbiology. 61:75-94.

John U, Lu Y, Wohlrab S, Groth M, Janouškovec J, Kohli GS, Mark FC, Bickmeyer U,
Farhat S, Felder M, et al. 2019. An aerobic eukaryotic parasite with functional mitochondria
that likely lacks a mitochondrial genome. Science Advances. 5:eaav1110.

Johnson LK, Alexander H, Brown CT. 2019. Re-assembly, quality evaluation, and annotation
of 678 microbial eukaryotic reference transcriptomes. GigaScience. 8:giy158.

Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 30:772-780.

Kent WJ. 2002. BLAT--the BLAST-like alignment tool. Genome Research. 12:656-664.

Kiessling W, Roniewicz E, Villier L, Leonide P, Struck U. 2009. An early Hettangian coral
reef in southern France implications for the end-Triassic reef crisis. Palaios. 24:657-671.

Kim D, Paggi JM, Park C, Bennett C, Salzberg SL. 2019. Graph-based genome alignment
and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. Nature Biotechnology. 37:907-915.

Kohli GS, John U, Figueroa RI, Rhodes LL, Harwood DT, Groth M, Bolch CJS, Murray SA.
2015. Polyketide synthesis genes associated with toxin production in two species of
Gambierdiscus (Dinophyceae). BMC Genomics. 16:410.

Korf I. 2004. Gene finding in novel genomes. BMC Bioinformatics. 5:59.

Kwan JC, Donia Mohamed S, Han Andrew W, Hirose E, Haygood Margo G, Schmidt Eric
W. 2012. Genome streamlining and chemical defense in a coral reef symbiosis. Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 109:20655-20660.

LaJeunesse TC, Lambert G, Andersen RA, Coffroth MA, Galbraith DW. 2005.
Symbiodinium (Pyrrhophyta) genome sizes (DNA content) are smallest among
dinoflagellates. Journal of Phycology. 41:880-886.

LaJeunesse TC, Parkinson JE, Gabrielson PW, Jeong HJ, Reimer JD, Voolstra CR, Santos
SR. 2018. Systematic revision of Symbiodiniaceae highlights the antiquity and diversity of
coral endosymbionts. Current Biology. 28:2570-2580.

Li H. 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics.
34:3094-3100.

Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
transform. Bioinformatics. 25:1754-1760.

Li T, Yu L, Song B, Song Y, Li L, Lin X, Lin S. 2020. Genome improvement and core gene
set refinement of *Fugacium kawagutii*. Microorganisms. 8:102.

Li W, Godzik A. 2006. CD-HIT: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of
protein or nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics. 22:1658-1659.

Liew YJ, Li Y, Baumgarten S, Voolstra CR, Aranda M. 2017. Condition-specific RNA
editing in the coral symbiont *Symbiodinium microadriaticum*. PLOS Genetics. 13:e1006619.

Lo R, Dougan KE, Chen Y, Shah S, Bhattacharya D, Chan CX. 2022. Alignment-free
analysis of whole-genome sequences from Symbiodiniaceae reveals different phylogenetic
signals in distinct regions. Frontiers in Plant Science. 13:815714.

Lomsadze A, Ter-Hovhannisyan V, Chernoff YO, Borodovsky M. 2005. Gene identification
in novel eukaryotic genomes by self-training algorithm. Nucleic Acids Research. 33:6494-
6506.

961 Marçais G, Delcher AL, Phillippy AM, Coston R, Salzberg SL, Zimin A. 2018. MUMmer4:
962 A fast and versatile genome alignment system. PLOS Computational Biology. 14:e1005944.

963 Marçais G, Kingsford C. 2011. A fast, lock-free approach for efficient parallel counting of
964 occurrences of *k*-mers. Bioinformatics. 27:764-770.

965 McCoy MJ, Fire AZ. 2020. Intron and gene size expansion during nervous system evolution.
966 BMC Genomics. 21:360.

967 McCutcheon JP, Moran NA. 2012. Extreme genome reduction in symbiotic bacteria. Nature
968 Reviews Microbiology. 10:13-26.

969 Mirdita M, von den Driesch L, Galiez C, Martin MJ, Söding J, Steinegger M. 2017. Uniclust
970 databases of clustered and deeply annotated protein sequences and alignments. Nucleic Acids
971 Research. 45:D170-D176.

972 Morrison HG, McArthur Andrew G, Gillin Frances D, Aley Stephen B, Adam Rodney D,
973 Olsen Gary J, Best Aaron A, Cande WZ, Chen F, Cipriano Michael J, et al. 2007. Genomic
974 minimalism in the early diverging intestinal parasite *Giardia lamblia*. Science. 317:1921-
975 1926.

976 Mrázek J, Xie S. 2006. Pattern locator: a new tool for finding local sequence patterns in
977 genomic DNA sequences. Bioinformatics. 22:3099-3100.

978 Nand A, Zhan Y, Salazar OR, Aranda M, Voolstra CR, Dekker J. 2021. Genetic and spatial
979 organization of the unusual chromosomes of the dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium*
980 *microadriaticum*. Nature Genetics. 53:618-629.

981 Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: a fast and effective
982 stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. Molecular Biology and
983 Evolution. 32:268-274.

984 Nikbakht H, Xia X, Hickey DA. 2014. The evolution of genomic GC content undergoes a
985 rapid reversal within the genus *Plasmodium*. Genome. 57:507-511.

986 Opperman CH, Bird David M, Williamson Valerie M, Rokhsar Dan S, Burke M, Cohn J,
987 Cromer J, Diener S, Gajan J, Graham S, et al. 2008. Sequence and genetic map of
988 *Meloidogyne hapla*: a compact nematode genome for plant parasitism. Proceedings of the
989 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 105:14802-14807.

990 Osanai-Futahashi M, Suetsugu Y, Mita K, Fujiwara H. 2008. Genome-wide screening and
991 characterization of transposable elements and their distribution analysis in the silkworm,
992 *Bombyx mori*. Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. 38:1046-1057.

Pandolfi JM, Kiessling W. 2014. Gaining insights from past reefs to inform understanding of
coral reef response to global climate change. Current Opinion in Environmental
Sustainability. 7:52-58.

Pertea G, Pertea M. 2020. GFF Utilities: GffRead and GffCompare. F1000Research. 9

Pessia E, Popa A, Mousset S, Rezvoy C, Duret L, Marais GAB. 2012. Evidence for
widespread GC-biased gene conversion in eukaryotes. Genome Biology and Evolution.
4:675-682.

Piechotta M, Wyler E, Ohler U, Landthaler M, Dieterich C. 2017. JACUSA: site-specific
identification of RNA editing events from replicate sequencing data. BMC Bioinformatics.
18:7.

Polne-Fuller M. 1991. A novel technique for preparation of axenic cultures of *Symbiodinium*
(Pyrrophyta) through selective digestion by amoebae. Journal of Phycology. 27:552-554.

Quattrini AM, Rodríguez E, Faircloth BC, Cowman PF, Brugler MR, Farfan GA, Hellberg
ME, Kitahara MV, Morrison CL, Paz-García DA, et al. 2020. Palaeoclimate ocean conditions
shaped the evolution of corals and their skeletons through deep time. Nature Ecology &
Evolution. 4:1531-1538.

Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. Bioinformatics. 26:841-842.

Rai SK. 2022. Total High Molecular Weight DNA extraction from plant tissues for long read
sequencing. Available from: 10.17504/protocols.io.b5qyq5xw

Ranallo-Benavidez TR, Jaron KS, Schatz MC. 2020. GenomeScope 2.0 and Smudgeplot for
reference-free profiling of polyploid genomes. Nature Communications. 11:1432.

Rayan NA, del Rosario RCH, Prabhakar S. 2016. Massive contribution of transposable
elements to mammalian regulatory sequences. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology.
57:51-56.

Reinert G, Chew D, Sun F, Waterman MS. 2009. Alignment-free sequence comparison (I):
statistics and power. Journal of Computational Biology. 16:1615-1634.

Remmert M, Biegert A, Hauser A, Söding J. 2012. HHblits: lightning-fast iterative protein
sequence searching by HMM-HMM alignment. Nature Methods. 9:173-175.

Rizzo PJ. 1991. The enigma of the dinoflagellate chromosome. The Journal of Protozoology.
38:246-252.

Rizzo PJ. 2003. Those amazing dinoflagellate chromosomes. Cell Research. 13:215-217.

Rizzo PJ, Jones M, Ray SM. 1982. Isolation and properties of isolated nuclei from the Florida
red tide dinoflagellate *Gymnodinium breve* (Davis). The Journal of Protozoology. 29:217-
222.

Robbins SJ, Singleton CM, Chan CX, Messer LF, Geers AU, Ying H, Baker A, Bell SC,
Morrow KM, Ragan MA, et al. 2019. A genomic view of the reef-building coral *Porites lutea*
and its microbial symbionts. Nature Microbiology. 4:2090-2100.

Saad OS, Lin X, Ng TY, Li L, Ang P, Lin S. 2020. Genome Size, rDNA Copy, and qPCR
Assays for Symbiodiniaceae. Frontiers in Microbiology. 11:847.

Sano J, Kato KH. 2009. Localization and copy number of the protein-coding genes actin, α-
Tubulin, and HSP90 in the nucleus of a primitive dinoflagellate, *Oxyrrhis marina*. Zoological
Science. 26:745-753.

Schettino A, Turco E. 2009. Breakup of Pangaea and plate kinematics of the central Atlantic
and Atlas regions. Geophysical Journal International. 178:1078-1097.

Shen W, Le S, Li Y, Hu F. 2016. SeqKit: A Cross-Platform and Ultrafast Toolkit for
FASTA/Q File Manipulation. PLOS ONE. 11:e0163962.

Shi T, Niu G, Kvitt H, Zheng X, Qin Q, Sun D, Ji Z, Tchernov D. 2021. Untangling ITS2
genotypes of algal symbionts in zooxanthellate corals. Molecular Ecology Resources. 21:137-
152.

Shoguchi E, Beedessee G, Tada I, Hisata K, Kawashima T, Takeuchi T, Arakaki N, Fujie M,
Koyanagi R, Roy MC, et al. 2018. Two divergent *Symbiodinium genomes* reveal conservation
of a gene cluster for sunscreen biosynthesis and recently lost genes. BMC Genomics. 19:458.

Shoguchi E, Shinzato C, Kawashima T, Gyoja F, Mungpakdee S, Koyanagi R, Takeuchi T,
Hisata K, Tanaka M, Fujiwara M, et al. 2013. Draft assembly of the *Symbiodinium minutum*
nuclear genome reveals dinoflagellate gene structure. Current Biology. 23:1399-1408.

Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO:
assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs.
Bioinformatics. 31:3210-3212.

Šmarda P, Bureš P, Horová L, Leitch IJ, Mucina L, Pacini E, Tichý L, Grulich V, Rotreklová
O. 2014. Ecological and evolutionary significance of genomic GC content diversity in
monocots. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 111:E4096-E4102.

Smit AFA, Hubley R, Green P. 2017. RepeatMasker Open-4.0. Available from:
http://www.repeatmasker.org

Stanke M, Keller O, Gunduz I, Hayes A, Waack S, Morgenstern B. 2006. AUGUSTUS: ab
initio prediction of alternative transcripts. Nucleic Acids Research. 34:W435-W439.

Stanley GD. 2003. The evolution of modern corals and their early history. Earth-Science
Reviews. 60:195-225.

Stanley GD, van de Schootbrugge B. 2018. The evolution of the coral–algal symbiosis and
coral bleaching in the geologic past. In: van Oppen MJH, Lough JM, editors. Coral
Bleaching: Patterns, Processes, Causes and Consequences. Cham: Springer International
Publishing. p. 9-26.

Stephen JG, Tripp HJ, Givan S, Podar M, Vergin Kevin L, Baptista D, Bibbs L, Eads J,
Richardson Toby H, Noordewier M, et al. 2005. Genome streamlining in a cosmopolitan
oceanic bacterium. Science. 309:1242-1245.

Stephens TG, González-Pech RA, Cheng Y, Mohamed AR, Burt DW, Bhattacharya D,
Ragan MA, Chan CX. 2020. Genomes of the dinoflagellate *Polarella glacialis* encode
tandemly repeated single-exon genes with adaptive functions. BMC Biology. 18:56.

Stephens TG, Ragan MA, Bhattacharya D, Chan CX. 2018. Core genes in diverse
dinoflagellate lineages include a wealth of conserved dark genes with unknown functions.
Scientific Reports. 8:17175.

Steuber T, Löser H. 2000. Species richness and abundance patterns of Tethyan Cretaceous
rudist bivalves (Mollusca: Hippuritacea) in the central-eastern Mediterranean and Middle
East, analysed from a palaeontological database. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,
Palaeoecology. 162:75-104.

Thornhill DJ, Lewis AM, Wham DC, LaJeunesse TC. 2014. Host-specialist lineages
dominate the adaptive radiation of reef coral endosymbionts. Evolution. 68:352-367.

Turnham KE, Wham DC, Sampayo E, LaJeunesse TC. 2021. Mutualistic microalgae co-
diversify with reef corals that acquire symbionts during egg development. The ISME Journal.

van der Burgt A, Severing E, de Wit PJ, Collemare J. 2012. Birth of new spliceosomal
introns in fungi by multiplication of introner-like elements. Current Biology. 22:1260-1265.

Veron JEN. 2011. Scleractinia, evolution and taxonomy. In: Hopley D, editor. Encyclopedia
of Modern Coral Reefs: Structure, Form and Process. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. p.
947-957.

Vinogradov AE. 2003. DNA helix: the importance of being GC-rich. Nucleic Acids
Research. 31:1838-1844.

Vulpius S, Kiessling W. 2017. New constraints on the last aragonite–calcite sea transition
from early Jurassic ooids. Facies. 64:3.

Wang B, Liang X, Gleason ML, Hsiang T, Zhang R, Sun G. 2020a. A chromosome-scale
assembly of the smallest Dothideomycete genome reveals a unique genome compaction
mechanism in filamentous fungi. BMC Genomics. 21:321.

Wang W, Das A, Kainer D, Schalamun M, Morales-Suarez A, Schwessinger B, Lanfear R.
2020b. The draft nuclear genome assembly of *Eucalyptus pauciflora*: a pipeline for
comparing *de novo* assemblies. GigaScience. 9:giz160.

Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM, Jaffe DB. 2017. Direct determination of
diploid genome sequences. Genome Research. 27:757-767.

Worden AZ, Lee J-H, Mock T, Rouzé P, Simmons MP, Aerts AL, Allen AE, Cuvelier ML,
Derelle E, Everett MV, et al. 2009. Green evolution and dynamic adaptations revealed by
genomes of the marine picoeukaryotes *Micromonas*. Science. 324:268-272.

Xiang T, Hambleton EA, DeNofrio JC, Pringle JR, Grossman AR. 2013. Isolation of clonal
axenic strains of the symbiotic dinoflagellate *Symbiodinium* and their growth and host
specificity. Journal of Phycology. 49:447-458.

Xue W, Li J-T, Zhu Y-P, Hou G-Y, Kong X-F, Kuang Y-Y, Sun X-W. 2013.
L_RNA_scaffolder: scaffolding genomes with transcripts. BMC Genomics. 14:604.

Zimin AV, Marçais G, Puiu D, Roberts M, Salzberg SL, Yorke JA. 2013. The MaSuRCA
genome assembler. Bioinformatics. 29:2669-2677.

Zimin AV, Puiu D, Luo M-C, Zhu T, Koren S, Marçais G, Yorke JA, Dvořák J, Salzberg SL.
2017. Hybrid assembly of the large and highly repetitive genome of *Aegilops tauschii*, a
progenitor of bread wheat, with the MaSuRCA mega-reads algorithm. Genome Research.
27:787-792.

1113

1114

Table

Table 1

Genome assemblies and gene predictions of *E. voratum* RCC1521, rt-383, and CCMP421.

Isolate	RCC1521	rt-383 (=CCMP3420)	CCMP421
Location of isolation	Mediterranean Sea off Blanes, Spain	Eastern North Pacific off Santa Barbara, USA	Cooks Strait, New Zealand
Reference	(Jeong et al. 2014)	(Polne-Fuller 1991)	(Chang 1983)
Genome sequencing technologies	Illumina, PacBio, Nanopore	Illumina, PacBio, Nanopore	10X Linked-reads
Genome assembly size (Gb)	1.2	1.3	1.1
Estimated genome size (Gb)	1.4	1.2	1.9
GC-content of genome assembly (%)	50.8	50.6	50.9
Total read coverage	446×	212×	153×
Number of genome scaffolds	3,881	11,607	38,022
N50 of genome assembly (Kb)	720	252	304
Number of predicted genes	32,108	39,878	32,615
% BUSCO recovery (genome)	34.0	35.1	20.4
% BUSCO recovery (proteins)	76.7	77.2	67.2

Figures

Figure 1

Species tree of dinoflagellates alongside estimated genome sizes. The species tree was
inferred using 91,115 orthologous protein sets derived from 1,420,328 protein sequences
from 33 dinoflagellate taxa. Symbiotic lifestyles are shown in yellow, free-living in blue, and
parasitic in orange. Node-total refers to the number of protein families which contain one or
more taxa at the node. Node-specific are protein families that exclude taxa outside the node.
Numbers at the tips of each branch represent isolate-specific protein families. For the S1, S2,
Ev, and Po groups of Suessiales, the mean of isolate-specific protein families and the mean ±
standard deviation of estimated genome sizes are displayed. Node N0 contains homologous
protein sets from all 33 taxa, whereas node N1 includes data from the 21 Suessiales.

1132

1133
Figure 2

Genome features of *E. voratum* and other dinoflagellates. (A) Genome-sequence identity
(*italics* within circle) and the percentage of aligned bases (outside circle) among the three *E.*
voratum isolates. Features of representative genomes in the four Suessiales groups of S2, Ev,
S1, and Po, plus *Prorocentrum cordatum* (Pc), in the order from the most-recent to most-
ancient divergence, shown for (B) mean GC content in whole-genome, intronic, and CDS
regions (*Amphidinium gibbosum* (Ag) was added for dinoflagellate-wide comparison), (C)
percentage of mobile elements, and (D) percentage of genes containing introner elements
(IEs). Gene features of Suessiales showing (E) mean gene length, (F) average proportions of
exons and introns, (G) the relative frequency of introns by length (symbiotic lineages in
boldface), (H) number of introns per gene, and (I) intron length versus relative intron position
(symbiotic lineages in boldface). In all bar charts, *, **, *** represent $p < 0.05$, < 0.01, and $<$
0.001 respectively based on Wilcoxon rank sum test.

1147

1148
1149 **Figure 3**

Gene family evolution in Suessiales. (A) Number of protein families is shown at each node and branch represents those that are shared among or specific to S1, Ev, S2, and/or Po. Number of families that are exclusive to Ev (green), to S1 (light blue), to Ev+Po (dark blue), to S2+S1 (yellow), and to S2+S1+Po (orange) were highlighted. (B) Enriched Gene Ontology (GO) terms for genes in the five distinct groups relative to all GO terms in the corresponding taxa, arranged in decreasing order of significance from top to bottom within the categories: Cellular Component, Biological Process, and Molecular Function.

1157

1158
1159 **Figure 4**

Pseudogenisation in Symbiodiniaceae. Number of protein families with significantly different level of pseudogenisation, Ψ, shown for (A) those with greater extent in symbiotic lineages (i.e., higher Ψ in S1, S2, or S1+S2, relative to Ev), and (B) those with greater extent in the free-living Ev (i.e., higher Ψ in Ev relative to S1, S2, or S1+S2). The black circles on the upset plots indicate taxa groups with higher Ψ than those with grey circles. The associated GO terms are shown for (C) those where $\Psi_{S1+S2} > \Psi_{Ev}$, and (D) those where $\Psi_{Ev} > \Psi_{S1+S2}$.

1167

1168
Figure 5

Phylogenetic relationship of *E. voratum* within Symbiodiniaceae and other taxa. (A)

Maximum likelihood species tree of dinoflagellates inferred based on alignment of 18S

rDNA sequences from 13 representative taxa, showing node support derived from ultrafast

bootstrap of 2,000 samples; unit of branch length is number of substitutions per site. Tree

topologies inferred from *k*-mers in 21 Suessiales genomes using our alignment-free (AF)

approach are shown for (B) intronic regions ($k = 21$), (C) repeat-masked whole-genome

sequences ($k = 23$), and (D) coding sequence regions ($k = 19$). Jackknife support of $\geq 96\%$

based on 100 pseudo-replicates is shown on each node of the AF trees.

1178

1179

Figure 6

Timeline of Symbiodiniaceae genome evolution and coral evolution. The estimated

divergence timeline of the Family Symbiodiniaceae (LaJeunesse et al. 2018) is shown at the

top, indicating representative taxa of S1, Ev, and S2. Key genome signatures for each group

related to pseudogenisation, mRNA editing, and intron size are shown along the branch. The

dotted line represents the yet-unknown timeline of Suessiales divergence from the rest of

dinoflagellates. Evolutionary timescale along the different eras highlighting key geological

events relevant to coral evolution, aligning with Symbiodiniaceae divergence, is shown at the

bottom. Mass of preserved corals and sponges represented by black line (left y-axis), low

latitude (30°S-30°N) ocean temperature in red (right y-axis), ocean chemistry of Mg/Ca ratio

showing aragonite (dark blue) vs calcite sea (light blue); data were sourced from earlier

studies (Veron 2011; Pandolfi and Kiessling 2014; LaJeunesse et al. 2018; Stanley and van

de Schootbrugge 2018; Quattrini et al. 2020; Frankowiak et al. 2021; Grossman and

Joachimski 2022).

1194