Evolution of the spider homeobox gene repertoire by tandem and whole genome duplication

Madeleine E. Aase-Remedios[1], Ralf Janssen[2,*], Daniel J. Leite[1], Lauren Sumner-Rooney[3], and Alistair P. McGregor[1]*

[1] Department of Biosciences, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK.
[2] Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, 752 36, Uppsala, Sweden.
[3] Museum für Naturkunde, Leibniz-Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung, 10115 Berlin Germany.

*Corresponding authors: alistair.mcgregor@durham.ac.uk, ralf.janssen@geo.uu.se

ABSTRACT

Whole genome duplication (WGD) generates new genetic material that can contribute to the evolution of gene regulatory networks and phenotypes. After WGD, retained ohnologues can undergo subfunctionalisation to partition ancestral functions and/or neofunctionalisation, where one copy assumes a new function. We previously found that there had been a WGD in an ancestor of arachnopulmonates, the lineage including spiders and scorpions but excluding other arachnids like mites, ticks, and harvestmen. This WGD was evidenced by many duplicated homeobox genes, including two Hox clusters, in spiders. However, it was unclear which homeobox paralogues were produced by WGD versus tandem duplications. Understanding this is key to determining the relative contributions of tandem duplications and WGD to arachnopulmonate genome evolution. Here we characterised the distribution of duplicated homeobox genes across eight chromosome-level spider genomes. We found that the majority of retained duplicate homeobox genes in spiders likely originated from WGD. We also found two copies of conserved homeobox gene clusters, including the Hox, NK, HRO, Irx, and SINE, in all eight species. Consistently, we noticed one degenerated copy of each cluster in terms of gene content and organisation while the other remained more intact. Focussing on the NK cluster, we found evidence for regulatory subfunctionalisation between the duplicated NK genes in the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* to their single-copy orthologues in the harvestman *Phalangium opilio*. Our study provides new insights into the contributions of multiple modes of duplication to the homeobox gene repertoire during the evolution of spiders and the function of NK genes.

INTRODUCTION

Homeobox genes are a superclass of transcription factor, characterised by encoding the homeodomain, a highly conserved DNA-binding domain. There are eleven recognised classes of homeobox genes, with diverse and wide-reaching roles in development (Holland et al. 2007; Zhong et al. 2008; Kumar 2009; Butts et al. 2010; Bürglin 2011; Zhong and Holland 2011; Holland 2013; Holland et al. 2017). Many of these classes are thought to have expanded by tandem duplication early in animal evolution to give rise to more than 100 homeobox genes in the ancestral bilaterian (Larroux et al. 2008; Holland et al. 2017). It has been argued that certain homeobox gene expansions coincided with important innovations that occurred at the evolutionary origins of animals and subsequently bilaterians (Garcia-Fernàndez 2005; Holland 2013; Holland 2015). These tandem expansions resulted in clusters of related genes that have been conserved across the animal phylogeny (Pollard and Holland 2000; Larroux et al. 2007; Larroux et al. 2008; Ferrier 2016a). Homeobox clusters are thought to be maintained via functional constraint on their genomic organisation exerted by complex and overlapping regulatory elements controlling the expression of adjacent genes (Irimia et al. 2012; Ferrier 2016b).

The best known homeobox cluster is the Hox cluster. In arthropods, the Hox cluster contains ten ANTP-class genes: *labial* (*lab*, *Hox1*), *proboscipedia* (*pb*, *Hox2*), *Hox3*, *Deformed* (*Dfd*, *Hox4*), *Sex combs reduced* (*Scr*, *Hox5*), *fushi tarazu* (*ftz*, *Hox6-8*), *Antennapedia* (*Antp*, *Hox6-8*), *Ultrabithorax* (*Ubx*, *Hox6-8*), *abdominal-A* (*abd-A*, *Hox6-8*), and *Abdominal-B* (*Abd-B*, *Hox9-15*) (Table 1), organised in the genomes of most arthropods in this specific order. In some genomes, the cluster has been expanded or rearranged, for instance, the *Drosophila melanogaster* Hox cluster contains three *Hox3*-family genes, *zerknüllt* (*zen*), *zen2*, and *bicoid* (*bcd*), and the complex has been separated between the Antennapedia complex from the Bithorax complex (Duboule 2007; Negre and Ruiz 2007). Nonetheless, Hox clusters are generally highly conserved in organisation and function, patterning the antero-posterior (A-P) axis in the same order as their relative genomic positions (Krumlauf 2018 and the references therein). Similarly, the ParaHox cluster, considered sister to the Hox cluster (Brooke et al. 1998),

also exhibits some collinearity in expression in a few extant animals and is thought to

have regulated the A-P patterning of the through-gut of the ancestral bilaterian (Hui et

al. 2009; Holland 2013). In deuterostomes and spiralians, the ParaHox cluster consists

of three families, *Gsx*, *Xlox/Pdx*, and *Cdx*; however, in ecdysozoans, *Xlox/Pdx* is

presumed lost (Ferrier and Minguillón 2003). The linkage between the two remaining

ParaHox genes has broken down in flies and nematodes, indicating the overall

disintegration of the ecdysozoan ParaHox cluster (Ferrier and Minguillón 2003).

Table 1 – Homeobox gene family names and synonyms in *D. melanogaster* for gene families
belonging to conserved clusters. Table adapted from Ferrier (2016). The dash for *Irx3* indicates it is not
found in *D. melanogaster*. Some of the NK2 cluster genes were first described as part of a 'pharyngeal'
cluster, containing *NK2.1*, *NK2.2*, and *Msxlx*, as well as two non-homeobox genes, *Pax1/9* and *FoxA1/2*
(Simakov and Kawashima 2017); linkage and sometimes clustering between *NK2.1*, *NK2.2*, and *Msxlx* is
evident across bilaterians, and here is referred to as the NK2 cluster (Simakov et al. 2015; Ferrier 2016b).
77

	Bilaterian family	Arthropod family	Synonyms		Bilaterian family	Arthropod family	Synonyms
Super-Hox (ANTP)	Hox1	lab	lab	NK (ANTP)	NK1	NK1	slou
	Hox2	pb	pb		NK3	NK3	bap
	Hox3	Hox3	zen, zen2, bcd		NK4	NK4	tin
	Hox4	Dfd	Dfd		NK5	NK5	Hmx
	Hox5	Scr	Scr		NK6	NK6	Hgtx
		ftz	ftz		NK7	NK7	NK7.1
	Hox6-8	Antp	Antp		Msx	Msx	Dr, msh
		Ubx	Ubx		Tlx	Tlx	C15, cll
		abd-A	abd-A		Lbx	Lbx	lbe, lbl
	Hox9-15	Abd-B	Abd-B		Hhex	Hhex	HHEX
	Abox	Abox	CG34031		Noto	Noto	Not
	Dbx	Dbx			Emx	Emx	ems, E5
	Dlx	Dlx	Dll	NK2 (ANTP)	NK2.1	NK2.1	scro
	En	En	en, inv		NK2.2	NK2.2	vnd
	Evx	Evx	eve		Msxlx	Msxlx	CG15696
	Gbx	Gbx	unpg		Hlx	Hlx	H2.0
	Meox	Meox	btn	IRX (TALE)	Irx	Irx1	ara, caup
	Mnx	Mnx	exex			Irx2	mirr
	Nedx	Nedx	lms			Irx3	–
	Ro	Ro	ro	HRO+Isl (PRD-LIM)	Hbn	Hbn	hbn
ParaHox (ANTP)	Xlox/Pdx				Rax	Rax	Rx
	Gsx	Gsx	ind		Otp	Otp	otp
	Cdx	Cdx	cad		Isl	Isl	tup
				SINE	Six1/2	Six1/2	so
					Six3/6	Six3/6	optix
					Six4/5	Six4/5	Six4

The NK cluster also belongs to the ANTP class. It was first described in *D.*

melanogaster as a cluster of genes involved in mesodermal patterning (Jagla et al.

2001). This cluster contains the orthologues in the bilaterian gene families *Msx*, *NK1*,

Tlx, *Lbx*, *NK3*, and *NK4* in *D. melanogaster*, which along with *Hhex*, *Noto*, *NK5*, *NK7*,

Emx, and *NK6* make up the ancestral NK complement (Table 1) (Larroux et al. 2007;

Butts et al. 2008; Li et al. 2020). Related to the NK cluster, the NK2 cluster contains

NK2.1, *NK2.2*, and *Msxlx*, as well as *Hlx* (Table 2), which seem to exhibit conserved

roles patterning the pharynx in deuterostomes (Butts et al. 2010; Simakov et al. 2015;

Simakov and Kawashima 2017).

The PRD-class HRO cluster consists of orthologues of *D. melanogaster hbn*, *Rx*, and

otp (Table 1), involved in brain and eye development across bilaterians, and neural

development in a cnidarian (Mazza et al. 2010). SINE-class genes have conserved

roles in the *Pax-Six-Eya-Dach* network in myogenesis, brain, and eye development

across animals (Kawakami et al. 2000; Stierwald et al. 2004; Kumar 2009). The SINE

class contains three bilaterian gene families, *Six1/2/sine oculis*, *Six3/6/optix*, and *Six4/5*

(Table 1), which sit in a conserved three-gene cluster (Gallardo et al. 1999; Ferrier

2016b). The TALE-class genes in the *Iroquois* (*Irx*) family have undergone multiple

independent tandem duplications resulting in clusters of various sizes in different

bilaterian lineages, indicating that these genes may be uniquely prone to tandem

duplication and retention (Irimia et al. 2008; Kerner et al. 2009). Their complex roles in

development are less well characterised from an evolutionary perspective, but *Irx* genes

have been implicated in eye development in *D. melanogaster* and neural crest in

vertebrates, but within both flies and vertebrate models, *Irx* paralogues seem to act

redundantly to one another (Cavodeassi et al. 2001).

Conserved linkage between homeobox clusters of the same and different classes in

multiple animal lineages gave rise to the Giga-cluster hypothesis, which posits that the

progenitor genes of each homeobox class were themselves situated in a tandem array

in a pre-metazoan ancestor (Ferrier 2016b). Linkage between classes may be

descendant from an ancestral association or reflect a recent association due to

chromosomal rearrangements.

Homeobox genes and clusters have also been pervasively retained in duplicate

following whole genome duplications (WGD). There were two rounds (2R) of WGD in

the gnathostome ancestor, and many homeobox ohnologues were retained, including

four ohnologous Hox clusters (Holland and Garcia-Fernàndez 1996; McLysaght et al.

2002; Holland et al. 2007; Putnam et al. 2008; Cañestro et al. 2013; Holland 2013;

Holland and Ocampo Daza 2018). The 2R WGD appears to have relaxed constraint on

Hox cluster organisation so that while the complement of genes from *Hox1* to *Hox14* are

present in at least one copy, no cluster contains all 14 genes (Hoegg and Meyer 2005).

Positive selection has also been detected between paralogues among the four

vertebrate Hox clusters (Lynch et al. 2006).

It is thought that retained WGD paralogues (ohnologues) have contributed to the

evolution of vertebrate novelties (Meyer and Schartl 1999; Shimeld and Holland 2000;

Cañestro et al. 2013; Aase-Remedios and Ferrier 2021). Duplicated genes are

hypothesised to be released from functional constraints, allowing paralogues to

subfunctionalise, specialise, or neofunctionalise while collectively maintaining full

functionality, either by changes to their cis-regulatory controls or protein sequence

(Force et al. 1999; Jiménez-Delgado et al. 2009; Tinti et al. 2012; Espinosa-Cantú et al.

2015; Marlétaz et al. 2018). While the 2R WGD has been credited with facilitating the

evolution of vertebrate novelties, the extent to which WGDs in other animal lineages

have contributed to diversification is not well understood.

An independent WGD took place in the arachnopulmonate ancestor (Figure 1), resulting

in many homeobox genes retained in duplicate in spiders and scorpions and their

relatives, including two ohnologous Hox clusters (Schwager et al. 2017; Leite et al.

2018; Harper et al. 2021; Ontano et al. 2021). Between the Hox genes, each ohnologue

exhibits different spatial and temporal expression, though overall, spatial and temporal

collinearity is largely intact (Schwager et al. 2007; Schwager et al. 2017; Turetzek et al.

2022). Beyond the two Hox clusters, nearly 60% of all homeobox gene families were

found to have retained duplicates in spiders and scorpions, with previous descriptions

totalling 145 homeobox genes belonging to 80 families in the spider *Parasteatoda*

tepidariorum and 156 genes in 82 families in the scorpion *Centruroides sculpturatus*

(Schwager et al. 2017; Leite et al. 2018). Of these retained paralogues, many exhibit

divergent expression consistent with both sub- and neofunctionalisation (Leite et al.

2018).

In previous surveys, certain paralogues were identified as likely tandem duplicates

based on their relative positions in the scaffold-level genome assembly for *P.*

tepidariorum. For instance, both two-gene clusters of *Emx* paralogues were complete

on their own scaffold (Leite et al. 2018). For other genes, however, their relationships

could not be reliably determined, particularly for families with more than two paralogues

or dispersed tandem duplicates like the *Msx* family (Leite et al. 2018). In the previous *P.*

tepidariorum assembly, only one of the two Hox clusters was found on a single scaffold,

so it could not be determined if the other was also intact (Schwager et al. 2017). Now

with several chromosome-level assemblies available for spiders including *P.*

tepidariorum (Figure 1), relative genomic positions of paralogous genes across species

can provide important information in determining their evolutionary origins. This includes

using chromosomal location and linkage to distinguish tandem duplication from WGD

and comparing species from different spider and outgroup lineages to estimate the

timing of duplications.

We surveyed the homeobox gene complement and synteny across eight recently

released chromosome-level spider genome assemblies (Figure 1). For the NK cluster,

we complemented the characterisation of the expression of *Emx* and *Msx* family genes

(Leite et al. 2018) by describing the temporal and spatial expression of the rest of the

NK cluster genes during embryogenesis in the harvestman *P. opilio* and their

orthologues and ohnologues from *P. tepidariorum*.

Our analysis of chromosome-level spider genomes allowed us to distinguish

ohnologues resulting from WGD versus paralogues from tandem duplication for the first

time. We found that many spider homeobox genes and clusters were retained in

duplicate following the WGD. We also characterised both ancient and recent tandem

duplications and determined the timing of these relative to the WGD and the divergence

of major lineages within arthropods. For NK cluster genes, we detected no evidence of

selection on coding

sequence in our

comparisons between

paralogues, but for each

family with retained

ohnologues in *P.*

tepidariorum, we found

evidence for

subfunctionalisation

during embryogenesis.

Combined, these results

provide new insight into

both the patterns of

ohnologue retention and

their consequences in

spider evolution.

Figure 1 – Phylogeny of arthropods used in this study. The timing of the whole genome duplication (WGD) is indicated by the red star; pre-duplicate lineages have grey lines, duplicate genomes have black lines. Genome assembly level is indicated below the species binomial, in bold for the eight chromosome-level spider and three non-WGD outgroup genome assemblies used for the synteny analyses.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Homeobox gene annotation

We classified the homeobox gene complement of the publicly available chromosome-level genomes from eight spider species, *Dysdera silvatica* (Sánchez-Herrero et al. 2019; Escuer et al. 2022), *Dolomedes plantarius* (Blaxter et al. 2022), *Latrodectus elegans* (Wang et al. 2022), *P. tepidariorum* (Zhu et al. 2023), *Hylyphantes graminicola* (Zhu et al. 2022), *Argiope bruennichi* (Sheffer et al. 2021), *Trichonephila antipodiana* (Fan et al. 2021), and *Trichonephila clavata* (Hu et al. 2022). We examined the previous homeobox gene classification of the scorpion *C. sculpturatus*, which shared the ancestral WGD, as an outgroup to the spiders (Schwager et al. 2017; Leite et al. 2018). As non-WGD outgroups, we included two arachnids, the harvestman *P. opilio* (Gainett et al. 2021), and the tick *Ixodes scapularis* (De et al. 2023), as well as three mandibulates: the centipede *Strigamia maritima* (Chipman et al. 2014; So et al. 2022), the fruit fly *D. melanogaster* (BDGP6.32), in which many of these homeobox genes and families were first described (Zhong et al. 2008), and the beetle *Tribolium castaneum* (Herndon et al. 2020), which was used by Butts et al. (2008) to describe the Super-Hox cluster. Only chromosome-level assemblies were used for synteny analyses, but homeobox genes were counted and classified in all genomes. We used tBLASTn searches (Altschul et al. 1990) with the contents of HomeoDB (accessed July 2020) (Zhong et al. 2008; Zhong and Holland 2011), as well as the previous classification of *P. tepidariorum* homeobox genes (Schwager et al. 2017; Leite et al. 2018) as the query set to retrieve homeodomain sequences from all eight spider genomes, and re-annotated the homeobox genes for the harvestman, tick, and centipede. Homeodomain sequences were then curated by tBLASTn searches against annotated gene models or transcriptomes for all species except *D. plantarius*, for which an annotation is not available, and classified based on sequence similarity and diagnostic residues of the homeodomain for all families. For some gene families with several duplication events, *e.g.*, *Irx*, *Pax4/6*, *Pax3/7*, as well as the NK cluster genes, phylogenies were constructed (see below). All homeodomain sequences can be found in the supplementary information (Table S1).

Phylogenetics

To determine the timing of duplication of the arachnopulmonate *Irx* genes relative to

pre-duplicate paralogues, we made a full-length amino acid sequence alignment from a

from a subset of our spider species, the scorpion, and a transcriptome from another

synspermiatan spider, *Segestria senoculata* (Baudouin-Gonzalez unpublished). Full

sequences for genomes with poor annotations were curated from GenBank searches

and BLASTp (Altschul et al. 1990) searches against nr (Benson et al. 2018). These

sequences were aligned with MUSCLE set to the protein alignment defaults (Edgar

2004) and manually curated and trimmed to remove gaps. We inferred a Maximum-

Likelihood phylogeny with IQ-TREE (Nguyen et al. 2015), determined the best

substitution model with ModelFinder (Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017), and used 1,000

bootstrap replicates to optimise topology support. The phylogeny was visualised with

FigTree (FigTree 2018). The full and trimmed alignments and the phylogeny can be

found in the supplementary information (Figure S1,

[https://github.com/madeleineaaseremedios/SpiderHomeoboxSequences]). Other family

phylogenies were made using only the homeodomain sequence and aligned manually,

but inferred as for the *Irx* family tree, except for the NK cluster and NK-linked genes

phylogeny, which used full protein sequences and was aligned with MUSCLE set to the

protein default (Edgar 2004) (Figure S2).

Whole genome synteny comparison

We performed whole genome synteny comparisons to explore chromosomal

rearrangements that might underlie trends in homeobox placement in spider genomes.

We used all spider species mentioned above, except for *D. plantarius* due to the lack of

genome annotation, and non-spider species *I. scapularis*, *T. castaneum* and *D.*

melanogaster. Hierarchical orthogroups (HOGs) of all non-homeobox genes were

identified using Orthofinder (Emms and Kelly 2019) with default settings, specifying the

species tree: ((Dmel,Tcas)N1,(Isca,(Dsil,((Ptep,Lele)N5,(Hgra,(Abru,(Tcla,Tant)N8)N7)

N6)N4)N3)N2)N0);. These were combined with HOGs of our homeobox orthology and

used to reconstruct ancestral gene orders with Agora (Muffato et al. 2023) , using the

basic pipeline. However, we used Agora to illustrate chromosomes with macrosynteny

and orthology relationships, rather than the Contiguous Ancestral Regions detected by

Agora, because we achieved better signal of chromosomal macrosynteny.

Coding sequence evolutionary analyses

For core NK cluster genes, we curated full coding sequences for a subset of species

with the best annotations: *P. tepidariorum*, *A. bruennichi*, *D. silvatica*, *D. melanogaster*,

T. castaneum and *I. scapularis*, as well as four species not included in the synteny

comparison: the centipede *S. maritima*, the harvestman *P. opilio*, the scorpion *C.*

sculpturatus, and the onychophoran *Euperipatoides rowelli*, for which NK homeobox

genes have been described, but which lack chromosomal-level genome assemblies

(Chipman et al. 2014; Leite et al. 2018; Treffkorn et al. 2018). The NK cluster genes

contained families with different duplication histories, including WGD ohnologues in

arachnopulmonates, tandem duplications both before and after the WGD, and families

with only single genes represented after the WGD, allowing us to compare possible

signatures of subfunctionalisation between the different evolutionary trajectories and

different types of duplicates.

We used aBSREL v2.3 (Smith et al. 2015) to detect selection on each branch of the

phylogeny for each of the spider NK core cluster gene families (*Msx*, *NK3*, *NK4*, *Tlx*,

Lbx, and *NK7*) as well as *Emx*. We used sequences from three spiders, *P. tepidariorum*,

D. silvatica, and *A. bruennichi*, and the scorpion, harvestman*,* tick, fly, and beetle, as

above, and rooted the trees with sequences from the onychophoran (Treffkorn et al.

2018). We created and trimmed codon alignments with PAL2NAL (Suyama et al. 2006)

from coding sequences and protein sequence alignments inferred with MUSCLE set to

the protein alignment default (Edgar 2004). We ran aBSREL using hyphy v2.5.46 and

the outputs were visualised with HyPhy Vision at [http://vision.hyphy.org/]. We also

conducted pairwise comparisons of dN/dS ratios between *P. opilio* and *P. tepidariorum*

for NK cluster genes calculated with codeML (Goldman and Yang 1994) from codon

alignments inferred as above for each gene pair. Sequence data and aBSREL outputs

can be found at [https://github.com/madeleineaaseremedios/NKseqevoldata] and

visualised with HyPhy Vision as above.

Animal husbandry, embryo collection, PCR, riboprobe synthesis, and in situ

hybridization

Embryos of the spider *P. tepidariorum* were collected from the colony established in

Uppsala, Sweden, maintained as described in Prpic et al. (2008). Embryos of the

harvestman *P. opilio* were collected from wild caught specimens in Uppsala, Sweden.

Adult specimens and embryos of *P. opilio* were treated as described in Janssen et al.

(2021). We applied the staging system of Mittmann and Wolff (2012) for *P.*

tepidariorum, and Gainett et al. (2022) for *P. opilio*. We investigated all developmental

stages of *P. tepidariorum* and *P. opilio* from the formation of the early germ band to

dorsal closure. Total RNA from *P. tepidariorum* and *P. opilio* was isolated from a mix of

embryonic stages using TRIzol (Invitrogen). mRNA was isolated from total RNA using

the Dynabeads mRNA Purification System (Invitrogen). mRNA was reverse transcribed

into cDNA using the SuperScriptII system (Invitrogen). PCRs were performed applying

sets of gene specific primers. For all investigated genes, reverse primers were ordered

with additional 5-prime T7-promotor sequences (gggTAATACGACTCACTATAG) for

subsequent antisense RNA probe synthesis (David and Wedlich 2001). *In situ*

hybridizations were performed as per Janssen et al. (2018). Primer sequences can be

found in Table S2.

Data availability statement

All data underpinning this study is available through the links above or in the

supplementary information.

RESULTS

Homeobox gene repertoires in arthropods

We surveyed the homeobox gene repertoires of eight spider species with chromosome-

level genome assemblies, representing seven entelegyne and one synspermiatan

species and compared these to the scorpion *C. sculpturatus*, the harvestman *P. opilio*

and the tick *I. scapularis*, as well as three mandibulate species (Figures 1, 2 and Table

2). We found that spiders and scorpions have similar numbers of homeobox genes, and

on average, have 1.4 times more homeobox genes than outgroup species that did not

have an ancestral WGD (Table 2). The spiders and scorpion had an average of 150

homeobox genes; the most are found in *H. graminicola* with 172 and the fewest in *D.*

silvatica with 140. Mandibulates and non-arachnopulmonate arachnids have on average

107 homeobox genes, with the fewest in the insects (103) and the most in *S. maritima*

(113). Previous surveys found 96 and 69 homeobox genes in *I. scapularis* and *P. opilio*,

respectively, 145 in *P. tepidariorum* and 156 in *C. sculpturatus* (Schwager et al. 2017;

Leite et al. 2018), but we identified between 1-55% more in each of these species

(Table 2). For *P. opilio*, searching both the recent genome assembly (Gainett et al.

2021) as well as the developmental transcriptome (Sharma et al. 2012) provided a more

complete dataset and enabled our identification of more homeobox genes than

previously described.

A total of 90 described homeobox families was represented in our arthropod species set

(Table 2), though some were absent in different species such that no species had a

gene from every family (Figure 2 A, Table S1). In addition, we also found several new

homeobox genes that could not be classified to family. A few of these may represent

new lineage-specific unclassified (un) families, temporarily called *ANTP-un1*, *PRD-un1*,

SINE-un1, and *TALE-un1*; *ANTP-un1* is found only in the chelicerates, while *PRD-un1*

and *SINE-un1* was found only in the Araneids, and *TALE-un1* only in the *Trichonephila*

spp. (Figure 2 A, Table S1). The '1' is simply a placeholder to indicate that these genes

have an orthologue in at least two species and to distinguish them from other

unclassified homeodomain sequences that have no similarity to described families and

were found only in one species, sometimes in several copies.

Comparing this taxonomic breadth of species in concert with genomic synteny enabled

us to distinguish ancient and recent tandem duplicates from likely ohnologues and

determine the timing of duplications relative to major radiations in arthropod evolution.

We have defined ancient tandem duplicates as those that are often linked or clustered

in most spider genomes and date to a duplication node in an ancestor before the

arachnopulmonate WGD, while recent tandem duplicates are also linked or clustered,

but have occurred either after the WGD or in the outgroups. Six homeobox gene

families, *Arx*, *Barhl*, *Irx*, *Pax3/7*, *Pax4/6*, and *Lhx2/9*, underwent ancient tandem

duplication events that are shared by arthropods and may have ancestry even deeper in

the bilaterian phylogeny (Figure 2 B). Only three of these ancient tandem paralogues

have been subsequently lost; just one *Lhx2/9* gene is found in *D. melanogaster*, and

only one *Barhl* gene is found in *T. castaneum* and *D. silvatica*. Within the chelicerates

but predating the arachnopulmonate WGD, three further tandem duplications occurred.

Bsx and *Msx* likely duplicated in the common ancestor of ticks, harvestmen and

arachnopulmonates, and *Emx* likely duplicated in the ancestor of harvestmen and

arachnopulmonates. *NK1* duplicated in tandem, likely just after the WGD, while the

other ohnologue was probably lost. Besides these duplications, the majority of tandem

duplications in spiders were more recent and lineage-specific. In particular, *H.*

graminicola has the highest number of families with recent tandem duplications (23

families) (Figure 2 B), resulting in this species having the highest number of homeobox

genes identified (172). Although this could be an assembly artefact, since overall, the *H.*

graminicola genome did not exhibit an exceptionally large number of duplicated genes

(Zhu et al. 2022).

Table 2 – Homeobox genes across arthropods are largely stable, except for an increase in the
arachnopulmonates. Species abbreviations: *Dmel Drosophila melanogaster, Tcas Tribolium castaneum,*
Smar Strigamia maritima, Isca Ixodes scapularis, Popi Phalangium opilio, Cscu Centruroides sculpturatus,
Dsil Dysdera silvatica, Dpla Dolomedes plantarius, Lele Latrodectus elegans, Ptep Parasteatoda
tepidariorum, Hgra Hylyphantes graminicola, Abru Argiope bruennichi, Tant Trichonephila antipodiana, Tcla
Trichonephila clavata.

	Dmel	Tcas	Smar	Isca	Popi	Cscu	Dsil	Dpla	Lele	Ptep	Hgra	Abru	Tant	Tcla
Homeobox genes	103	103	113	109	107	157	140	146	148	147	172	145	143	148
Homeobox families	83	85	90	88	90	90	79	86	88	91	86	87	86	88
Families with paralogues from ancient TD(s)	5	5	6	8	9	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Families with paralogues from recent TD(s)	9	9	13	8	5	4	8	3	6	4	23	3	2	5
Families with only one gene	71	71	75	75	79	42	34	40	44	43	41	43	43	44
Families with retained ohnologues	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	44	41	43	41	43	37	40	40	40

In contrast to tandem duplicates, dispersed paralogues consistently found on different chromosomes in surveyed spider genomes were inferred to be ohnologues. There were between 37 and 44 families with retained ohnologues in spider species, and the families that were retained were largely consistent across species. All the Hox genes besides *Hox3* and *ftz* were retained as ohnologues, as previously reported for two spider species (Schwager et al. 2017), as well as a few Super-Hox genes, namely *Dbx*, *En*, and *Gbx* (Figure 2 A). Many of the NK cluster genes were also retained as ohnologues, including *NK4*, *NK5*, *NK6*, *NK7*, *Lbx*, *Tlx*, and tandem paralogues of *Emx* and *Msx* (Figure 2 A).

Ohnologues were likely lost from several families following the WGD (Figure 2 A). 32 families are found as single-copy in scorpions and spiders (discounting subsequent lineage-specific tandem duplications of single-copy genes), indicating an ohnologue was lost between the WGD and the divergence of scorpions and spiders. These include many of the Super-Hox families (*Ro*, *Nedx*, *Mnx*, *Evx*, and *Abox*), the ParaHox family *Gsx*, most of the NK2 cluster families (*Hlx*, *Msxlx*, and *NK2.1*) and the HRO

Figure 2: Many homeobox genes were retained in duplicate in scorpion and spider genomes. A) Heatmap of homeobox genes by family. B) Homeobox gene families having undergone tandem duplication events specific lineages of arthropods. *ftz* ohnologues in *D. plantarius* and *P. tepidariorum* are pseudogenes. Species abbreviations are as in Table 2.

cluster family *Hbn*. Six families including the ParaHox family *Cdx* and the HRO cluster

family *Otp* were found in the single copy in spiders while both ohnologues were retained

in the scorpion, indicating the loss of an ohnologue in the spider ancestor (Figure 2 A).

Within spiders, an ohnologue was lost from five families in the entelegyne ancestor: *ftz*,

Dlx, *Six4/5*, *Msxlx*, and *NK3*. *D. silvatica*, the sole synspermiatan representative, has

lost the largest number of ohnologues from eighteen families. Though the extent to

which this applies across synspermiatans cannot be determined, it is greater than the

twelve losses that have occurred across the entelegynes, or the eleven losses in *C.*

sculpturatus. Only a few families underwent losses multiple times, namely *Hox3* in *C.*

sculpturatus, *D. plantarius*, *L. elegans*, and the araneids; *Tgif* in the theridiids, *D.*

plantarius, *D. silvatica* and *C. sculpturatus*; and *Bsx* in both *H. graminicola* and *D.*

silvatica. Only one family, *Vax*, was potentially lost before the WGD, or both ohnologues

were lost in the arachnopulmonate ancestor (Figure 2 A). Though it was not reported in

the harvestman previously (Leite et al. 2018), we identified a single *Vax* gene in the

harvestman genome (Figure 2 A, Table S1).

Homeobox gene clusters in spider genomes

The Hox cluster

Each of the spider genomes here contains two Hox clusters (Figure 3), consistent with

previous descriptions for *P. tepidariorum* and other spiders (Schwager et al. 2007;

Schwager et al. 2017; Fan et al. 2021; Sheffer et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2022). With the

new *P. tepidariorum* chromosome-level assembly, it could be confirmed that each

cluster is on a single chromosome. Cluster B (Figure 3), is typically intact, organised,

and contains orthologues of all ten arthropod Hox genes, while cluster A often lacks

Hox3 and *ftz*, and is sometimes rearranged. There are some exceptions to this,

however. For one, there have been several tandem duplications of *H. graminicola* Hox

genes resulting in four *lab* paralogues, and three *pb*, *Antp*, *Ubx*, and *Abd-B* paralogues

(Figure 3). While these duplications have occurred in both Hox clusters, cluster B is

ordered, and contains the single orthologues of *Hox3* and *ftz*, while cluster A lacks

those genes and has been rearranged so that *lab-A-1*, *lab-A-2*, *pb-A-1*, *pb-A-2*, and

Dfd-A lie to the right of *Scr-A* through *abd-A-2* (Figure 3). Furthermore, the Super-Hox

gene *Dlx-A* is between *pb-A-2* and *Dfd-A* separated by 124 kb from *pb-A-2* and 380 kb

from *Dlx-A* and *Dfd-A*. In *D. plantarius* there is a new gene, identified with highest

similarity in the homeodomain to *Scr*, but not linked to either Hox cluster, possibly

representing a divergent *Scr* paralogue (blue *'S'* in Figure 3). A gene with similarity to

Dbx (grey *'Db'* in Figure 3) is also found between *pb-A* and *Dfd-A*, in the same relative

position as *Dlx* in the *H. graminicola* Hox cluster A. In *D. silvatica*, both Hox clusters are

rearranged, though one does contain both *Hox3* and *ftz*, while the other has lost only *ftz*

(Figure 3). Pseudogenes of *ftz* were found in *D. plantarius* and *P. tepidariorum*,

identified by the homeodomain disrupted by a stop codon. In *P. tepidariorum*, the *ftz-*

pseudogene is not linked to either Hox cluster, while in *D. plantarius,* it is adjacent to *ftz-*

B (Table S1, Figure S3 F).

Generally, the more degenerated Hox cluster, cluster A, contains more intervening

genes, but this greatly depends on the quality of annotation. In several genomes, Hox

genes encompass multiple predicted gene models, even for genomes with annotations

generated using transcriptomic data, resulting in an inflation of the estimation of the

number of intervening genes. Some estimates count as many as 98 protein coding

genes interspersed within the Hox clusters in *P. tepidariorum* (Turetzek et al. 2022),

which may be inaccurate both because of the fragmentation of gene models, as well as

the scaffold break disrupting Hox cluster B in the previous assembly. The triangle icons

in Figure 2 reflect the presence of any intervening genes, rather than the number, to

avoid overestimation due to fragmented gene models.

The Super-Hox genes consist of the Hox genes along with several ANTP-class genes

consistently found linked to each other and/or the Hox cluster across bilaterians (Butts

et al. 2008; Ferrier 2016b). While the Super-Hox complement is fairly intact in the

single-copy genomes studied here, with many Super-Hox genes still linked to one

another and/or to the Hox cluster in the tick and insects, Super-Hox genes have

dispersed in spider genomes (Figure 3), and many Super-Hox families have also

returned to the single copy (Figure 2 A, Figure 3). Amid the disintegration of the Super-

Hox cluster, there are still some associations between certain genes that indicate

conserved clustering and possibly functional constraint. *Abox* and *Meox* are commonly

found linked or clustered in all the entelegyne species (Figure 3). Other apparent

linkage patterns likely rather reflect the passive maintenance of linkage over time, like

the linkage of *Dbx* and *Gbx* to Hox cluster B in *H. graminicola*, *P. tepidariorum*, and *D.*

plantarius. Due to the >1 Mb distances between these genes and the Hox cluster, it is

unlikely that there is a functional aspect to their association. These passive remnants of

Super-Hox linkage also include the linkage of *En* with *Mnx*, *Gbx* with *Nedx*, and *Dbx*

Figure 3: Two ohnologous Hox clusters and a disintegrated arthropod ParaHox cluster are found in spiders. Genes are represented by coloured boxes; chromosomes are black lines. Gene orientation is indicated by arrows above or below genes, and distances are indicated by slashes between genes. Gene families are denoted a one- or two-letter code, and by colour for Hox and ParaHox genes, or in grey for Hox-linked genes. ParaHox genes are coloured based on relationship to Hox genes, *Gsx* with anterior genes and *Cdx* with posterior genes; *Xlox* was not found in any arthropod genome. Species abbreviations are as in Table 2.

with *Evx*, though these have more frequently been disrupted and dispersed, unlike *Abox*

and *Meox*. Thus, while the Hox cluster is maintained intact in both copies, most of the

Super-Hox genes have largely dispersed and their linkage arrangements have broken

down following the WGD.

The ParaHox cluster has largely disintegrated in spiders. Neither ParaHox gene is

linked to the other, and both have returned to the single copy (Figure 3). The two *Cdx*

paralogues in *D. silvatica* likely arose in a recent lineage-specific tandem duplication, as

they are found in a two-gene cluster only in this species. In both insects, *Gsx* and *Cdx*

family genes are unlinked, while in the tick they are on the same chromosome but

separated by a large distance (28 Mb) (Figure 3). This is consistent with the ancestral

breakdown of the ParaHox clustering in an arthropod ancestor, and the further

separation of the genes onto separate chromosomes in insects and spiders (Figure 3).

It is not clear whether these genes belong to the same ohnology group or not (*i.e.*, both

A or both B versus one A and one B), as there is only one ohnologue retained in any of

the species surveyed.

The NK cluster

We found two ohnologous NK clusters in all spider genomes (Figure 4). One consists of

Msx1-A, *NK4-A*, *NK3-A*, *Tlx-A*, *Lbx-A*, and *NK7-A* clustered on one chromosome, while

Msx1-B, *Tlx-B*, *Lbx-B*, and *NK7-B* are found on a separate chromosome, with *NK3-B*

and *NK4-B* in the species that have retained these genes (core NK clusters are

delineated with grey boxes in Figure 4). Cluster B is less organised; *NK3-B* has likely

been lost in entelegynes and *NK4-B* has likely been lost in *H. graminicola* and *P.*

tepidariorum. NK core cluster A is conserved across spiders, except that *Msx1-A* is not

found in *L. elegans* or *P. tepidariorum*, which could indicate the loss of *Msx1-A* from NK

cluster A in a theridiid ancestor. While NK cluster A is found in a conserved complement

and order in almost all spider species analysed, it is rarely linked to any other genes

belonging to the larger ancestral NK complement. In contrast, NK cluster B has a

varying gene complement, having undergone lineage-specific gene losses and more

rearrangements, making it more degenerate and less conserved between species. This

second cluster is, however, often linked to other ancestral NK cluster genes *Hhex, Noto,*
Emx1-B, Emx2-B, NK5-B, and *NK1,* which has undergone a tandem duplication, and to
NK6-B and *Msx2-B* in all spiders (Figure 4). *NK6-A* is found linked to *Msx2-A* in all the
entelegyne species, suggesting this two-gene *NK6-Msx2* cluster predates the WGD and
was retained in duplicate some species, while others have lost either *Msx2-A* or *NK6-A.*

Figure 4: Two ohnologous NK clusters are retained, and a disintegrated NK2 cluster is found in spiders. Genes are represented by coloured boxes; chromosomes are black lines. Gene orientation is indicated by arrows above or below genes, and distances are indicated by slashes between genes. Gene families are denoted by colour and a one- or two-letter code. The genes making up the spider core NK cluster are delineated by grey boxes. Species abbreviations are as in Table 2.

The NK2 cluster has largely broken down in spiders, with successive gene losses, first

Hlx from chelicerates, and then *Msxlx* from entelegynes, though further lineage

sampling may change this pattern (Figure 4). In all spiders, *NK2.2* is retained in

duplicate on two separate chromosomes, indicating an ohnologous relationship, while

NK2.1 has returned to the single copy (Figure 4). *NK2.1* and *NK2.2* are unlinked in all

spiders, except for *D. plantarius*, indicating the two genes have separated twice.

Alternatively, different ohnologues could have been lost in different lineages. If the

ancestral linkage between *NK2.1* and *NK2.2* was intact following the WGD, either one

ohnologue was lost from each of the NK2 chromosomes, resulting in unlinked genes, or

both were lost from one of the ohnologous chromosomes and a rearrangement

separated the *NK2.1* and *NK2.2*. Either scenario would have to occur multiple times in

the lineages leading to *D. silvatica* and the Araneoidea, but not in *D. plantarius*, unless

the linkage between *NK2.1* and *NK2.2* in *D. plantarius* occurred secondarily.

Phylogenetics were not able to determine which ohnologue of *NK2.1* was retained in

different species because no genome here contains both ohnologues.

The HRO cluster

The PRD-class HRO cluster was so named because the order of the genes in the fly

genome is *hbn* (*Hbn*), *Rx* (*Rax*), then *otp* (*Otp*); this gene order is conserved in insects

and the tick genome, indicating it is likely the ancestral arthropod arrangement (Figure

5). In spiders, the HRO cluster is found intact, but reordered: *Rax*, *Hbn*, then *Otp*

(Figure 5). There have also been several inversions of the orientations of the genes

within the cluster, but the R-H-O order is conserved across spiders, suggesting this

rearrangement occurred once ancestrally. It likely did not predate the WGD but

occurred in a spider ancestor because the scorpion HRO cluster A order is *Hbn*, *Rax*,

then *Otp*, as in insects and the tick (Table S1). Also consistently found linked to the

HRO cluster is the LIM-class gene *Isl* (Figure 5). Ferrier (2016) suggested this pattern is

evidence for the ancestral linkage between the LIM-class and PRD-class progenitor

genes in the ancestral Giga-cluster as it has been observed across species with a

common ancestor in the ancestor of all animals (see Introduction). The consistent

linkage pattern between these genes in spiders, the tick, and beetle genomes supports

this association. This broad phylogenetic distribution makes this between-class linkage

unlikely to be a convergent secondary association; rather it is more likely to be a

conserved ancestral trait.

The Irx cluster

Irx genes have duplicated independently many times, giving rise to six genes in spiders.

Each of the ohnologous Irx

clusters contains one of each

gene type, *Irx1*, *Irx2*, and

Irx3, though *Irx2-B* has been

lost from one of the clusters

in the entelegynes (Figure 5).

Consistent with the findings

of Kerner et al. (2009), insect

Irx genes fall into two clades,

one containing orthologues of

D. melanogaster mirr and the

other with orthologues of *ara*

and *caup* (Figure S1). Spider

and scorpion *Irx2-A* and *Irx2-*

B group with *mirr*, while

spider and scorpion *Irx1-A*

and *Irx1-B* group with *ara* and

caup (Figure S1). The exact

relationships between *Irx3*

and other arthropod genes

remains somewhat unclear.

There are three *Irx* genes in

the centipede *S. maritima* and

the millipede *Trigoniulus*

corallinus genomes (Chipman

Figure 5: Two ohnologous HRO clusters, one of which is linked to one of the two ohnologous *Irx* clusters, and two ohnologous SINE clusters are retained in spiders. Genes are represented by coloured boxes; chromosomes are black lines. Gene orientation is indicated by arrows above or below genes, and distances are indicated by slashes between genes. Gene families are denoted by colour and a one- or two-letter code. Species abbreviations are as in Table 2.

et al. 2014; So et al. 2022), one of which is not contained within either the *Irx1/ara/caup*

or *Irx2/mirr* clade, and groups sister to the *Irx3* clade, albeit with very low bootstrap

support (Figure S1). The potential *Irx3* is clustered with *Irx1* and *Irx2* in the *S. maritima*

genome in the same relative position as spider *Irx3* (Figures S3 C and 5). There is a

clear orthologue of each of the three arachnopulmonate *Irx* gene families in both the

harvestman and tick genomes, indicating the three gene types originated in or before

the chelicerate ancestor, and possibly *Irx3* genes were lost from an insect ancestor after

the divergence of Myriapoda. According to Kerner et al. (2009), *Irx* genes duplicated

independently in spiralians, ecdysozoans, and deuterostomes, suggesting that all

paralogues arose from a single ancestral bilaterian *Irx* gene. From our phylogeny

(Figure S1), we can tentatively infer that the duplication that gave rise to fly paralogues

is ancestral to the arthropods, and that there was a three-gene cluster in the ancestral

chelicerate that further duplicated in the arachnopulmonate WGD resulting in spider *Irx*

paralogues in two ohnologous clusters.

In spiders the HRO+*Isl* cluster is also linked to one of the two ohnologous *Irx* clusters

(Figure 5). Since this association occurs only to *Irx-A*, while the *Irx-B* is consistently not

linked to the second *Rax* paralogue (Figure 5, Figure S3 E-L), a likely explanation is that

one *Irx* cluster translocated to be linked to HRO+*Isl* following the WGD. We infer it

occurred secondarily, i.e., only on one ancestral arachnopulmonate chromosome, rather

than deeper in animal ancestry because of the consistent lack of linkage between

HRO+*Isl* with *Irx* genes in any other species examined here, in contrast to the linkage

between HRO and *Isl* found across bilaterians.

Conserved macrosynteny of spider genomes

To contextualise our observations of homeobox cluster conservation and

rearrangements, we explored macrosynteny across spider chromosomes, using *H.*

graminicola as the reference (Figure 6). Across entelegynes, we detected clear patterns

of orthology between chromosomes, and consistency in the synteny blocks in which

certain homeobox clusters are found, but these patterns were not as evident when

Figure 6 – Conserved macrosynteny of spider chromosomes and associated location of homeobox gene clusters. Vertical bars show stacks of genes on each chromosome representing a macrosynteny block, with *H. graminicola* as the reference genome. Chromosomes of other species were ordered to show the orthologous relationships to *H. graminicola*. Chromosome numbers are denoted below, with 'X' indicating sex chromosomes. Locations of HOX, NK, IRX, SINE and HRO clusters are shown with black arrows, along with the assignment for cluster A (red) versus cluster B (blue). The grey triangle in *T. antipodiana* indicates the partial translocation of Hox cluster A.

compared to the sole

synspermiatan

representative *D.*

silvatica (Figure 6).

Depictions of locations of

all homeobox genes

across genomes can be

found in Figure S3.

In each araneid analysed

here, there are 13

chromosomes, however

there are only 12 in *P.*

tepidariorum and 14 in *L.*

elegans (Figure 6). In *P.*

tepidariorum, the

synteny block

corresponding to

chromosome 2 in *H. graminicola* appears to have been mostly lost or distributed

throughout the genome, although Irx cluster B which belongs to this block has been

relocated (Figure 6). In *L. elegans* there appear to have been large fission and fusion

events on chromosomes 2, 4, 5, 6,8, 11, and 13. Such events in *L. elegans* are

consistent with Hox cluster A and SINE cluster A being found on separate

chromosomes, as well as the rearrangement of Irx cluster B (Figures 6 and S3 G).

Sex chromosomes have been identified in multiple spider species (Sheffer et al. 2021;

Zhu et al. 2022; Miller et al. 2023), which are denoted with an 'X' in Figure 6.

Interestingly, Hox cluster B and NK cluster B are both found on the same sex

chromosome in *H. graminicola* (12) and *D. silvatica* (X), but on separate sex

chromosomes in other entelegynes, whereas Hox cluster A is located on an autosome

(Figure 6). Across entelegynes, NK cluster A is found in the same conserved synteny

block corresponding to a full chromosome in all species except for *T. antipodiana*. In

this species, a small rearrangement brought NK cluster A onto another chromosome,

and this is the only entelegyne species in which the NK cluster A is rearranged (Figure

4). Overall, this analysis illustrates the conservation of macrosynteny blocks and

chromosomes across entelegyne genomes and shows several chromosomal

rearrangements affecting homeobox gene clusters.

Analysis of selection on NK cluster genes

We next sought to determine whether single copy orthologues, ancient tandem

paralogues, or WGD ohnologues of NK cluster genes are under different selective

pressures. To do this we compared the aBSREL estimated ω values across

phylogenies for seven families with different inferred duplication histories: *Msx*, *NK4*,

NK3, *Tlx*, *Lbx*, *NK7*, and *Emx* (aBSREL output JSON files available on Github).

While none of the focal ohnologues were found to be under positive selection, certain

genes from the pre-duplicate outgroups were (Supplementary material on GitHub

repository, see Materials and Methods). *NK7* was found to be under positive selection in

D. melanogaster and *I. scapularis*, *Tlx* also in *I. scapularis*, and *NK3* in *T. castaneum*.

Popi	Ptep		S	N	dS	dN	dN/dS	
NK4	NK4	1 to 1	184.1	574.9	7.8104	0.5245	0.0673	
NK3	NK3	1 to 1	137.5	387.5	5.2370	0.3058	0.0584	
Tlx	Tlx-B	1 to 2	209.7	591.3	48.8193	0.2948	0.0060	
	Tlx-A	1 to 2	291.1	761.9	42.6118	0.3399	0.0094	
	Tlx-A x Tlx-B	O	203.9	603.1	50.8092	0.2147	0.0042	
Lbx	Lbx-B	1 to 2	136.5	433.5	4.8815	0.2053	0.0421	
	Lbx-A	1 to 2	201.8	635.2	7.6580	0.2289	0.0299	
	Lbx-A x Lbx-B	O	137.4	489.6	33.8338	0.2574	0.0076	
NK7	NK7-B	1 to 2	223.8	739.2	12.2032	0.7833	0.0642	
	NK7-A	1 to 2	307.5	835.5	25.5859	1.1008	0.0430	
	NK7-A x NK7-B	O	286.8	1012	12.8423	0.7380	0.0575	
Msx1	Msx1-B	1 to 1	211.1	595.9	48.2788	0.5018	0.0104	
Msx2	Msx2-A	1 to 2	187.8	487.2	45.3891	0.5191	0.0011	
	Msx2-B	1 to 2	156.9	398.1	44.7737	0.4745	0.0106	
	Msx2-A x Msx2-B	O	145.2	457.8	53.1546	0.2699	0.0051	
	Msx1-B x Msx2-B	T	135.8	461.2	4.4066	0.3723	0.0845	
Emx1	Emx1-A	1 to 2	204.7	653.3	41.5860	0.5123	0.0123	
	Emx1-B	1 to 2	184.5	613.5	53.9284	0.6923	0.0128	
Emx2	Emx2-A	1 to 2	207.8	650.2	51.7318	0.6215	0.0120	
	Emx2-B	1 to 2	249.6	686.4	47.5150	0.4485	0.0094	
	Emx1-A x Emx1-B	O	176.6	636.4	5.3808	0.7658	0.1423	
	Emx2-A x Emx2-B	O	190.4	670.6	56.4343	0.6652	0.0118	
	Emx1-A x Emx2-A	T	196.9	673.1	28.1173	0.5279	0.0188	
	Emx1-B x Emx2-B	T	149.2	621.8	63.8842	0.7941	0.0124	

However, certain ohnologues did have longer branches separating them from other

ohnologues or the single copy outgroup genes in the aBSREL-generated phylogenies,

indicating a higher substitution rate. These include *Msx1* in arachnopulmonates and the

harvestman, *NK3-A* in the entelegynes, and *Lbx-B* in the scorpion. No consistent

pattern was detected between A versus B ohnologues, despite the A cluster being more

highly conserved in organisation, nor was there a clear pattern between ohnologues

versus tandem duplicates. In the one-to-one comparisons between *P. tepidariorum* and

P. opilio genes, and between *P. tepidariorum* ohnologues, the dN/dS ratio varied from

0.0011 (between *P. opilio Msx2* and *P. tepidariorum Msx2-A*) to 0.1423 (between *P.*

tepidariorum Emx1-A and *Emx1-B*) (Table 3). There are some patterns among gene

families, with low dN/dS ratios for *Tlx* ohnologues compared to a consistently higher

rate for *NK7* ohnologues. The *Emx1* and *Emx2* and *Msx1* and *Msx2* ohnologues had

consistently low dN/dS values when compared to their *P. opilio* orthologues but varied

when compared between ohnologues in *P. tepidariorum*. Overall, these low dN/dS

ratios likely reflect the highly conserved nature of homeobox genes.

Developmental expression of NK cluster genes in P. tepidariorum

It was previously shown that several ohnologues of spider homeobox genes had been

subject to sub- and/or neofunctionalisation with respect to their single copy orthologues

in the harvestman (Leite et al. 2018). To better understand the roles of homeobox

genes better following WGD in the arachnopulmonate ancestor we assayed the

expression of NK cluster genes in *P. tepidariorum* in comparison to *P. opilio*.

Single-copy genes

Both *NK3* and *NK4* were found in single copies in both *P. opilio* and *P. tepidariorum*,

indicating the loss of an ohnologue of each from the spider following the WGD. The

single identified orthologue of *NK3* in the spider is strongly expressed in the developing

heart and is weakly expressed around the stomodaeum and in the head (Figure 7 A-E).

This is very similar to the single spider orthologue of *NK4*, which is also expressed

strongly in the heart (Figure 7 F-J). Unlike *NK3*, *NK4* is also expressed in a dot-like

fashion in the ventral nervous system of the opisthosoma, and at the anterior rim of the

head lobes (Figure 7 asterisks and double arrowheads in Figure 7 F-I). There is no *NK3*

expression in the developing heart of the harvestman; instead *NK3* is expressed in a

segmental fashion ventral to the base of the appendages and in similar short transverse

segmental stripes in the opisthosomal segments (Figure 7 K-N). The expression of

harvestman *NK3* is thus more like the expression of its orthologue in *D. melanogaster*

(Azpiazu and Frasch 1993) and the millipede *Glomeris marginata* (Figure S4) than that

of the spider. Detectable expression of *NK4* in the harvestman is restricted to the

developing dorsal vessel at late developmental stages (Figure 7 O-P), a pattern that is

conserved among panarthropods (Azpiazu and Frasch 1993; Janssen and Damen

2008; Treffkorn et al. 2018).

Figure 7 – Expression of *P. tepidariorum* and *P. opilio NK3* and *NK4*. In all panels, anterior is to the left. Panels A-C, F, G, I, K, M, and N show ventral views. Panels D and H show anterior-dorsal views. Panels E, and J show dorsal views. Panels L and O show lateral views and dorsal up. Panel P shows a posterior-dorsal view. Embryos in panels A, F and K are flat-mounted. Panel B shows a magnification of the posterior region of a flat-mounted embryo. Panels A´-L´, O´ and P´ show SYBR green stained embryos as shown in panels A-L, O and P. Developmental stages of *P. tepidariorum* (after Mittmann and Wolff (2012)) and *P. opilio* (after Gainett et al. (2022)) are indicated in the upper right corner of each panel with a bright field photograph. Arrows in panels A, C-J, O and P mark expression of *NK3* and *NK4* in the developing heart of *P. tepidariorum*, and expression of *NK4* in the developing heart of *P. opilio*. The arrowhead in panel A points to expression in the labrum. The asterisk in panels A and D mark expression in the head. In panel B, expression in the mesoderm is marked (note absence of expression in the overlying ectoderm). Double arrowheads in panels F, G and I point to dot-like expression of *NK4* in the opisthosoma of the spider. Asterisks in panels F and H mark stripes of expression in the anterior of the head. Asterisks in panels K and L mark two domains of *NK3* expression in the head of the harvestman. Arrows in panels K-M mark short segmental stripes of *NK3* expression. The arrowhead in panel N marks expression in the labrum at late developmental stages. Abbreviations: ch, chelicera; ect, ectoderm; hl, head lobe; L1-L4, first to fourth walking leg; lr, labrum; mes, mesoderm; O, opisthosomal segment; pp, pedipalp; s, stomodaeum.

Ancient tandem paralogues

Both *Emx* and *Msx* families appear to have undergone an ancient tandem duplication,

resulting in two paralogues of each gene in the harvestman genome, with four *Emx* and

three *Msx* paralogues retained in *P. tepidariorum*. Leite et al. (2018) described *Emx1-A*

and *Emx2-A* (previously designated *Emx4* and *Emx3*, respectively) expression in the

precheliceral region and in patches in each segment along the ventral midline, and

Emx1-B and *Emx2-B* expression (designated *Emx2* and *Emx1*, respectively by Leite et

al. (2018)) in the anterior of each opisthosomal segment, with *Emx1-B* also expressed

at the base of the prosomal appendages. *P. opilio Emx2* (previously designated *Emx*)

was detected at the base of the appendages and in patches along the ventral midline in

stage 10-11 embryos (Leite et al. 2018).

Very similar to its paralogue *Emx2*, *P. opilio Emx1* is expressed in all posterior

segments including the cheliceral segment (Figure 8). The sharp anterior border of

expression is conserved among other arthropods, including spiders (Walldorf and

Gehring 1992; Simonnet et al. 2006; Schinko et al. 2008; Birkan et al. 2011; Janssen

2017; Leite et al. 2018) and an onychophoran (Janssen 2017). Indeed, the overall

expression pattern of *P. opilio Emx1* is identical with that of the previously reported

Emx2, with the exception that expression of *Emx1* starts earlier than that of *Emx2*.

Figure 8 – Expression of *P. opilio Emx1* and *Msx2*. In panels A-E, anterior is to the left and ventral views (except panel C, lateral view and dorsal up). Panels F and G each show dissected head lobes + chelicerae, a walking leg and a pedipalp. The dissected heads are shown with anterior up, ventral views. The dissected legs and pedipalps present lateral views, dorsal to the right. Panels A´-E´ show SYBR green stained embryos as shown in panels A-E. Developmental stages after Gainett et al. (2022) are indicated in the upper right corner of each panel with a bright field photograph. Arrowheads in panels A and B mark the sharp anterior border of *Emx1* expression anterior to the cheliceral segment. The arrows in panels A and C mark sharp distal border of expression in the appendages. Asterisks in panel D mark expression in the ventral nervous system, ventral to the base of the appendages. Double arrowheads in panels A, C and E mark expression in the opisthosoma. Arrows in panels F and G point to expression at the base of the appendages. Arrowheads in panels F and G point to dot-like expression in the chelicerae. Asterisks in panels F and G mark a ring-like expression in the legs. Abbreviations: ch, chelicera; hl, head lobe; L1-L4, first to fourth walking leg; lr, labrum; pp, pedipalp.

According to Leite et al. (2018), *P. tepidariorum Msx1-B* (previously designated *Msx3*) is

expressed in the base of the prosomal appendages at stage 11, while *Msx2-B*

(previously designated *Msx2*) is expressed in the chelicerae at stage 12, and *Msx2-A*

(previously designated *Msx1*) is expressed in each segment along the ventral midline in

stages 8 and 10. In *P. opilio*, *Msx1* (previously designated *Msx*) was detected in a stripe

in each segment at stage 7 and along the ventral midline in each segment at stage 13

(Leite et al. 2018). However, we detected *P. opilio Msx2* expression only at late

developmental stages and in a very restricted dot-like patch at the base of the

appendages, and a ring-like domain in the legs (Figure 8 F-G). Thus, *P. tepidariorum*

Msx2-A expression is similar to *P. opilio Msx1* in the segments and along the ventral

midline, while *Msx1-B* is similar to *P. opilio Msx2*, expressed in the base of appendages.

P. opilio Msx2 expression was also detected in a small region of the chelicerae,

matching the expression of *Msx2-B* observed by Leite et al. (2018) in stage 12 *P.*

tepidariorum. This means that the inferred neofunctionalisation is more likely a case of

subfunctionalisation between the tandem *Msx* paralogues, which was not detected

previously due to the absence of *Msx2* in the transcriptome-based survey.

Ohnologues

Three other NK families, *NK7*, *Tlx*, and *Lbx*, are found in the single copy in *P. opilio* and

have two retained ohnologues in *P. tepidariorum* (Figure 4). The two ohnologues of *P.*

tepidariorum Tlx are both expressed in the distal region of the legs, but in

complementary patterns (Figure 9 A-M). *Tlx-A* is first expressed in the complete distal

region of the appendages and restricts into two rings of stronger expression around

stage 10 (Figure 9 G-H). *Tlx-B* expression only begins after this point and is strongest in

the region between the two rings of *Tlx-A* expression (Figure 9 M). Apart from its

expression in the developing appendages, *Tlx-A* is also expressed in the dorsal tissue

of the opisthosoma in a pattern that suggests a role in heart development (Figure 9 B,

D-E), and at later stages, in the ventral opisthosoma (Figure 9 F). In contrast, *Tlx-B* is

only expressed in the opisthosoma at the very posterior at late developmental stages,

after segment addition is complete (Figure 9 J). Unlike *Tlx-A*, *Tlx-B* is expressed in the

form of a transverse stripe in the developing head lobe at late developmental stages

 (double arrowheads in Figure 9 K). This is at the anterior edge of non-neurogenic

715 ectoderm that overgrows the neurogenic ectoderm of the head lobe from the anterior.

Figure 9 – Expression of *P. tepidariorum* and *P. opilio Tlx*, *Lbx* and *NK7* ohnologues. In all panels showing whole embryos, anterior is to the left. Dissected heads in panels m, n, and q, are anterior up. Dissected appendages are shown by lateral views, dorsal to the right. Panels A, E, T, V, and g show lateral views and dorsal up. Panels B, C, D, F, I, J, N, O, U, W, Y, b, c, d, h, and i show ventral views. Panels K and P show anterior views. Panel Q shows a posterior view. Panel X shows a dorsal view. The embryo in panel I is flat-mounted. Panels A´-F, I-K´, N´, O´, T´-Y´, b´-d´, and g´-i´ show SYBR green stained embryos as shown in panels with corresponding bright field panels. Developmental stages of *P. tepidariorum* (after Mittmann and Wolff (2012)) and *P.opilio* (after Gainett et al. (2022) are indicated in the upper right corner of each panel with a bright field photograph. Arrowheads in panels B, D, and E mark dorsal expression in the opisthosoma. The asterisks in panels C and E mark expression in the labrum. The arrows in panels E and F mark expression in the posterior spinneret, and the double arrowhead marks ventral expression in the opisthosoma. Asterisks in panels G and H mark two stripes of stronger expression within the distal region of *Tlx-A* expression in the legs. The asterisk in panel J marks expression of *Tlx-B* in the very posterior of the embryo. The double arrowhead in panel K marks a transverse stripe of expression in the head. The arrows in panels N and O mark expression of *Tlx* in the labrum of the harvestman. The arrow in panel U points to expression in the mesoderm of the leg. Arrowheads in panels V-Y point to dorsal expression in the opisthosoma and double arrowheads point to expression ventral to the base of the opisthosomal appendages. The asterisks in panels g-i mark expression in the very posterior of the embryos. The arrows in panels l, m, and q point to expression in the labrum. Asterisks and arrowheads in panels m and q mark expression of *NK7* in the head of the spider and the harvestman. Asterisks in panels o, p, r, and s mark expression in the appendages. Abbreviations: ch, chelicera; L1-L4, first to fourth walking leg; mes, mesoderm; pp, pedipalp; saz, segment addition zone.

The single *Tlx* gene of the harvestman shares many aspects with one or both spider

ohnologues. *P. opilio Tlx* is expressed in the distal half of the developing appendages

(Figure 9 R-S), reflecting the combined expression of both spider *Tlx* ohnologues

(Figure 9 G-H, L-M). Like *P. tepidariorum Tlx-A*, *P. opilio Tlx* is expressed in dorsal

tissue of the opisthosoma and in the labrum (Figure 9 N-O), and like *P. tepidariorum*

Tlx-B, *P. opilio Tlx* is expressed at the anterior edges of the head lobes (Figure 9 Q).

The single *P. opilio Tlx* gene thus combines aspects of expression that are either found

in *P. tepidariorum Tlx-A* or *Tlx-B*, suggesting a case of subfunctionalisation in the

spider.

The first expression of *P. tepidariorum Lbx-A* appears in the mesoderm of the

outgrowing prosomal limb buds (Figure 9 T-U). Later, expression in the appendages is

also in the ventral ectoderm, but the dorsal ectoderm remains free of expression (Figure

9 W-Y). Additional expression of *Lbx-A* is found in the dorsal ectoderm of the

opisthosoma and in the form of segmental patches in the opisthosoma (Figure 9 V-Y).

This latter expression is possibly associated with the ventral-most tissue of the

opisthosomal limb buds. Compared to *Lbx-A*, expression of *P. tepidariorum Lbx-B*

appears later and is restricted to the prosomal appendages (Figure 9 b-d). The pattern

of expression in these appendages is similar, but not identical, to that of *Lbx-A* (Figure 9

e-f). *Lbx-B* is expressed in fewer ventral cells of the developing appendages than *Lbx-A*.

Expression of the single *P. opilio Lbx* gene is similar to that of *P. tepidariorum Lbx-A*. It

appears early during development in the mesoderm of the prosomal appendages

(Figure 9 g-h), and later extends into ventral ectodermal cells of the limbs (Figure 9 j-k).

Unlike the two *P. tepidariorum Lbx* ohnologues, *P. opilio Lbx* is also expressed at the

posterior of the developing embryo (asterisks in Figure 9 h-i).

Expression of both ohnologues of *P. tepidariorum NK7* are restricted to relatively late

stages of embryogenesis. *NK7-A* is exclusively expressed in the stomodaeum and in a

few patches in the head lobes (Figure 9 l-m). *NK7-B* is expressed in the form of three

rings in the developing walking legs (Figure 9 n-p). The expression of *P. opilio NK7*

combines the expression of both spider *NK7* genes as it is expressed in the head lobes

and in three ventral domains in the legs (Figure 9 q-s).

DISCUSSION

Evolution of the repertoire and organisation of spider homeobox genes before and after the WGD

We characterised the homeobox gene complement of eight recently released chromosomal-level assembly spider genomes and compared their genomic positions to detect conserved clustering and evidence for ancestral linkage. Leite et al. (2018) previously discovered that up to 59% spider homeobox families were duplicated in arachnopulmonates compared to non-arachnopulmonates and that most of these were dispersed duplicates rather than closely linked tandem duplicates. However, the fragmented nature of the genomes available at the time meant that whether these were ohnologues or tandem duplicates could not be determined. Here with synteny analysis across eight chromosome-level spider genome assemblies we showed that most duplicated homeobox genes are likely ohnologues retained after WGD, e.g., 44 out of 91 families in *P. tepidariorum*, and the vast majority have been retained in all spiders surveyed (Table 2). We detected far fewer gene families (up to 9) with homeobox paralogues from ancient tandem duplications and more recent lineage specific tandem duplicates (up to 23 families in *H. graminicola* but fewer in other spiders) (Table 2). WGD has therefore had a massive impact on the homeobox gene repertoire in spiders.

We also examined the impact of the arachnopulmonate WGD on clusters of homeobox genes. In addition to the two Hox clusters in spiders and scorpions that have been described before, as well as some evidence for the duplication of other homeobox clusters in *P. tepidariorum* (Leite et al. 2018), we found two ohnologous NK, Irx, and SINE clusters, but only one intact HRO cluster and degenerate ParaHox and NK2 clusters (Figure 3-6 and S3). For those that were largely retained in duplicate, we noticed an asymmetry in the level of organisation between the clusters. While one ohnologous cluster was more conserved across spiders in gene content, orientation, and order, the other was more disorganised, having undergone rearrangements, gene losses, and duplications. We observed this pattern across the two Hox NK, Irx, and SINE clusters (Figures 3-6). This pattern was associated with chromosomal

organisation. Hox-B and NK-B clusters on the sex chromosomes were less degenerated

than those on the autosomes, though in different ways. Hox-B was retained intact, while

NK-B was more rearranged but exhibited larger-scale patterns of conserved linkage.

Given the X_1X_2 male and $X_1X_1X_2X_2$ female sex determination in entelegynes, differential

rates of purifying selection on sex chromosomes versus autosomes may have a role in

maintaining the synteny of these chromosomes, thus affecting the homeobox clusters

on them (Kořínková and Král 2013; Charlesworth 2017; Cordellier et al. 2020).

Subfunctionalisation has already been described for the Hox genes in *P. tepidariorum*,

with differences observed between paralogues in the timing of their activation and their

spatial expression domains (Schwager et al. 2007; Schwager et al. 2017; Turetzek et al.

2022). While spatial collinearity is exhibited by both Hox clusters, temporal collinearity is

maintained more for cluster A (Schwager et al. 2017; Turetzek et al. 2022), though this

cluster has lost *ftz* and *Hox3* in many species (Figure 3). Previously, it has been

hypothesised that cluster integrity is essential for the mechanism of temporal

collinearity, whereas spatial collinearity is controlled at the gene level (Duboule 2007;

Krumlauf 2018; Ferrier 2019). Here, we find the opposite; the cluster that exhibits a

stricter pattern of temporal collinearity is apparently more organised.

In different lineages within Drosophilidae, NK cluster genes have undergone an

interesting series of rearrangements, fragmenting and then reuniting (Chan et al. 2015).

While the NK genes in different drosophilid species are found in different orders, certain

gene pairs or triplets are consistently clustered and move as units: *slou* (NK1) with *Hmx*

(NK5), *lbe* (Lbx) and *lbl* (Lbx) with *C15* (Tlx), and *tin* (NK4) with *bap* (NK3). In spiders,

we found a core NK cluster made up of *Msx1*, *NK4*, *NK3*, *Tlx*, *Lbx* and *NK7*, largely

conserved in this gene order and complement and retained in duplicate (Figure 4).

While the NK cluster B has undergone more rearrangements and lost certain genes,

Lbx-B and *Tlx-B* are still adjacent in all eight spider genomes. NK cluster B is also linked

to a conserved three-gene cluster of *NK5* and two recent tandem *NK1* paralogues, and

sometimes to *NK6-B* and *Msx2-B*, which are ohnologous to the cluster of *NK6-A* and

Msx2-A seen across the entelegynes (Figure 4).

Some sub-cluster gene organisation patterns seen in spiders are similar to those seen

across other arthropods. In spiders, *NK3* and *NK4* are adjacent, as in *D. melanogaster*,

T. castaneum, *Bombyx terrestris*, many butterflies, and *Anopheles gambiae*, and *Tlx*

and *Lbx* are adjacent, as in *D. melanogaster*, *T. castaneum*, several butterflies, *A.*

gambiae and *I. scapularis* (Figure 4) (Luke et al. 2003; Chan et al. 2015; Mulhair et al.

2022). Though *NK1* has undergone a recent tandem duplication in spiders, *NK5* and

NK1 are also adjacent in *T. castaneum*, *B. terrestris*, *A. gambiae*, and *I. scapularis*, but

not *D. melanogaster* or butterflies (Figure 4) (Chan et al. 2015; Mulhair et al. 2022).

These NK sub-clusters are even conserved across to other bilaterians (Luke et al. 2003;

Larroux et al. 2007; Wotton et al. 2009; Hui et al. 2012; Mulhair et al. 2022). *NK3* and

NK4 are clustered, as are *Lbx* and *Tlx* in the annelid *Platynereis dumerilii* and the

invertebrate chordate amphioxus (*Branchiostoma floridae*) (Hui et al. 2012), while in

human, one *NK4* ohnologue clusters with *Tlx* and *Lbx* ohnologues on chromosome 10

(Luke et al. 2003; Wotton et al. 2009). In contrast, the NK sub-clusters of tardigrades

consist of different subgroups: *Msx* with *NK3*, *NK1* with *Lbx*, and *NK4* with *NK6* and *Tlx*,

while *NK5* is alone (*NK7* was not shown) (Treffkorn et al. 2018), which most likely is a

result of rearrangements in this lineage, but could also arise from convergent

rearrangements in arthropods, annelids, and chordates. Overall, these patterns suggest

that while the entire NK cluster has undergone many rearrangements in different animal

lineages, these events have repeatedly occurred between these sub-clusters, and far

less often within them, indicating a conserved functional constraint on these gene pairs

and triplets.

Conserved and subfunctionalised expression of NK cluster genes

NK cluster genes are broadly involved in similar processes patterning the mesoderm

(Jagla et al. 2001; Saudemont et al. 2008; Treffkorn et al. 2018). Here, NK cluster

genes were expressed during development in the mesoderm of segments, in the

developing heart, along the limbs, and in the head (Figure 7-9). Interestingly, we

observed similar expression patterns between NK cluster genes that make up

conserved NK sub-clusters. In *P. tepidariorum*, *NK3* and *NK4* were both expressed in

the developing heart and the head (Figure 7), while *Tlx* and *Lbx* were both primarily

expressed in the legs in both *P. tepidariorum* and *P. opilio* (Figure 9). Perhaps these

similar functions are a result of shared cis-regulatory elements and the selective

constraint for their preservation has resulted in the conservation of these sub-clusters.

Future study is required to identify those regulatory elements and to determine whether

they are indeed responsible for similar developmental roles. It would also be of interest

to investigate whether these are shared with other bilaterians that exhibit similar NK

sub-clusters.

We previously found a few examples of neofunctionalisation among spider homeobox

gene paralogues, but subfunctionalisation appeared to be the more common fate

(Schwager et al. 2017; Leite et al. 2018), as is the case for other genes (Schomburg et

al. 2015; Janssen et al. 2021). This is consistent with our analysis of the spatial

expression patterns of NK cluster genes, with clear complementary expression between

the ohnologues of *Tlx*, *Lbx*, and *NK7* in *P. tepidariorum* that largely summed to the

expression of the single genes in *P. opilio*. For *Emx* and *Msx*, the newly found

paralogues in *P. opilio* contradict previous conclusions about the timing of duplication

and subfunctionalisation. Searching in the recently released *P. opilio* genome (Gainett

et al. 2021) allowed us to identify paralogues of *Emx* and *Msx* in this harvestman,

suggesting these families underwent ancient tandem duplications. In previous

transcriptome-based analyses the highly similar sequences for each *Emx* paralogue

were merged into a single transcript model, and only a partial sequence was found for

Msx1, split across two different transcript models (Sharma et al. 2012).

Each *P. tepidariorum Emx* ohnologue is expressed in overlapping subsets of the

expression observed for *P. opilio Emx* paralogues, though the pattern between single-

copy genes and their orthologues is not so clear: the expression of *Emx1-A* and *Emx1-*

B of the spider does not equal that of *Emx1* in the harvestman, nor does *Emx2-A* and

Emx2-B equal that of *Emx2.* Rather, expression of *Emx1-A* was more similar to that of

Emx2-A than to *Emx1-B* or *Emx2-B*, and likewise, expression patterns were similar

between the B ohnologues (Leite et al. 2018), despite the duplication giving rise to

Emx1 and *Emx2* now estimated to predate the WGD. The main observed difference in

Emx ohnologue expression patterns was temporal, which may be controlled by an
element shared by both tandem paralogues within a cluster, that only diverged following
the WGD. Furthermore, the two *Emx* paralogues in *P. opilio* were expressed in near-
identical patterns (Figure 8) (Leite et al. 2018), which suggests that while the tandem
duplication gave rise to two conserved paralogues, they seem to have redundantly
retained much of the ancestral expression pattern, and the spider *Emx* ohnologues only
diverged in function after the WGD.

For *Msx*, the newly described *P. opilio* gene exhibits a similar expression pattern to
Msx2-B, which now seems more likely to have subfunctionalised. This result stresses
the importance of a correct ancestral comparison to identify neofunctionalisation. The
other NK cluster genes that are missing from *P. tepidariorum*, *Msx1-A* and *NK4-B*,
would also be of interest in the context of subfunctionalisation. Furthermore, because of
shared ancient tandem duplications of *Emx* and *Msx* in spiders and the harvestman, the
ancestral function of the single-copy gene is not yet known but could be determined
from earlier-branching lineages of chelicerates or arachnids. Future investigations of NK
cluster ohnologues in other spiders, as well as comparisons to other arthropods
outgroups, may reveal further examples of sub- and/or neofunctionalisation.

No NK cluster ohnologues were found to be under positive selection in our analysis, yet
several of these genes exhibited clear patterns of subfunctionalisation. It has been
proposed that duplicated genes encoding developmental transcription factors like
homeobox genes are more likely to undergo regulatory subfunctionalisation, driven by
the complementary loss of cis-regulatory elements (Force et al. 1999; Jiménez-Delgado
et al. 2009; Espinosa-Cantú et al. 2015; Marlétaz et al. 2018). While other types of
paralogues may evolve by changes to coding sequence, the changes we observed
between *P. tepidariorum* NK ohnologues and single-copy orthologues from *P. opilio*
may primarily have occurred in the regulatory controls of these genes.

Our results suggest that there have been similar outcomes between the
arachnopulmonate WGD and the likely independent WGDs in horseshoe crabs (Nossa
et al. 2014; Kenny et al. 2016; Shingate et al. 2020; Nong et al. 2021). Not only were

many homeobox gene families expanded to four or more copies as a result of up to

three WGDs in horseshoe crabs, but there are also multiple homeobox clusters

conserved in duplicate, including up to six Hox clusters, six NK clusters, and seven

SINE clusters in *Limulus polyphemus* (Nong et al. 2021). Similar to the pattern seen in

spiders, some ohnologous clusters are more intact than others; for instance, two of the

six Hox clusters are intact and ordered, while the others have lost two, seven, and eight

genes in *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda* (Shingate et al. 2020). However, in the absence

of additional chromosome-level assemblies, the extent to which this applies to other

horseshoe crabs is not fully clear yet.

In comparison to vertebrate homeobox gene clusters, which were duplicated in the 2R

WGD, the ohnologous clusters of spiders are more conserved in terms of gene content.

Across the four human Hox clusters, complementary gene losses have occurred such

that no cluster contains all gene families, with between two and four gene losses per

cluster, but in spiders, one Hox cluster is intact while the other has lost two of the ten

genes (Figure 3). The four ohnologous human NK clusters are spread across five

chromosomes, and most genes are retained in two or three copies, and none in four

(Luke et al. 2003; Wotton et al. 2009). For the human HRO cluster, *Hbn* is not found in

chordates, and *Otp* is not linked to *Rax* or *Rax2* in the human genome (Mazza et al.

2010), but in spiders an HRO cluster is conserved and intact (Figure 5). For SINE

genes, however, the clusters have evolved similarly between vertebrates and spiders

following WGD. In spiders, one cluster is rearranged with a large distance separating

Six4/5 from a cluster of *Six1/2* and *Six3/6*, and ohnologues of *Six1/2* and *Six3/6* are

linked on another chromosome (Figure 5). In vertebrates, *Six4*, *Six1* and *Six6* are

linked, as are *Six2* and *Six3*, while *Six5* is on a third chromosome (Kawakami et al.

2000; Ferrier 2016b). In each of these lineages, all three genes are still linked on one

chromosome, while the ohnologous cluster(s) have undergone losses and

rearrangements. The pattern we see between most ohnologous spider homeobox gene

clusters, wherein one copy is retained intact while the other has degenerated, is similar

to the pattern for only some human homeobox clusters, and not the human Hox or NK

clusters.

Besides conserved clusters, some homeobox genes have returned to the single copy in
both humans and spiders or scorpions, namely *Hlx*, *Hhex*, *Mnx*, *Dmbx*, *Otp*, *Prop*, and
Mkx (Holland et al. 2007; Leite et al. 2018). Genes often found in the single copy in both
spiders and horseshoe crabs are *Bari*, *Barx*, *CG11294*, *Dmbx*, *Hhex*, *Meox*, *Mkx*, *Msxlx*,
and *NK4* (Nong et al. 2021). The fact that there are single copy genes in common
between arachnopulmonates and vertebrates or horseshoe crabs suggests that certain
genes may be constitutive singletons, and either they are disadvantageous in multiple
copies, or unable to subfunctionalise so redundant copies are lost to nonfunctionalising
mutations. However, these comparisons are only between three distantly related
species, and humans and horseshoe crabs have each undergone multiple WGDs, while
there was only one in arachnopulmonates. Wider sampling of WGD lineages may reveal
clearer patterns of genes that tend to return to the single copy, and functional and
genomic investigations may reveal the underlying reasons.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear from analyses of WGDs in arachnopulmonates, horseshoe crabs, and
vertebrates that homeobox genes are commonly retained in duplicate, as seems to be
the case for other regulatory genes (Cañestro et al. 2013; Berthelot et al. 2014; Leite et
al. 2016; Harper et al. 2021; Janssen et al. 2021). Recent advances in sequencing
technologies and reduction of costs, as well as endeavours like the Darwin Tree of Life
project (Blaxter et al. 2022) have generated a growing number of chromosome-level
genome assemblies for a more diverse array of species. These resources now provide
the opportunity to identify and compare the sets of retained ohnologues and consistently
single-copy genes to further explore the similarities and differences between the
consequences of WGDs in different animal lineages. In eight spiders, we find that the
majority of duplicated homeobox genes likely originated in the arachnopulmonate WGD
and that often, cluster or sub-cluster integrity is maintained in at least one ohnologous
copy. Across the eight genomes, we see varying levels of conserved macrosynteny, but
can identify genomic rearrangements affecting homeobox cluster synteny blocks.
Comparisons of expression patterns of selected homeobox genes support extensive
subfunctionalisation among spider ohnologues. Taken together, our results help us

understand the impact of WGD and tandem duplication on the evolution of homeobox

genes and genomes in spiders and provide an important comparison to WGD in other

animals.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

APM and LSR conceived of the project. MEAR annotated the homeobox genes,

conducted the phylogenetics and protein sequence analyses, and drafted the

manuscript. RJ characterised the developmental expression of NK genes. DJL

conducted the whole genome macrosynteny analysis. All authors contributed to writing

and approved the final version of the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Julio Rozas for early access to the *D. silvatica* genome. This

project was funded in by a NERC grant (NE/T006854/1) to APM and LSR.

REFERENCES

Aase-Remedios ME, Ferrier DEK. 2021. Improved Understanding of the Role of Gene
    and Genome Duplications in Chordate Evolution With New Genome and
    Transcriptome Sequences. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 9:429.
    https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.703163.
Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment
    search tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* 215:403–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-
    2836(05)80360-2.
Azpiazu N, Frasch M. 1993. tinman and bagpipe: two homeo box genes that determine
    cell fates in the dorsal mesoderm of Drosophila. *Genes Dev.* 7:1325–1340.
    https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.7.7b.1325.
Benson DA, Cavanaugh M, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Ostell J, Pruitt KD, Sayers EW.
    2018. GenBank. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 46:D41–D47.
    https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx1094.
Berthelot C, Brunet F, Chalopin D, Juanchich A, Bernard M, Noël B, Bento P, Da Silva
    C, Labadie K, Alberti A, et al. 2014. The rainbow trout genome provides novel
    insights into evolution after whole-genome duplication in vertebrates. *Nat.
    Commun.* 5:3657. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4657.
Birkan M, Schaeper ND, Chipman AD. 2011. Early patterning and blastodermal fate
    map of the head in the milkweed bug Oncopeltus fasciatus. *Evol. Dev.* 13:436–
    447. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2011.00497.x.
Blaxter M, Mieszkowska N, Di Palma F, Holland P, Durbin R, Richards T, Berriman M,
    Kersey P, Hollingsworth P, Wilson W, et al. 2022. Sequence locally, think

globally: The Darwin Tree of Life Project. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* [Internet] 119.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2115642118. Available from:
http://www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.2115642118/-
/DCSupplemental.
Brooke NM, Garcia-Fernàndez J, Holland PWH. 1998. The ParaHox gene cluster is an
evolutionary sister of the Hox gene cluster. *Nature* 392:920–922.
https://doi.org/10.1038/31933.
Bürglin TR. 2011. Homeodomain Subtypes and Functional Diversity. In: Hughes TR,
editor. A Handbook of Transcription Factors. Subcellular Biochemistry.
Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. p. 95–122. Available from:
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9069-0_5
Butts T, Holland PWH, Ferrier DEK. 2008. The Urbilaterian Super-Hox cluster. *Trends*
Genet. 24:259–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2007.09.006.
Butts T, Holland PWH, Ferrier DEK. 2010. Ancient homeobox gene loss and the
evolution of chordate brain and pharynx development: deductions from
amphioxus gene expression. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 277:3381–3389.
https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.0647.
Cañestro C, Albalat R, Irimia M, Garcia-Fernàndez J. 2013. Impact of gene gains,
losses and duplication modes on the origin and diversification of vertebrates.
Semin. Cell Dev. Biol. 24:83–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2012.12.008.
Cavodeassi F, Modolell J, Gómez-Skarmeta JL. 2001. The Iroquois family of genes:
from body building to neural patterning. *Development* 128:2847–2855.
https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.128.15.2847.
Chan C, Jayasekera S, Kao B, Páramo M, von Grotthuss M, Ranz JM. 2015.
Remodelling of a homeobox gene cluster by multiple independent gene reunions
in Drosophila. *Nat. Commun.* 6:6509. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7509.
Charlesworth D. 2017. Evolution of recombination rates between sex chromosomes.
Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 372:20160456.
https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0456.
Chipman AD, Ferrier DEK, Brena C, Qu J, Hughes DST, Schröder R, Torres-Oliva M,
Znassi N, Jiang H, Almeida FC, et al. 2014. The First Myriapod Genome
Sequence Reveals Conservative Arthropod Gene Content and Genome
Organisation in the Centipede Strigamia maritima.Tyler-Smith C, editor. *PLoS*
Biol. 12:e1002005. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002005.
Cordellier M, Schneider JM, Uhl G, Posnien N. 2020. Sex differences in spiders: from
phenotype to genomics. *Dev. Genes Evol.* 230:155–172.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-020-00657-6.
David R, Wedlich D. 2001. PCR-Based RNA Probes: A Quick and Sensitive Method to
Improve Whole Mount Embryo In Situ Hybridizations. *BioTechniques* 30:768–
774. https://doi.org/10.2144/01304st02.
De S, Kingan SB, Kitsou C, Portik DM, Foor SD, Frederick JC, Rana VS, Paulat NS,
Ray DA, Wang Y, et al. 2023. A high-quality Ixodes scapularis genome advances
tick science. *Nat. Genet.* 55:301–311. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01275-
w.
Duboule D. 2007. The rise and fall of Hox gene clusters. *Development* 134:2549–2560.
https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.001065.

Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: Multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high
throughput. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 32:1792–1797.
https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkh340.
Emms DM, Kelly S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for
comparative genomics. *Genome Biol.* 20:238. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-
019-1832-y.
Escuer P, Pisarenco VA, Fernández-Ruiz AA, Vizueta J, Sánchez-Herrero JF, Arnedo
MA, Sánchez-Gracia A, Rozas J. 2022. The chromosome-scale assembly of the
Canary Islands endemic spider Dysdera silvatica (Arachnida, Araneae) sheds
light on the origin and genome structure of chemoreceptor gene families in
chelicerates. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 22:375–390. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-
0998.13471.
Espinosa-Cantú A, Ascencio D, Barona-Gómez F, De Luna A. 2015. Gene duplication
and the evolution of moonlighting proteins. *Front. Genet.* 6:227.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2015.00227.
Fan Z, Yuan T, Liu P, Wang LY, Jin JF, Zhang F, Zhang ZS. 2021. A chromosome-level
genome of the spider Trichonephila antipodiana reveals the genetic basis of its
polyphagy and evidence of an ancient whole-genome duplication event.
GigaScience 10:1–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/GIGASCIENCE/GIAB016.
Ferrier DEK. 2016a. The origin of the Hox/ParaHox genes, the Ghost Locus hypothesis
and the complexity of the first animal. *Brief. Funct. Genomics* 15:333–341.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bfgp/elv056.
Ferrier DEK. 2016b. Evolution of Homeobox Gene Clusters in Animals: The Giga-
Cluster and Primary vs. Secondary Clustering. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 4:1–13.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2016.00036.
Ferrier DEK. 2019. Space and time in Hox/ParaHox gene cluster evolution. In: Fusco G,
editor. Perspectives on Evolutionary and Developmental Biology: Essays for
Alessandro Minelli. Padova: Padova University Press. p. 245–274.
Ferrier DEK, Minguillón C. 2003. Evolution of the Hox/ParaHox gene clusters. *Int. J.*
Dev. Biol. 47:605–611. https://doi.org/10.1387/ijdb.14756336.
FigTree. 2018. FigTree v1.4.4. Available from: http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/
Force A, Lynch M, Pickett FB, Amores A, Yan Y, Postlethwait J. 1999. Preservation of
Duplicate Genes by Complementary, Degenerate Mutations. *Genetics*
151:1531–1545.
Gainett G, Crawford AR, Klementz BC, So C, Baker CM, Setton EVW, Sharma PP.
2022. Eggs to long-legs: embryonic staging of the harvestman Phalangium opilio
(Opiliones), an emerging model arachnid. *Front. Zool.* 19:11.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-022-00454-z.
Gainett G, González VL, Ballesteros JA, Setton EVW, Baker CM, Barolo Gargiulo L,
Santibáñez-López CE, Coddington JA, Sharma PP. 2021. The genome of a
daddy-long-legs (Opiliones) illuminates the evolution of arachnid appendages.
Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 288:20211168. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.1168.
Gallardo ME, Lopez-Rios J, Fernaud-Espinosa I, Granadino B, Sanz R, Ramos C,
Ayuso C, Seller MJ, Brunner HG, Bovolenta P, et al. 1999. Genomic cloning and
characterization of the human homeobox gene SIX6 reveals a cluster of SIX
genes in chromosome 14 and associates SIX6 hemizygosity with bilateral

1079    anophthalmia and pituitary anomalies. *Genomics* 61:82–91.
1080    https://doi.org/10.1006/geno.1999.5916.
1081 Garcia-Fernàndez J. 2005. The genesis and evolution of homeobox gene clusters. *Nat.*
1082    *Rev. Genet.* 6:881–892. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1723.
1083 Goldman N, Yang Z. 1994. A codon-based model of nucleotide substitution for protein-
1084    coding DNA sequences. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 11:725–736.
1085    https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a040153.
1086 Harper A, Baudouin Gonzalez L, Schönauer A, Janssen R, Seiter M, Holzem M, Arif S,
1087    McGregor AP, Sumner-Rooney L. 2021. Widespread retention of ohnologs in key
1088    developmental gene families following whole-genome duplication in
1089    arachnopulmonates.Lott S, editor. *G3 GenesGenomesGenetics*
1090    11:2020.07.10.177725. https://doi.org/10.1093/g3journal/jkab299.
1091 Herndon N, Shelton J, Gerischer L, Ioannidis P, Ninova M, Dönitz J, Waterhouse RM,
1092    Liang C, Damm C, Siemanowski J, et al. 2020. Enhanced genome assembly and
1093    a new official gene set for Tribolium castaneum. *BMC Genomics* 21:47.
1094    https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-019-6394-6.
1095 Hoegg S, Meyer A. 2005. Hox clusters as models for vertebrate genome evolution.
1096    *Trends Genet.* 21:421–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2005.06.004.
1097 Holland LZ, Ocampo Daza D. 2018. A new look at an old question: when did the second
1098    whole genome duplication occur in vertebrate evolution? *Genome Biol.* 19:209.
1099    https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-018-1592-0.
1100 Holland PWH. 2013. Evolution of homeobox genes. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Dev. Biol.*
1101    2:31–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/wdev.78.
1102 Holland PWH. 2015. Did homeobox gene duplications contribute to the Cambrian
1103    explosion? *Zool. Lett.* 1:1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40851-014-0004-x.
1104 Holland PWH, Booth HAF, Bruford EA. 2007. Classification and nomenclature of all
1105    human homeobox genes. *BMC Biol.* 5:47. https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-5-
1106    47.
1107 Holland PWH, Garcia-Fernàndez J. 1996. HoxGenes and Chordate Evolution. *Dev.*
1108    *Biol.* 173:382–395. https://doi.org/10.1006/dbio.1996.0034.
1109 Holland PWH, Marlétaz F, Maeso I, Dunwell TL, Paps J. 2017. New genes from old:
1110    asymmetric divergence of gene duplicates and the evolution of development.
1111    *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 372:20150480.
1112    https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0480.
1113 Hu W, Jia A, Ma S, Zhang G, Wei Z, Lu F, Luo Y, Zhang Z, Sun J, Yang T, et al. 2022.
1114    Molecular atlas reveals the tri-sectional spinning mechanism of spider dragline
1115    silk. :2022.06.21.496984. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.21.496984. Available
1116    from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.06.21.496984v1
1117 Hui JH, Raible F, Korchagina N, Dray N, Samain S, Magdelenat G, Jubin C, Segurens
1118    B, Balavoine G, Arendt D, et al. 2009. Features of the ancestral bilaterian
1119    inferred from Platynereis dumerilii ParaHox genes. *BMC Biol.* 7:43.
1120    https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-7-43.
1121 Hui JHL, McDougall C, Monteiro AS, Holland PWH, Arendt D, Balavoine G, Ferrier
1122    DEK. 2012. Extensive Chordate and Annelid Macrosynteny Reveals Ancestral
1123    Homeobox Gene Organization. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 29:157–165.
1124    https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msr175.

Irimia M, Maeso I, Garcia-Fernàndez J. 2008. Convergent Evolution of Clustering of
Iroquois Homeobox Genes across Metazoans. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 25:1521–1525.
https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msn109.
Irimia M, Tena JJ, Alexis MS, Fernandez-Miñan A, Maeso I, Bogdanovic O, de la Calle-
Mustienes E, Roy SW, Gómez-Skarmeta JL, Fraser HB. 2012. Extensive
conservation of ancient microsynteny across metazoans due to cis-regulatory
constraints. *Genome Res.* 22:2356–2367. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.139725.112.
Jagla K, Bellard M, Frasch M. 2001. A cluster of Drosophila homeobox genes involved
in mesoderm differentiation programs. *BioEssays* 23:125–133.
https://doi.org/10.1002/1521-1878.
Janssen R. 2017. Comparative analysis of gene expression patterns in the arthropod
labrum and the onychophoran frontal appendages, and its implications for the
arthropod head problem. *EvoDevo* 8:1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-016-0064-
4.
Janssen R, Andersson E, Betnér E, Bijl S, Fowler W, Höök L, Leyhr J, Mannelqvist A,
Panara V, Smith K, et al. 2018. Embryonic expression patterns and phylogenetic
analysis of panarthropod sox genes: insight into nervous system development,
segmentation and gonadogenesis. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 18:88.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-018-1196-z.
Janssen R, Damen WGM. 2008. Diverged and conserved aspects of heart formation in
a spider. *Evol. Dev.* 10:155–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-
142X.2008.00223.x.
Janssen R, Pechmann M, Turetzek N. 2021. A chelicerate Wnt gene expression atlas:
novel insights into the complexity of arthropod Wnt-patterning. *EvoDevo* 12:12.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-021-00182-1.
Jiménez-Delgado S, Pascual-Anaya J, Garcia-Fernàndez J. 2009. Implications of
duplicated cis-regulatory elements in the evolution of metazoans: the DDI model
or how simplicity begets novelty. *Brief. Funct. Genomic. Proteomic.* 8:266–275.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bfgp/elp029.
Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, von Haeseler A, Jermiin LS. 2017.
ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat.*
Methods 14:587–589. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4285.
Kawakami K, Sato S, Ozaki H, Ikeda K. 2000. Six family genes-structure and function
as transcription factors and their roles in development. *BioEssays* 22:616–626.
https://doi.org/10.1002/1521-1878(200007)22:7<616::AID-BIES4>3.0.CO;2-R.
Kenny NJ, Chan KW, Nong W, Qu Z, Maeso I, Yip HY, Chan TF, Kwan HS, Holland
PWH, Chu KH, et al. 2016. Ancestral whole-genome duplication in the marine
chelicerate horseshoe crabs. *Heredity* 116:190–199.
https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2015.89.
Kerner P, Ikmi A, Coen D, Vervoort M. 2009. Evolutionary history of the iroquois/Irx
genes in metazoans. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 9:74. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-9-
74.
Kořínková T, Král J. 2013. Karyotypes, Sex Chromosomes, and Meiotic Division in
Spiders. In: Nentwig W, editor. Spider Ecophysiology. Berlin, Heidelberg:
Springer. p. 159–171. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-33989-
9_12

Krumlauf R. 2018. Hox genes, clusters and collinearity. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* 62:659–663.
https://doi.org/10.1387/ijdb.180330rr.
Kumar JP. 2009. The sine oculis homeobox (SIX) family of transcription factors as
regulators of development and disease. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* 66:565–583.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-008-8335-4.
Larroux C, Fahey B, Degnan SM, Adamski M, Rokhsar DS, Degnan BM. 2007. The NK
Homeobox Gene Cluster Predates the Origin of Hox Genes. *Curr. Biol.* 17:706–
710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.03.008.
Larroux C, Luke GN, Koopman P, Rokhsar DS, Shimeld SM, Degnan BM. 2008.
Genesis and Expansion of Metazoan Transcription Factor Gene Classes. *Mol.*
Biol. Evol. 25:980–996. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msn047.
Leite DJ, Baudouin-Gonzalez L, Iwasaki-Yokozawa S, Lozano-Fernandez J, Turetzek
N, Akiyama-Oda Y, Prpic N-M, Pisani D, Oda H, Sharma PP, et al. 2018.
Homeobox Gene Duplication and Divergence in Arachnids. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*
35:2240–2253. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msy125.
Leite DJ, Ninova M, Hilbrant M, Arif S, Griffiths-Jones S, Ronshaugen M, McGregor AP.
2016. Pervasive microRNA Duplication in Chelicerates: Insights from the
Embryonic microRNA Repertoire of the Spider Parasteatoda tepidariorum.
Genome Biol. Evol. 8:2133–2144. https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evw143.
Li Y, Nong W, Baril T, Yip HY, Swale T, Hayward A, Ferrier DEK, Hui JHL. 2020.
Reconstruction of ancient homeobox gene linkages inferred from a new high-
quality assembly of the Hong Kong oyster (Magallana hongkongensis) genome.
BMC Genomics 21:713. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-07027-6.
Luke GN, Castro LFC, McLay K, Bird C, Coulson A, Holland PWH. 2003. Dispersal of
NK homeobox gene clusters in amphioxus and humans. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
100:5292–5295. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0836141100.
Lynch VJ, Roth JJ, Wagner GP. 2006. Adaptive evolution of Hox-gene homeodomains
after cluster duplications. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 6:86. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-
2148-6-86.
Marlétaz F, Firbas PN, Maeso I, Tena JJ, Bogdanovic O, Perry M, Wyatt CDR, de la
Calle-Mustienes E, Bertrand S, Burguera D, et al. 2018. Amphioxus functional
genomics and the origins of vertebrate gene regulation. *Nature* 564:64–70.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0734-6.
Mazza ME, Pang K, Reitzel AM, Martindale MQ, Finnerty JR. 2010. A conserved cluster
of three PRD-class homeobox genes (homeobrain, rx and orthopedia) in the
Cnidaria and Protostomia. *EvoDevo* 1:3. https://doi.org/10.1186/2041-9139-1-3.
McLysaght A, Hokamp K, Wolfe KH. 2002. Extensive genomic duplication during early
chordate evolution. *Nat. Genet.* 31:200–204. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng884.
Meyer A, Schartl M. 1999. Gene and genome duplications in vertebrates: the one-to-
four (-to-eight in fish) rule and the evolution of novel gene functions. *Curr. Opin.*
Cell Biol. 11:699–704. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0955-0674(99)00039-3.
Miller J, Zimin AV, Gordus A. 2023. Chromosome-level genome and the identification of
sex chromosomes in Uloborus diversus. *GigaScience* 12:giad002.
https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giad002.
Mittmann B, Wolff C. 2012. Embryonic development and staging of the cobweb spider
Parasteatoda tepidariorum C. L. Koch, 1841 (syn.: Achaearanea tepidariorum;

Araneomorphae; Theridiidae). *Dev. Genes Evol.* 222:189–216.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-012-0401-0.

Muffato M, Louis A, Nguyen NTT, Lucas J, Berthelot C, Roest Crollius H. 2023.
Reconstruction of hundreds of reference ancestral genomes across the
eukaryotic kingdom. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 7:355–366. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-022-01956-z.

Mulhair P, Crowley L, Boyes DH, Harper A, Lewis OT, Consortium DT of L, Holland
PWH. 2022. Diversity, duplication, and genomic organization of homeobox genes
in Lepidoptera. *Genome Res.*:gr.277118.122.
https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.277118.122.

Negre B, Ruiz A. 2007. HOM-C evolution in Drosophila: is there a need for Hox gene
clustering? *Trends Genet.* 23:55–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2006.12.001.

Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: A Fast and
Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies.
Mol. Biol. Evol. 32:268–274. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu300.

Nong W, Qu Z, Li Y, Barton-Owen T, Wong AYP, Yip HY, Lee HT, Narayana S, Baril T,
Swale T, et al. 2021. Horseshoe crab genomes reveal the evolution of genes and
microRNAs after three rounds of whole genome duplication. *Commun. Biol.* 4:83.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-01637-2.

Nossa CW, Havlak P, Yue J-X, Lv J, Vincent KY, Brockmann HJ, Putnam NH. 2014.
Joint assembly and genetic mapping of the Atlantic horseshoe crab genome
reveals ancient whole genome duplication. *GigaScience* 3:2047-217X-3–9.
https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-217X-3-9.

Ontano AZ, Gainett G, Aharon S, Ballesteros JA, Benavides LR, Corbett KF, Gavish-
Regev E, Harvey MS, Monsma S, Santibáñez-López CE, et al. 2021. Taxonomic
Sampling and Rare Genomic Changes Overcome Long-Branch Attraction in the
Phylogenetic Placement of Pseudoscorpions. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 38:2446–2467.
https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msab038.

Pollard SL, Holland PWH. 2000. Evidence for 14 homeobox gene clusters in human
genome ancestry. *Curr. Biol.* 10:1059–1062. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(00)00676-X.

Prpic N-M, Schoppmeier M, Damen WGM. 2008. Collection and Fixation of Spider
Embryos. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.* 2008:pdb.prot5067.
https://doi.org/10.1101/pdb.prot5067.

Putnam NH, Butts T, Ferrier DEK, Furlong RF, Hellsten U, Kawashima T, Robinson-
Rechavi M, Shoguchi E, Terry A, Yu J-K, et al. 2008. The amphioxus genome
and the evolution of the chordate karyotype. *Nature* 453:1064–1071.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06967.

Sánchez-Herrero JF, Frías-López C, Escuer P, Hinojosa-Alvarez S, Arnedo MA,
Sánchez-Gracia A, Rozas J. 2019. The draft genome sequence of the spider
Dysdera silvatica (Araneae, Dysderidae): A valuable resource for functional and
evolutionary genomic studies in chelicerates. *GigaScience* 8:giz099.
https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz099.

Saudemont A, Dray N, Hudry B, Le Gouar M, Vervoort M, Balavoine G. 2008.
Complementary striped expression patterns of NK homeobox genes during

segment formation in the annelid Platynereis. *Dev. Biol.* 317:430–443.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.02.013.

Schinko JB, Kreuzer N, Offen N, Posnien N, Wimmer EA, Bucher G. 2008. Divergent
functions of orthodenticle, empty spiracles and buttonhead in early head
patterning of the beetle Tribolium castaneum (Coleoptera). *Dev. Biol.* 317:600–
613. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.03.005.

Schomburg C, Turetzek N, Schacht MI, Schneider J, Kirfel P, Prpic N-M, Posnien N.
2015. Molecular characterization and embryonic origin of the eyes in the
common house spider Parasteatoda tepidariorum. *EvoDevo* 6:15.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-015-0011-9.

Schwager EE, Schoppmeier M, Pechmann M, Damen WGM. 2007. Duplicated Hox
genes in the spider Cupiennius salei. *Front. Zool.* 4:10.
https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-9994-4-10.

Schwager EE, Sharma PP, Clarke T, Leite DJ, Wierschin T, Pechmann M, Akiyama-
Oda Y, Esposito L, Bechsgaard J, Bilde T, et al. 2017. The house spider genome
reveals an ancient whole-genome duplication during arachnid evolution. *BMC*
Biol. 15:62. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-017-0399-x.

Sharma PP, Schwager EE, Extavour CG, Giribet G. 2012. Hox gene expression in the
harvestman Phalangium opilio reveals divergent patterning of the chelicerate
opisthosoma. *Evol. Dev.* 14:450–463. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-
142X.2012.00565.x.

Sheffer MM, Hoppe A, Krehenwinkel H, Uhl G, Kuss AW, Jensen L, Jensen C, Gillespie
RG, Hoff KJ, Prost S. 2021. Chromosome-level reference genome of the
European wasp spider Argiope bruennichi: a resource for studies on range
expansion and evolutionary adaptation. *GigaScience* 10:1–12.
https://doi.org/10.1093/GIGASCIENCE/GIAA148.

Shimeld SM, Holland PWH. 2000. Vertebrate innovations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*
A. 97:4449–4452. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.97.9.4449.

Shingate P, Ravi V, Prasad A, Tay BH, Garg KM, Chattopadhyay B, Yap LM, Rheindt
FE, Venkatesh B. 2020. Chromosome-level assembly of the horseshoe crab
genome provides insights into its genome evolution. *Nat. Commun.* 11:1–13.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16180-1.

Simakov O, Kawashima T. 2017. Independent evolution of genomic characters during
major metazoan transitions. *Dev. Biol.* 427:179–192.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2016.11.012.

Simakov O, Kawashima T, Marlétaz F, Jenkins J, Koyanagi R, Mitros T, Hisata K,
Bredeson J, Shoguchi E, Gyoja F, et al. 2015. Hemichordate genomes and
deuterostome origins. *Nature* 527:459–465. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16150.

Simonnet F, Célérier M-L, Quéinnec E. 2006. Orthodenticle and empty spiracles genes
are expressed in a segmental pattern in chelicerates. *Dev. Genes Evol.* 216:467–
480. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-006-0093-4.

Smith MD, Wertheim JO, Weaver S, Murrell B, Scheffler K, Kosakovsky Pond SL. 2015.
Less is more: an adaptive branch-site random effects model for efficient
detection of episodic diversifying selection. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32:1342–1353.
https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msv022.

So WL, Nong W, Xie Y, Baril T, Ma H, Qu Z, Haimovitz J, Swale T, Gaitan-Espitia JD,
Lau KF, et al. 2022. Myriapod genomes reveal ancestral horizontal gene transfer
and hormonal gene loss in millipedes. *Nat. Commun.* 13:3010.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30690-0.
Stierwald M, Yanze N, Bamert RP, Kammermeier L, Schmid V. 2004. The Sine
oculis/Six class family of homeobox genes in jellyfish with and without eyes:
development and eye regeneration. *Dev. Biol.* 274:70–81.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2004.06.018.
Suyama M, Torrents D, Bork P. 2006. PAL2NAL: robust conversion of protein sequence
alignments into the corresponding codon alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
34:W609–W612. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkl315.
Tinti M, Johnson C, Toth R, Ferrier DEK, Mackintosh C. 2012. Evolution of signal
multiplexing by 14-3-3-binding 2R-ohnologue protein families in the vertebrates.
Open Biol. 2:120103. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsob.120103.
Treffkorn S, Kahnke L, Hering L, Mayer G. 2018. Expression of NK cluster genes in the
onychophoran Euperipatoides rowelli: implications for the evolution of NK family
genes in nephrozoans. *EvoDevo* 9:17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-018-0105-
2.
Turetzek N, Pechmann M, Janssen R, Prpic N-M. 2022. Hox genes in spiders: Their
significance for development and evolution. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.*:in press.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2022.11.014.
Walldorf U, Gehring W j. 1992. Empty spiracles, a gap gene containing a homeobox
involved in Drosophila head development. *EMBO J.* 11:2247–2259.
https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1460-2075.1992.tb05284.x.
Wang Z, Zhu K, Li H, Gao L, Huang H, Ren Y, Xiang H. 2022. Chromosome-level
genome assembly of the black widow spider Latrodectus elegans illuminates
composition and evolution of venom and silk proteins. *GigaScience* 11:1–11.
https://doi.org/10.1093/GIGASCIENCE/GIAC049.
Wotton KR, Weierud FK, Juárez-Morales JL, Alvares LE, Dietrich S, Lewis KE. 2009.
Conservation of gene linkage in dispersed vertebrate NK homeobox clusters.
Dev. Genes Evol. 219:481–496. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-009-0311-y.
Zhong YF, Butts T, Holland PWH. 2008. HomeoDB: A database of homeobox gene
diversity. *Evol. Dev.* 10:516–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-
142X.2008.00266.x.
Zhong YF, Holland PWH. 2011. HomeoDB2: Functional expansion of a comparative
homeobox gene database for evolutionary developmental biology. *Evol. Dev.*
13:567–568. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2011.00513.x.
Zhu B, Jin P, Hou Z, Li J, Wei S, Li S. 2022. Chromosomal-level genome of a sheet-
web spider provides insight into the composition and evolution of venom. *Mol.*
Ecol. Resour. 22:2333–2348. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13601.
Zhu B, Jin P, Zhang Y, Shen Y, Wang W, Li S. 2023. Genomic and transcriptomic
analyses support a silk gland origin of spider venom glands. *BMC Biol.* 21:82.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-023-01581-7.
1350