1 Genomic features of asexual animals

Kamil S. Jaron[1,2], Jens Bast[1], T. Rhyker Ranallo-Benavidez[3], Marc Robinson-Rechavi[1,2] &

Tanja Schwander[1]

[1]Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

[2]Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, Switzerland

[3]Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

Corresponding Author: Correspondence to Kamil S. Jaron (kamiljaron@gmail.com)

Data Availability: The code of the pipeline for gathering data, calculating and plotting

results is available at https://github.com/KamilSJaron/genomic-features-of-asexual-animals;

the majority of sequencing reads are available in public databases under the accessions

listed in **Supplementary Table 1**. The data without publicly available sequencing reads were

obtained via personal communication with the corresponding authors.

Abbreviations: TE, transposable element; HGT, horizontal gene transfer

17 Abstract

Evolution under asexuality is predicted to impact genomes in numerous ways, but empirical

evidence remains unclear. Case studies of individual asexual animals have reported peculiar

genomic features which have been linked to asexuality, including high heterozygosity, a high

abundance of horizontally acquired genes, a low transposable element load, and the

presence of palindromes. However, it is unclear whether these features are lineage-specific

or general consequences of asexuality. We reanalyzed published genomes of 24 asexual

animals and found that not a single genome feature is systematically replicated across a

majority of these species, suggesting that there is no genomic feature characteristic of

asexuality. We found that only asexuals of hybrid origin were characterized by high

heterozygosity levels. Asexuals that were not of hybrid origin appeared to be largely

homozygous, independently of the cellular mechanism underlying asexuality. Overall,

despite the importance of recombination rate variation for understanding the evolution of

sexual animal genomes, the genome-wide absence of recombination does not appear to

have the dramatic effects which are expected from classical theoretical models. The reasons

for this are probably a combination of lineage-specific patterns, impact of the origin of

asexuality, and a survivor bias of asexual lineages.

Introduction

Sex: What is it good for? The reasons for why most eukaryotes take a complicated detour to reproduction, when straightforward options are available, remains a central and largely unanswered question in evolutionary biology [1,2]. The species that use asexual reproduction as their sole form of replication typically occur at the tips of phylogenies and only few of them have succeeded like their sexually reproducing counterparts [3]. In other words, most asexual lineages may eventually be destined for extinction. These incipient evolutionary failures are however invaluable because by understanding the evolutionary fate of asexual species, something may be learned about the adaptive value of sex.

An accumulating number of studies have sequenced the genomes of asexually reproducing animals, often with the aim of identifying features that would distinguish them from sexual species (**Figure 1**). In asexual animals, females produce daughters from unfertilized eggs via so-called thelytokous parthenogenesis (hereafter asexuality) [4]. Asexuality is predicted to have many consequences for genome evolution, since gamete production via meiosis and the restoration of somatic ploidy levels via fertilization no longer take place. Predicted consequences include for example the accumulation of deleterious mutations [5–7], as well as changes in heterozygosity levels [8,9] and transposable element (TE) dynamics [10]. Some predictions have been tested without genomic data, using a handful of housekeeping genes. However, conclusions based on such small and non-random subsets of genomes can lead to erroneous conclusions [11]. With the advent of high-throughput sequencing it is possible to evaluate classical predictions of asexuality at the genome scale, and furthermore to test new predictions, such as the accumulation of palindromes (see below), which could not be studied with single gene approaches. In the present study, we compare the published genomes of 24 asexual animal species (**Figure 1**) to assess whether we can identify any key features characteristic of asexual animals. The 24 species comprise four species of bdelloid rotifers, a group that likely persisted and diversified in the absence of canonical sex for over 40 million years [12]. Bdelloids have thus far overcome the predicted dead-end fate of asexuality, which raises the question of what mechanisms protect them from extinction, and whether these mechanisms are visible in specific characteristics of their genomes.

Because the predicted consequences of asexuality are strongly affected by how asexuality evolved from the sexual ancestor (**Box 1**) as well as by the cellular mechanisms underlying asexuality (**Box 2**), we include biological differences among asexual species in our comparisons. For example, some asexual species have evolved via hybridization (**Box 1**), which generates high heterozygosity and can result in increased activity of transposable

elements [13–15]. In such instances, it can be difficult to disentangle consequences of

hybridization from consequences of asexuality. Similarly, some cellular mechanisms

underlying asexuality involve meiotic divisions, with a secondary restoration of somatic

ploidy levels, while others do not. In the former case, heterozygosity in the asexual species

is expected to decay rapidly, while in the latter case, it could be maintained or even increase

over time (**Box 2**). Finally, because genome studies differed in their focus and in the

methods used, we reanalyzed published genomes with standardized approaches. Whenever

possible, we conducted quantitative comparisons between groups of asexual species.

However, for interpretation, it is important to consider that the available genomes are not a

random nor representative sample of asexual animals, and that not all of these genomes

reflect evolutionarily independent events.

We uncovered a number of unusual features in the genomes of asexual animals, including

extreme loads of transposable elements and highly asymmetric divergence among

haplotypes in polyploid species of hybrid origin. However, none of these were systematically

replicated across even a majority of analyzed species, let alone all of them, suggesting that

there is no universal genomic feature specific to asexual species. We found that a hybrid

origin of asexuality was the most important factor affecting heterozygosity, with potential

effects of asexuality being masked by effects of hybrid ancestry. Unexpectedly, asexuals

that are not of hybrid origin are largely homozygous, independently of the cellular

mechanism underlying asexuality.

Figure 1: **Genome features studied in asexual animal species.** The phylogeny displays

the taxonomic relation of the 24 sequenced asexual animal species considered here. The

color of the circle indicates the cellular mechanism of asexuality and the number inside the

circle the ploidy of the species (see Supplemental Table 1 for details). Note that *M.*
floridensis is considered 2n in the published genome studies but our analyses clearly show
that this species is triploid (Supplementary Materials). The 24 species correspond to at least
16 independent transitions from sexual to asexual reproduction; species that might derive
from the same original transition are grouped in triangles. Each original genome article
explored a given set of genome features: the green cells (both light and dark) represent
cases where the genomic feature was quantified; the dark cells (grey, dark green) represent
studies where the genomic features were discussed with respect to asexuality.
Heterozygosity, palindromes and transposable elements were reanalysed in this study, the
discussion of the remaining features is based on the analyses reported in the individual
genome studies [16–38].
106
Box 1: Transitions to asexuality
Meiotic sex evolved once ~1.5 billion years ago, and since then remained the predominant
mode of reproduction in eukaryotes [3,39]. Current asexual animals therefore derive from a
sexual ancestor, but how transitions from sexual to asexual reproduction occur can vary.
While the molecular changes underlying different types of transitions are unknown, the
expected genomic consequences of asexuality vary extensively among them [14].
Hybrid origin. Hybridization between sexual species can generate hybrid females that
reproduce asexually [14,40]. Asexuality caused by hybridization generates high levels of
heterozygosity, corresponding to the divergence between the parental sexual species prior
to hybridization. Hybridization can also result in a burst of transposable element activity [13].
Endosymbiont infection. Infection with intracellular endosymbionts (such as *Wolbachia*,
Cardinium or *Rickettsia*) can cause asexuality, a pattern that frequent in species with
haplodiploid sex determination [41]. This type of transition often (but not always) results in fully
homozygous lineages because asexuality induction frequently occurs via gamete duplication
(see Box 2).
Spontaneous mutations/Contagious asexuality. Spontaneous mutations can also
underlie transitions from sexual to asexual reproduction. In addition, asexual females of
some species produce males that mate with females of sexual lineages, and thereby
generate new asexual strains (contagious asexuality). In both cases, the genomes of
incipient asexual lineages are expected to be very similar to those of their sexual relatives
and subsequent changes should be largely driven by the cellular mechanism underlying
asexuality (Box 2).
129
Box 2: Cellular mechanisms of asexuality

In sexual species offspring is generated through the fusion of male and female gametes. In

asexuals, females generate diploid (or polyploid) offspring from unfertilized oocytes via

different cellular mechanisms. The cellular mechanism used is predicted to affect genome

evolution and especially heterozygosity levels. For details see [4,42].

Mitotic asexuality (Apomixis). Under mitotic asexuality, no ploidy reduction occurs and

offspring are clones of their mother.

Meiotic asexuality (Automixis). Under meiotic asexuality, meiotic divisions occur partially or

completely, but somatic ploidy levels are maintained via different mechanisms. Some of

these mechanisms have similar genomic consequences as mitotic asexuality, even though

meiosis is involved (for example, endoduplication in hybrid asexuals results in offspring that

are clones of their mother. Such mechanisms are often referred to as "functionally mitotic"

(or functionally apomictic), especially when the cellular mechanisms are not known in detail

but genotyping data suggest that offspring are clones of their mother.

Endoduplication. A duplication of the entire chromosome set occurs before normal

meiosis, during which ploidy is reduced again. If recombination occurs between

identical chromosome copies rather than between chromosome homologs,

endoduplication produces offspring that are clones of their mother.

Inverted meiosis with terminal fusion (gonoid thelytoky). During the first meiotic

division, sister chromatids separate instead of homologous chromosomes. The

homologues are separated in the second meiotic division. In the absence of

recombination, inverted meiosis with terminal fusion generates offspring that are

clones of their mother (and though mechanistically different, is conceptually

equivalent to central fusion without recombination). Holocentric chromosomes seem

to be a prerequisite for this type of mechanism [43,44].

Central fusion and *terminal fusion*. Under these two mechanisms, somatic ploidy

levels are restored through the fusion of two of the four meiotic products (products

separated during the first meiotic division merge under central fusion, products

separated during the second division merge under terminal fusion). In the absence of

recombination, central fusion generates offspring that are clones of their mother.

Gamete duplication. After a full meiosis, a haploid meiotic product undergoes

duplication. This results in a diploid, but fully homozygous offspring.

Results

Overview of species and genomes studied

We reanalyzed the published genomes of 24 asexual animal species with the aim of identifying general genomic signatures of asexualilty. The 24 species correspond to at least 16 independent transitions to asexuality and cover a broad taxonomic range, including chordates, rotifers, arthropods, nematodes and tardigrades. In addition to covering this taxonomic range, the asexual species vary in the cellular mechanisms underlying asexuality, in the mechanisms that caused the transition to asexuality, as well as in other biological aspects (**Figure 1, Supplementary Tables 1 & 2**). This variation allows us to assess whether asexuality generates universal genomic signatures independently of species-specific traits.

The cellular mechanisms underlying asexuality were studied in 20 of the 24 species. Eight of them use mitotic asexuality, while the 12 remaining species use different types of meiotic asexuality (**Figure 1**). All but one of the eight species with mitotic asexuality are polyploid, the amazon molly *P. formosa* being the only diploid studied. Conversely, all but one species with meiotic asexuality are diploid. This is expected given that polyploidy can generate problems during meiosis (reviewed in [45]). Nevertheless, the nematode *Panagrolaimus sp.* is characterized by both meiotic asexuality and triploidy [30] (see **Supplementary Table 1** for details).

Information on how asexuality evolved is available for 15 of the 24 sequenced species (Figure 1). A hybrid origin has been suggested for ten of these. Endosymbionts are the most likely cause of asexuality in four species (the springtail, both wasps and the thrips), and spontaneous mutation in one (the ant). Across the 24 species, hybrid origin is correlated with polyploidy. Six of the 11 polyploids in our sample are of hybrid origin, while for the five others a hybrid origin has thus far not been suggested, but is supported by our results (see below). It is important to note however that there are many polyploid asexual animals that are not of hybrid origin, including several well studied asexual species such as the New Zealand mudsnail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*, the bush cricket *Saga pedo*, or the bagworm moth *Dahlica triquetrella*. None of these has a published genome yet which precludes their inclusion in our study.

Most if not all predicted consequences of asexuality are expected to accumulate over time, meaning that their effect size as well as the power to detect them increases in old asexual

197 lineages. However, estimating the age of asexual lineages is difficult and always associated
198 with large uncertainties [46,47]. We therefore did not include quantitative comparisons among
199 asexuals with respect to their age. However, because our set of species comprises asexuals
200 believed to be 'ancient' (i.e., several million years old, see **Supplementary Table 1**), we
201 discuss, where appropriate, potential age effects in a qualitative manner.

Mutation accumulation and positive selection

One of the classical predictions linked to asexuality is that it reduces the efficacy of selection
[5–7,48–50]. This reduction occurs because linkage among loci in asexual species prevents
selection from acting individually on each locus. This can allow for deleterious mutations to
accumulate over time, because they are linked to other sites under selection. It can also
reduce the rate of adaptation, because beneficial mutations cannot reach fixation in a
population as easily as under sexual reproduction.
209
The prediction that deleterious mutations accumulate more rapidly in asexual than sexual
lineages has been tested in over twenty groups of different asexual species (reviewed in [51]
and with three additional studies published since [16,21,52]), with results generally supporting
the prediction. However, in only eight studies were the tests conducted genome wide, while
tests in the remaining studies were based on one or a few genes only. Note that four [11,52–54]
of these studies were based on transcriptomes and are therefore not included in our
systematic reanalysis. Among the genome wide tests, results are much more mixed than
among the 'single or few genes' studies, raising the question whether the latter are
representative of the genome as a whole. Specifically, only two of the eight genome-wide
studies found support for deleterious mutation accumulation in asexuals [52,53]. However, two
studies found that *sexual* taxa experienced more deleterious mutation accumulation than
asexual taxa [11,19] while the four remaining ones found no differences between sexual and
asexual taxa [16,21,24,54]. In the case of the water flea *D. pulex*, the study specifically reported
that earlier inferences of deleterious mutation accumulation under asexuality were incorrect,
as the detected deleterious mutations in asexual strains were inherited from the sexual
ancestor and did not accumulate after the transition to asexuality [24].
226
In summary, results from genome-wide studies addressing the prediction of deleterious
mutation accumulation in asexual species are equivocal. More studies are therefore needed.
A major constraint for studying deleterious mutation accumulation, and the reason why it
was not studied in most genome studies of asexuals species (**Figure 1**), is that it requires
sexual references for comparison. Such references are either unknown or not included in
most published genome studies of asexuals.

The same constraints likely explain why no study has thus far addressed adaptive evolution
in the genome of an asexual species. The question of adaptive evolution was addressed
indirectly in the amazon molly, by studying the amount of segregating variation at immune
genes (where variation is known to be beneficial). The authors found very high diversities at
immune genes [16]. However, these were difficult to interpret because standing variation was
not compared to sexual relatives, and because the amazon molly is a hybrid species. Hence
the high diversity could be a consequence of the hybrid origin rather than of asexuality.

Heterozygosity

Expected heterozygosity levels in asexual organisms are influenced by three major factors:
(1) the mechanism of transition to asexuality (which determines the initial level of
heterozygosity) **(Box 1)**, (2) the cellular mechanism underlying asexuality (which determines
whether heterozygosity should increase or decrease over time) (**Box 2**), and (3) for how long
a species has been reproducing asexually (because effects of asexuality accumulate over
time).

As expected, all of the asexual species with a known hybrid origin display high
heterozygosity levels (1.73% - 8.5%, **Figure 2**), while the species with an intraspecific origin
of asexuality show low heterozygosity levels (0.03% - 0.53%, **Figure 2**). However, it is
important to note that hybrid origin is correlated with polyploidy in our dataset, and that
heterozygosity does not have a clear definition in polyploids **(Box 3)**. Our measures of
heterozygosity are based on the proportion of sites with more than one allele present among
all copies, where the total number of copies includes all homologous genome regions **(Box
3)**.

The heterozygosity levels present at the inception of asexuality should decay over time for
most forms of meiotic asexuality [42,55]. Under mitotic asexuality, heterozygosity is expected to
increase over time as haplotypes can accumulate mutations independently of each other
(generating the so-called 'Meselson effect')[8]. However, gene conversion can strongly reduce
haplotype divergence and, if high enough, can even result in a net loss of heterozygosity
over time, even under mitotic asexuality [8,17]. In spite of the prediction that the cellular
mechanism of asexuality should affect heterozygosity, the cellular mechanism of asexuality
appears to have little or no effect on heterozygosity levels once we control for the effect of
hybrid origins (**Figure 2**). However, we have very little power to detect such effects,
especially because our dataset does not include any asexual species that uses mitotic
asexuality but is not of hybrid origin. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that species with

different forms of meiotic asexuality (including gamete duplication and central fusion) feature

similarly low heterozygosity levels. This suggests that although the rate of heterozygosity

loss is expected to vary according to mechanisms of asexuality, this variation is only relevant

very recently after transitions to asexuality, and no longer affects heterozygosity among

established asexual species. Alternatively, variation in heterozygosity caused by different

forms of meiotic asexuality may be too small to be picked up with our methods.

Figure 2: **Hybrid origin is the main driver of high heterozygosity in asexual species**.

Heterozygosity estimates with respect to hybrid origin (x axis) and cellular mechanism of

asexuality (color code). Species with a possible shared origin of asexuality are grouped in

gray ellipses. Nematode genus abbreviations: Pl: *Plectus*, D: *Diploscapter* Pa:

Panagolaimus, A: *Acrobeloides*, M: *Meloidogyne*. We were unable to generate

heterozygosity estimates for three of the 24 asexual species for different reasons: in the

tardigrade *H. dujardini* because of extensive contamination in the sequencing reads, in the

water flea *Daphnia pulex* samples because of too low coverage, and in the rotifer *A. vaga*

because of divergence levels that exceed the range quantifiable with the applied methods

(see **Methods** and **Figure 3**). Heterozygosity is significantly higher in the eight asexuals of

confirmed hybrid origin relative to the five that are not (Mann–Whitney U test; p-value =

0.0009).

Box 3: Quantification of heterozygosity for different ploidy levels

The classical definition of heterozygosity describes heterozygosity as a measure of allelic

divergence, where alleles are defined through chromosome pairing [56]. This definition poses

a problem for genomes where chromosome pairing is not known (e.g., in polyploid

genomes), as well as for genomes of mitotic asexuals where chromosome pairing may not

occur at all. In these cases, concepts such as divergence between alleles (i.e.,

heterozygosity) *vs.* divergence of paralogs, that are clearly distinct in diploids, become

blurred. We therefore quantify heterozygosity as the proportion of nucleotides that differ in at

least one of the homologous chromosomes. Three examples of genomes with similar

heterozygosity but different ploidy levels are shown on the scheme for illustration. Grey bars

highlight specific loci, coloured bars represent alternative alleles at a given locus.

diploid   triploid   tetraploid

Heterozygosity structure in polyploids

Heterozygosity in polyploids is estimated via the proportion of sites that differ in at least one of the homologous regions (see **Box 3**). This means that the estimated genome-wide heterozygosity could be generated by a single haplotype that is highly divergent while others are similar, or by homogeneous divergence across all copies present, or a combination of these. We therefore decomposed genome-wide heterozygosity for each polyploid genome into portions with different divergence structures (**Figure 3**).

In polyploid species of hybrid origin (sexual or asexual), heterozygosity is generally driven by divergence between haplotypes originating from different species (hereafter homoeologs, following the terminology of Glover et al [57]). In our dataset, the polyploid species with confirmed hybrid origins are nematodes in the genera *Meloidogyne* (five species) and *Panagrolaimus* (one). As expected, heterozygosity in these species is largely dominated by divergence between homoeologs. In the triploid species, divergence is between a single homoeolog and two similar homologs (yellow portions in **Figure 3**), consistent with previous findings [30,34]. In the tetraploid species, genome-wide heterozygosity is generated by a combination of genome portions comprised of one homoeolog and three similar homologs and of other portions comprised of pairs of homoeologs (pink portions in **Figure 3**).

Given that in asexual polyploids of hybrid origin we expect and observe highly heterogeneous divergences among haplotypes, while polyploidy of intra-specific origin is predicted to generate homogeneous divergences, haplotype divergences can be used to infer the origin of asexuality in polyploid species. Notably, the highly asymmetric divergence levels between haplotypes in the four bdelloid rotifers (**Figure 3**) are best explained by a hybrid origin of bdelloids. When tetraploidy was first discovered in bdelloids, it was proposed that tetraploidy stemmed from either a whole genome duplication or a hybridization event in their ancestor [58]. However, studies of bdelloid rotifers traditionally refer to the divergent haplotypes as "ohnologs" (e.g., [17,18]), which, following the unified vocabulary of Glover et al [57] would imply that the diverged haplotypes are products of a whole genome duplication. However, given their likely hybrid origin, referring to them as homoeologs appears more appropriate.

Whether the crayfish is also of hybrid origin remains as an open question. Its genome features two nearly identical haplotypes and one that is substantially divergent (1.8%, **Figure 3**), which is suggestive of a hybrid origin. However, the divergence of the latter is within the

range of heterozygosity commonly observed in sexual species, and therefore we cannot
clearly distinguish between an intra-specific or a hybrid origin.

Our analyses also reveal that the divergence of homologs varies extensively among bdelloid
rotifer genera. Divergence is very low in *Rotaria* (0% in *R. magnacalcarata* and 0.25% *R.*
macrura) and low in *A. ricciae* (0.5%) but relatively high in *A. vaga* (2.4%). The mechanisms
causing these differences remain unknown. In *A. vaga* it has been suggested that gene
conversion reduces divergence between homologs in some genome regions [17]. It is possible
that rates of gene conversion are higher in *Rotaria* than *Adineta*, for unknown reasons.
Independently of the mechanisms causing the differences between bdelloid genera and
species, it is important to note that with such low levels of divergence between homologs,
there can be no genome-wide 'Meselson effect' in bdelloid rotifers (see also [17]). It remains
possible that the subset of genomic regions with divergence between homologs in *Adineta*
feature allele phylogenies as expected under the 'Meselson effect'. This is the case in the
asexual unicellular eukaryote *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense*: some genome regions
feature high heterozygosity and allele phylogenies as expected under the 'Meselson effect',
while others are largely homozygous [59]. Again, it remains unknown why there is such
extensive heterogeneity in divergence across the genome in this species. A possible
explanation is that the heterozygous genome regions are the consequence of ancient
introgression, and that gene conversion rates are low in such regions with very high
heterozygosity (see Discussion).

Figure 3: **Heterozygosity structure in polyploids.** Biallelic loci are indicated in yellow or

pink:, yellow when the alternative allele is carried by a single haplotype (AAB or AAAB), and

pink when both alleles are represented twice (AABB). Loci with more than two alleles are

indicated in blue. Note that homoeolog divergence in the rotifer *Adineta vaga* is so extensive

that it is impossible to estimate the exact divergence level using kmer spectra analysis (see

Methods for details).

Palindromes and gene conversion

Palindromes are duplicated regions on a single chromosome in reverse orientation. Because

of their orientation, palindromes can align and form hairpins, which allows for gene

conversion within duplicated regions (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Palindrome-mediated gene

conversion was shown to play a major role in limiting the accumulation of deleterious

mutations for non-recombining human and chimpanzee Y chromosomes [60–62]. Indeed,

approximately one third of coding genes on these Y chromosomes occur in palindromes,

and the highly concerted evolution of palindromic regions indicates that the rates of gene

conversion are at least two orders of magnitude higher in the palindromes than between

homologous chromosomes. The reports of palindromes in the genomes of the bdelloid rotifer

Adineta vaga [17] and the springtail *Folsomia candida* [23] led to the hypothesis that palindromes

could play a similar role in asexual organisms – reducing deleterious mutation accumulation

in the absence of recombination. However, the potential benefit of palindrome-mediated

gene conversion depends on the portion of genes in palindromic regions [61]. In addition to

identifying palindromes, it is therefore important to also quantify the number of genes

affected by palindrome-mediated gene conversion.

Methods for palindrome identification depend on genome assemblies (contrary to the other

genome features we re-analysed in our study). Palindromes are less likely to be detected in

highly fragmented assemblies and artificial palindromes can be generated by erroneous

scaffolding (see also [18]). Our analyses and interpretations assume that there are no

systematic scaffolding errors in the published assemblies. Palindrome identification methods

rely on genome annotations, which are available for 22 of the 24 asexual species (all except

D. pulex and *A. rufus*). We screened these 22 genomes for the presence of palindromic

arrangements (See **Methods** and **Supplementary Text S2** for details). We identified 19

palindromes in *A. vaga*, 16 in *F. candida,* and up to four palindromes in seven additional

genomes (Table 1). Not a single palindrome was detected in the remaining 13 species. The

frequency of palindromes had no phylogenetic signal; for example, although we found 19

palindromes in *A. vaga*, we found no palindromes in the three other bdelloid rotifers (in

agreement with [18]). There is also no indication for major rearrangements being present

solely in very old asexuals; among the very old asexuals, the non-*A. vaga* rotifers along with

the *Diploscapter* nematodes have either no or only a single palindrome.

Adineta vaga and *F. candida* are the only two species with more than 100 genes potentially

affected by palindrome-mediated gene conversion, but even for these two species, the

overall fraction of genes in palindromes is very small (1.23% and 0.53% respectively). The

fraction of genes in the other seven species ranges between 0.01% and 0.16%, suggesting

that palindromes do not play a major role in the genome evolution of any of the asexual

lineages analyzed. Our findings substantiate the conclusion of a previous study [18] that major

genomic rearrangements and the breaking of gene syntenies do not occur at high rates in

asexual organisms. They appear to occur at rates similar to those known in recombining

genome portions of sexual species [63,64].

Table 1: Palindromes in asexual genomes. Only species with at least one palindrome

detected are listed in the table. Rows in bold highlight species with more than 100 genes

detected in palindromes.

Species	Palindromes detected	Potentially affected genes	Fraction of genes [%]
P. formosa	1	2	0.01
A. vaga	**19***	**636**	**1.29**
O. biroi	2	6	0.04
F. candida	**15***	**152**	**0.53**
D. pachys	1	2	0.01
M. incognita	1	26	0.06
M. arenaria	3	38	0.04
H. dujardini	1	8	0.04
R. varieornatus	4	22	0.16

* The detected number of palindromes in these species exceeds the number reported in the
corresponding genome articles (17 in *A. vaga* and 11 in *F. candida*). This is because we
included individual genes in palindromic arrangements, whereas the original genome studies
only included genes if they were in palindromic synteny blocks of at least five genes. See
also **Supplementary Text S2**.

Mitotic gene conversion can also occur outside of palindromic regions, for example when

double-stranded DNA breaks are repaired using the homologous chromosome as a template

[65,66]. It can, in theory, contribute to the loss of heterozygosity under all forms of asexuality,

but mitotic gene conversion rates have only rarely been studied in asexual species – or

sexual ones for that matter. Gene conversion rates are estimated differently in different

studies and are therefore difficult to compare: in the water flea *D. pulex*, they were estimated

to amount to approximately 10^{-6} locus^{-1} generation^{-1} [24,25,67], in the amazon molly *P. formosa*

to 10^{-8} [16]. Up to 11% of the genome of the nematode *D. pachys* [29] is suggested to be

homozygous as a consequence of gene conversion, and studies also argued for an

important role of gene conversion for genome evolution in root knot nematodes [34] and

rotifers [17,18], although no quantitative estimates are available for these species groups.

Transposable elements

Transposable elements (TEs) are DNA sequences that can autonomously change positions

in a genome via various 'cut-and-paste' and 'copy-and-paste' mechanisms [68,69]. TEs can

invade genomes even though they generally provide no adaptive advantage to the individual

carrying them [70–72]. To the contrary, new TE insertions in coding or regulatory sequences

disrupt gene functions and cause deleterious effects in the host; only very rarely can specific

insertions be co-opted to acquire novel, adaptive, functions for the host [72]. In sexual

organisms, TEs can spread through panmictic populations because of their ability to rapidly

colonize new genomes [10,73]. At the same time, sexual reproduction facilitates the purging of

deleterious TE insertions, because recombination, segregation and genetic exchange

among individuals improve the efficacy of selection [74,75]. In the absence of sex, TEs could

therefore accumulate indefinitely, which led to the prediction that TEs could frequently drive

the extinction of asexual lineages. Only asexual lineages without active TEs, or with efficient

TE suppression mechanisms, would be able to persist over evolutionary times [75]. Consistent

with this view, a study in bdelloid rotifers reported extremely low TE loads [76]. This prompted

the authors to suggest that bdelloid rotifers could have been able to persist in the absence of

sex for over 40 million years thanks to their largely TE-free genomes.

Our analysis of asexual animal genomes does not support the view that bdelloid rotifers

have unusually low TE contents. The TE content of bdelloid rotifers (0.8% to 9.1%) is

comparable to other asexual animal taxa (**Figure 4**), all of which are considerably younger

than the bdelloids. Across the 24 genomes, there was large variation in total TE content,

overall ranging from 6.6% to 17.9%, but with one species, the marbled crayfish, reaching

34.7%. Nevertheless, the abundance of TEs in asexual animal genomes appears to be

generally lower than in sexual species, which range typically from 8.5-37.6% (median:

24.3%) [77]. Whether this difference is indeed driven by asexuality remains an open question

as TE loads are known to be highly lineage-specific [20,78]. Furthermore, we annotated TEs in

each genome via homology searches in general databases (see methods). This can result in

an underestimation of TE loads relative to annotations based on species-specific TE

libraries. However, this is unlikely to be of major concern in our study since the methods we

used allowed us to identify more TEs than most of the individual genome studies

(**Supplementary Table 3**). Specifically, most studies estimate TE loads from genome

assemblies, which underestimates TE loads because regions with high repetitive contents

are generally not assembled.

In addition to other lineage-specific characteristics, the cellular mechanisms underlying

asexuality could also affect TE loads. For example, most forms of meiotic asexuality can

allow for the purging of heterozygous TE-insertions, given the loss of heterozygosity

between generations **(Box 2)**. Barring potential gene conversion events, this form of purging

cannot occur under mitotic asexuality. However, in the genomes analyzed here, we did not

find any effect of cellular mechanisms on TE loads (**Supplementary Figure 3**), likely

because the expected effect of the cellular mechanisms is very small relative to lineage-

specific mechanisms. Moreover, host TE suppression mechanisms can contribute to the

inactivation and subsequent degeneration of TE copies over time, independently of the

cellular mechanism of asexuality [72,79].

Two asexual animals clearly stand out (**Figure 4**), one for very low TE contents (the rotifer *A.*

ricciae; <1% of the genome) and one for very high contents (the marbled crayfish *P.*

virginalis >34%). There is currently no known mechanism that could help explain why *A.*

ricciae differs so extensively from other bdelloid rotifers. In the case of the marbled crayfish,

it is unknown whether its extreme repetitive content is a heritage from its sexual ancestor or

a consequence of a possible hybrid origin with a subsequent burst of TE activity. In the

absence of information on TE loads in the sexual relative *P. fallax,* these possibilities cannot

be evaluated. More generally, in most studies quantifying TE contents in asexual species, no

comparisons to related sexual species are made. In the cases where this was done, no

differences could be detected [16,20,21,26,35,80].

Independently of the question of whether asexuality affects genome-level TE loads, our

dataset allows us to study whether hybrid species have higher TE loads than non-hybrid

species. Indeed, TE activity in hybrids is expected to be high because of mismatches

between species-specific TEs and silencing machineries [13,15,81,82]. However, we do not find

any difference in TE content according to hybrid vs intraspecific origin of asexuals

(**Supplementary Figure 2**).

Figure 4: Percentage of transposable elements (TEs) in asexual genomes. Both the TE load

and frequency of TE classes vary substantially between individual asexual lineages. The TE
classes are: class I "cut-and-paste" DNA transposons (DNA), and class II "copy-and-paste"
long interspersed nuclear elements or autonomous non-LTR elements (LINEs), short
interspersed nuclear elements or non-autonomous non-LTR elements (SINEs), long terminal
repeat elements (LTR), and rolling-circle elements (Helitron).

Gene loss

Asexual animals are predicted to lose genes underlying sexual reproduction traits, including
male-specific traits and functions (e.g. male-specific organs, spermatogenesis), as well as
female traits involved in sexual reproduction (e.g., pheromone production, sperm storage
organs) [83]. In the absence of pleiotropic effects, gene loss is expected due to mutation
accumulation in the absence of purifying selection maintaining sexual traits, as well as to
directional selection to reduce costly sexual traits [84]. Some gene loss consistent with these
predictions is documented. For example, the sex determination genes xol-1 and tra-2 are
missing in the nematode *D. coronatus* [28]. Furthermore, genes believed to be involved in
male functions harbour an excess of deleterious mutations in the wasp *Leptopilina clavipes*
[19], which could represent the first step towards the loss of these genes. However, a similar
excess of deleterious mutations in genes with (presumed) male-specific functions was not
detected in the amazon molly *P. formosa* [16].

Species reproducing via mitotic asexuality are further predicted to lose genes specific to
meiotic processes [85]. The genes involved in meiosis have been studied in three of eight
mitotic parthenogens, as well as in *Rotaria* rotifers and *Diploscapter* nematodes, whose
cellular mechanisms of asexuality are unknown. Most meiotic genes have been found in the
four bdelloid rotifers [17,18] and in both species of *Diploscapter* nematodes [28,29]. There was also
no apparent loss of meiosis genes in the amazon molly *P. formosa* [16]. As much as the idea
is appealing, there does not seem to be any support for the predicted loss of meiotic genes
in mitotic asexuals. We note that the lack of our understanding of meiosis on the molecular
level outside of few model organisms (particularly yeast and *C. elegans*) makes the
interpretation of gene loss (or absence thereof) difficult. This is best illustrated by the fact
that losses of meiosis genes have also been reported in different sexual species, where
meiosis is clearly functional [86].

In summary, some gene loss consistent with the loss of different sexual functions has been
reported in several asexual species. However, a clear interpretation of gene loss in asexual
species is problematic because the function of the vast majority of genes is unknown in
these non-model organisms.

Horizontal gene transfer

Asexual species could harbour many genes acquired via horizontal gene transfer (HGT) as a consequence of relaxed selection on pairing of homologous chromosomes. It has also been proposed that HGTs represented an adaptive benefit which allows for the long term maintenance of asexuality [87]. Indeed, bdelloid rotifers have been reported to carry an unusually large amount (6.2% - 9.1%) of horizontally acquired genes compared to sexual lophotrochozoan genomes (0.08% - 0.7%) [18,88]. Many of these have contributed to adaptive divergence between bdelloid rotifer species [89]. However, there are no other ancient asexuals sequenced and evaluating the role of HGTs in the long-term persistence of asexuality is therefore not possible. In more recent asexuals, levels of HGT appear mostly low, e.g. in *Panagolaimus* (0.63% - 0.66%) and in two tardigrade species (0.8% - 0.97%)[18,30,37]. The only genome with a high reported fraction of HGT (2.8%) outside of the rotifers is the springtail *F. candida* [23]. This is a meiotic asexual, hence a relaxed constraint on chromosome pairing did not contribute to the high retention of horizontally acquired genes. Nevertheless, the presence of a gene for lignocellulose degradation in the springtail and in the root-knot nematode *M. incognita*, which was likely acquired via HGT in both species, supports an adaptive role of HGT in these asexuals [23,33]. However, such isolated events of adaptive HGTs are not specifically linked to asexuality, since they are reported in sexual species as well [90]. The potential relation of HGT and asexuality will remain unclear until we are able to reliably identify HGTs in more genomes of asexual as well as sexual species. Indeed, current reports of HGT are often unreliable because of the difficulty of distinguishing HGT from contamination [37].

Gene family expansions

Most genome papers, including those focussing on asexual animals, scan for expansions of specific gene families. Such expansions are then discussed in the light of the focal species' biology. The expansion of specific gene families *per se* is thus generally a species-specific trait [91] that is not related to asexuality. For example, expansions of stress response genes in *M. incognita* [33], *Panagrolaimus* spp. [30], and *R. varieornatus* [38] were suggested to be associated with the evolution of cryptobiosis in these species. To our knowledge, the only example of a gene family expansion that could be directly associated with asexuality is the diversification of the RNA silencing machinery of TEs in bdelloid rotifers [17]. TEs are expected to evolve reduced activity rates in asexual hosts (see section **Transposable elements**), and an improved RNA silencing machinery could be the mechanism underlying such reduced activity rates.

However, mitotic asexuality might allow for extensive variation in gene copy numbers
between homologous chromosomes as a consequence of relaxed constraints on
chromosome pairing (see also section on **Horizontal gene transfer**). Gene family
expansions (and contractions) could therefore be more extensive and be retained more
frequently in asexual than sexual species. To test this hypothesis, an overall comparison of
gene family expansions in sexual and asexual species is needed (see **Supplementary Text**
S3). Four studies have surveyed gene family expansions in asexual species as well as in
(sometimes distantly related) sexual counterparts, but these studies found no differences
between reproductive modes [16,21,23,31]. However, only two of the four studies are based on
asexuals with mitotic asexuality (i.e., where chromosome pairing is not required), and
additional studies are therefore needed to address the question of whether asexuality affects
gene family expansions.

Discussion

We re-analyzed 24 published genomes of asexual animals to investigate whether we can
detect genomic features that are characteristic of asexual animals in general. Many of the
original genome studies highlighted one or a few specific features in their focal asexual
species, and suggested that it might be linked to asexuality. However, our analyses and
review of published studies show that none of these genome features appear to be a general
consequence of asexuality given that none them was systematically replicated across even
a majority of analyzed species.

The variation among genomes of asexual species is at least in part due to species- or
lineage-specific traits. But variation among the features detected in the published single-
genome studies is also generated by differences in the methods used. Such differences are
often less obvious, and maybe less interesting to discuss, yet they can be critical in our
assessment of genome diversity among animals. In this work we thus re-analyzed several
key genome features with consistent methods. To minimize the effect of differences in
genome quality, we have used in priority robust methods, e.g. based on sequencing reads
rather than from assemblies. For example, re-estimating heterozygosity levels directly from
reads of each species allowed to show a strong effect of hybrid origin, but not of cellular
mechanism of asexuality (**Figure 2**). Another advantage of using the same methods over all
species is that it diminishes the "researcher degrees of freedom" [92–94]. For example, the
analysis of polyploid genomes requires choosing methods to call heterozygosity and ploidy.
By providing a common framework among species, we have shown that homoeolog
divergence is very diverse among polyploid asexuals.

We have identified hybrid origin as the major factor affecting heterozygosity levels across all

asexual animal species with available genomic data. This is consistent with the conclusions

of two studies that focussed on individual asexual lineages: hybridization between diverse

strains explains heterozygosity in *Meloidogyne* root knot nematodes and *Lineus* ribbon

worms [34,54]. This rule applies more generally to all the species analysed with known

transitions to asexuality, but it is important to highlight that all the non-hybrid species in our

dataset are hexapods. Thus in principle the low heterozygosity could be a hexapod specific

pattern, for example due to high gene conversion rates in hexapods. The taxonomic range of

the sequenced species is wide but we are missing several clades rich in asexual species,

such as mites or annelids [95,96]. These clades would be useful foci for future genomic studies

of asexual species. Independently of the findings of such future studies, our results suggest

that mitotic gene conversion (that acts independently of palindromes) plays a significant and

highly underappreciated role in the evolution of asexual species of intraspecific origin. For

example, it has been argued that one of the main benefits of sex could be the masking of

recessive deleterious mutations (referred to as "complementation") which would be exposed

under many forms of meiotic asexuality [97,98]. If gene conversion is indeed pervasive, these

arguments would extend to functionally mitotic forms of asexuality. Conversely, high rates of

gene conversion could also allow for the purging of deleterious mutations while in the

heterozygous state, as in highly selfing species (eg. [99,100]). Such purging could help explain

why most of the genome scale studies did not find support for the theoretical expectation

that asexual reproduction should result in increased rates of deleterious mutation

accumulation (see section **Mutation accumulation and positive selection)**. More

generally, given the major differences in genome evolution for asexuals of intra-specific vs.

hybrid origin, our study calls for future theoretical approaches on the maintenance of sex that

explicitly consider the loss *vs*. the maintenance of heterozygosity in asexuals.

In our evaluation of the general consequences of asexuality, we were not able to take two

key aspects into account: survivor bias of asexual lineages, and characteristics of sexual

ancestors. How often new asexual lineages emerge from sexual ancestors is completely

unknown, but it has been speculated that in some taxa asexual lineages might emerge

frequently, and then go extinct rapidly because of negative consequences of asexuality. In

other words, asexuals that would exhibit the strongest consequences of asexuality, as

predicted by theoretical models, are expected to go extinct the fastest. Such transient

asexuals remain undetected in natural populations, because research focuses on asexual

species or populations, and not on rare asexual females in sexual populations. Indeed, most

of the species included in our study have persisted as asexuals for hundreds of thousands to

millions of years. They might thus be mostly representative of the subset of lineages that
suffer weaker consequences of asexuality. Finally, the key constraint for identifying
consequences of asexuality is that almost none of the published genome studies of asexual
animals included comparisons to close sexual relatives. This prevents the detection of
specific effects of asexuality, controlling for the variation among sexual species - which is
extensive for all of the genome features we analyzed and discussed in our study. Overall,
despite the importance of recombination rate variation for understanding the evolution of
sexual animal genomes (e.g., [101,102]), the genome-wide absence of recombination does not
appear to have the dramatic effects which are expected from classical theoretical models.
The reasons for this are probably a combination of lineage-specific patterns, differences
according to the origin of asexuality, and survivor bias of asexual lineages.

Methods

We combined different methods into a complete pipeline that collects published assemblies,
sequencing reads, and genome annotation data from online databases, and automatically
computes the genome features discussed here. The methods for the different steps in the
pipeline are detailed below. The pipeline is available at
https://github.com/KamilSJaron/genomic-features-of-asexual-animals. We used this pipeline
to gather and analyze the data for 29 sequenced individuals from 24 asexual species. For
some species, additional genomes to the ones we used were available, but we did not
include them because of low data quality and/or unavailable illumina reads (this was the
case for one sample of *M. incognita*, *M. floridensis* and multiple samples of *D. pulex* [24,33,36]).
Overall, the genome features computed were: ploidy, genome size, heterozygosity,
heterozygosity, haplotype divergence structure, transposable elements/ repeat content,
conserved gene content (see **Supplementary Text S3**), and palindrome abundance.
661
Core genome features (ploidy, haploid genome size, heterozygosity, repetitive fraction of the
genome, and characterisation of TE content) were estimated directly from sequencing reads
to avoid potential assembly biases in reference genome-based approaches. The raw reads
were publicly available for 27 samples and for three more samples shared by authors on
request. We cleaned the raw reads by removing adaptors and low quality bases using
Skewer (parameters "-z -m pe -n -q 26 -l 21") [103].
668
We used smudgeplot v0.1.3 (available at https://github.com/tbenavi1/smudgeplot) to
estimate ploidy levels. This method extracts from the read set unique kmer pairs that differ
by one SNP from each other. These kmer pairs are inferred to derive from heterozygous

genome regions. The sum of coverages of the kmer pairs is then compared against their
coverage ratio. This comparison separates different haplotype structures (**Supplementary**
Figure 1b). The most prevalent structure is then indicative of the overall ploidy of the
genome. We used this ploidy estimate in all species, except *A. vaga*. The most prevalent
structure suggested that this species is diploid. *A. vaga* is well characterized as tetraploid [58],
but we were unable to detect tetraploidy because homoeologs are too diverged to be
identified as such by the kmer-based smudgeplot method.

Using the inferred ploidy levels, we then estimated genome size and heterozygosity using an
extended version of GenomeScope [104]. GenomeScope estimates genome wide
heterozygosity via kmer spectra analysis, that is, by fitting a mixture model of evenly spaced
negative binomial distributions, where the number of fitted distributions is decided given the
input ploidy. Estimated distributions correspond to kmers that occur once, twice, etc., in the
genome. Fits are then used to estimate heterozygosity, the fraction of repeats in the
genome, as well as the 1n sequencing coverage. The latter is subsequently used for
estimation of genome size. The definition of heterozygosity for polyploids is not well
established (see **Box 3**), but GenomeScope distinguishes different types of heterozygous
loci in polyploids (as shown in **Figure 3**).

Kmer spectra analysis is affected by the choice of kmer length. Longer kmers require higher
sequencing coverage, but lead to more informative kmer spectra. We have chosen the
default kmer size 21 nt for all species except the marbled crayfish, where we chose kmer
length 17 nt due to low sequencing coverage.

We quantified transposable elements using DnaPipeTE v1.2 [105]. The method uses haploid
genome size (parameter -genome_size) to subsample sequencing reads to 0.5x coverage
(parameter -genome_coverage). Subsampled reads are then assembled using an assembler
that can deal with uneven coverages, and annotated using the database of known TEs. This
process is repeated three times (parameter -sample_number), and the union of results
represents the repeat library. Additionally, repeats are annotated as TEs if their sequence
matches known TEs by homology (for details see [105]). Our reported values of TE loads
include only repeats that were annotated as TEs, i.e., we did not include 'unknown' repeats
which consist of tandem repeats (satellite repeats), duplications or very divergent/unknown
TEs.

The palindrome analysis was based on genome assemblies and their published annotations,
from 27 samples of 22 species (annotations were not available for *D. pulex* and *A. rufus*).

We performed collinearity analysis using MCScanX (untagged version released 28.3.2013) [106], allowing even a single gene to form a collinear bloc (parameter -s) if there were fewer than 100 genes in between (parameter -m). The output was then filtered to contain only blocs on the same scaffold in a reverse order. Furthermore we filtered all the homologous gene pairs that have appeared on the same strand. All the remaining blocks are palindromes, blocs built of reverse complementary genes on the same scaffold. See **Supplementary Text S2** for more details.

References

1. Neiman, M., Lively, C. M. & Meirmans, S. Why sex? A pluralist approach revisited. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32,** 589–600 (2017).

2. Sharp, N. P. & Otto, S. P. Evolution of sex: Using experimental genomics to select among competing theories. *Bioessays* **38,** 751–757 (2016).

3. Bell, G. *The Masterpiece of Nature: The Evolution and Genetics of Sexuality*. (Univ of California Press, 1982).

4. Suomalainen, E., Saura, A. & Lokki, J. *Cytology and evolution in parthenogenesis*. (CRC Press, 1987).

5. Muller, H. J. The relation of recombination to mutational advance. *Mutat. Res.* **1,** 2–9 (1964).

6. Felsenstein, J. The evolutionary advantage of recombination. *Genetics* **78,** 737–756 (1974).

7. Keightley, P. D. & Otto, S. P. Interference among deleterious mutations favours sex and recombination in finite populations. *Nature* **443,** 89–92 (2006).

8. Birky, C. W., Jr. Heterozygosity, heteromorphy, and phylogenetic trees in asexual eukaryotes. *Genetics* **144,** 427–437 (1996).

9. Balloux, F., Lehmann, L. & de Meeûs, T. The population genetics of clonal and partially clonal diploids. *Genetics* **164,** 1635–1644 (2003).

10. Hickey, D. A. Selfish DNA: a sexually-transmitted nuclear parasite. *Genetics* **101,** 519–531 (1982).

11. Brandt, A. *et al.* Effective purifying selection in ancient asexual oribatid mites. *Nat.*
Commun. **8,** 873 (2017).

12. Fontaneto, D., Tang, C. Q., Obertegger, U., Leasi, F. & Barraclough, T. G. Different
diversification rates between sexual and asexual organisms. *Evol. Biol.* **39,** 262–270
(2012).

13. Arkhipova, I. R. & Rodriguez, F. Genetic and epigenetic changes involving
(retro)transposons in animal hybrids and polyploids. *Cytogenet. Genome Res.* **140,**
295–311 (2013).

14. Neiman, M., Sharbel, T. F. & Schwander, T. Genetic causes of transitions from sexual
reproduction to asexuality in plants and animals. *J. Evol. Biol.* **27,** 1346–1359 (2014).

15. Rodriguez, F. & Arkhipova, I. R. Transposable elements and polyploid evolution in
animals. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **49,** 115–123 (2018).

16. Warren, W. C. *et al.* Clonal polymorphism and high heterozygosity in the celibate
genome of the Amazon molly. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2,** 669–679 (2018).

17. Flot, J.-F. *et al.* Genomic evidence for ameiotic evolution in the bdelloid rotifer Adineta
vaga. *Nature* **500,** 453–457 (2013).

18. Nowell, R. W. *et al.* Comparative genomics of bdelloid rotifers: Insights from desiccating
and nondesiccating species. *PLoS Biol.* **16,** e2004830 (2018).

19. Kraaijeveld, K. *et al.* Decay of sexual trait genes in an asexual parasitoid wasp. *Genome*
Biol. Evol. **8,** 3685–3695 (2016).

20. Bast, J. *et al.* No accumulation of transposable elements in asexual arthropods. *Mol.*
Biol. Evol. **33,** 697–706 (2016).

21. Lindsey, A. R. I. *et al.* Comparative genomics of the miniature wasp and pest control
agent Trichogramma pretiosum. *BMC Biol.* **16,** 54 (2018).

22. Oxley, P. R. *et al.* The genome of the clonal raider ant Cerapachys biroi. *Curr. Biol.* **24,**
451–458 (2014).

23. Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva, A. *et al.* Coping with living in the soil: the genome of the
parthenogenetic springtail Folsomia candida. *BMC Genomics* **18,** 493 (2017).

24. Tucker, A. E., Ackerman, M. S., Eads, B. D., Xu, S. & Lynch, M. Population-genomic

insights into the evolutionary origin and fate of obligately asexual Daphnia pulex. *Proc.*

Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **110,** 15740–15745 (2013).

25. Xu, S., Omilian, A. R. & Cristescu, M. E. High rate of large-scale hemizygous deletions

in asexually propagating Daphnia: implications for the evolution of sex. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*

28, 335–342 (2011).

26. Jiang, X., Tang, H., Ye, Z. & Lynch, M. Insertion polymorphisms of mobile genetic

elements in sexual and asexual populations of Daphnia pulex. *Genome Biol. Evol.*

(2017). doi:10.1093/gbe/evw302

27. Gutekunst, J. *et al.* Clonal genome evolution and rapid invasive spread of the marbled

crayfish. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2,** 567–573 (2018).

28. Hiraki, H. *et al.* Genome analysis of Diploscapter coronatus: insights into molecular

peculiarities of a nematode with parthenogenetic reproduction. *BMC Genomics* **18,** 478

(2017).

29. Fradin, H. *et al.* Genome architecture and evolution of a unichromosomal asexual

nematode. *Curr. Biol.* **27,** 2928–2939.e6 (2017).

30. Schiffer, P. H. *et al.* Signatures of the evolution of parthenogenesis and cryptobiosis in

the genomes of panagrolaimid nematodes. *bioRxiv* 159152 (2017). doi:10.1101/159152

31. Schiffer, P. H. *et al.* The gene regulatory program of Acrobeloides nanus reveals

conservation of phylum-specific expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115,** 4459–

4464 (2018).

32. Blanc-Mathieu, R. *et al.* Hybridization and polyploidy enable genomic plasticity without

sex in the most devastating plant-parasitic nematodes. *PLoS Genet.* **13,** e1006777

(2017).

33. Abad, P. *et al.* Genome sequence of the metazoan plant-parasitic nematode

Meloidogyne incognita. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **26,** 909–915 (2008).

34. Szitenberg, A. *et al.* Comparative genomics of apomictic root-knot nematodes:

hybridization, ploidy, and dynamic genome change. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **9,** 2844–2861

(2017).

35. Szitenberg, A. *et al.* Genetic Drift, Not Life History or RNAi, Determine Long-Term

Evolution of Transposable Elements. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **8,** 2964–2978 (2016).

36. Lunt, D. H., Kumar, S., Koutsovoulos, G. & Blaxter, M. L. The complex hybrid origins of

the root knot nematodes revealed through comparative genomics. *PeerJ* **2,** e356

(2014).

37. Koutsovoulos, G. *et al.* No evidence for extensive horizontal gene transfer in the

genome of the tardigrade Hypsibius dujardini. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **113,** 5053–

5058 (2016).

38. Hashimoto, T. *et al.* Extremotolerant tardigrade genome and improved radiotolerance of

human cultured cells by tardigrade-unique protein. *Nat. Commun.* **7,** 12808 (2016).

39. Cavalier-Smith, T. Origins of the machinery of recombination and sex. *Heredity* **88,**

125–141 (2002).

40. Schultz, R. J. Unisexual fish: laboratory synthesis of a 'species'. *Science* **179,** 180–181

(1973).

41. van der Kooi, C. J., Matthey-Doret, C. & Schwander, T. Evolution and comparative

ecology of parthenogenesis in haplodiploid arthropods. *Evol Lett* **1,** 304–316 (2017).

42. Engelstädter, J. Asexual but not clonal: evolutionary processes in automictic

populations. *Genetics* **206,** 993–1009 (2017).

43. Lenormand, T., Engelstädter, J., Johnston, S. E., Wijnker, E. & Haag, C. R. Evolutionary

mysteries in meiosis. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **371,** (2016).

44. Melters, D. P., Paliulis, L. V., Korf, I. F. & Chan, S. W. L. Holocentric chromosomes:

convergent evolution, meiotic adaptations, and genomic analysis. *Chromosome Res.*

20, 579–593 (2012).

45. Cifuentes, M., Grandont, L., Moore, G., Chèvre, A. M. & Jenczewski, E. Genetic

regulation of meiosis in polyploid species: new insights into an old question. *New Phytol.*

186, 29–36 (2010).

46. Schurko, A. M., Neiman, M. & Logsdon, J. M. Signs of sex: what we know and how we

know it. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **24,** 208–217 (2009).

47. Neiman, M., Meirmans, S. & Meirmans, P. G. What can asexual lineage age tell us

about the maintenance of sex? *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1168,** 185–200 (2009).

48. Hill, W. G. & Robertson, A. The effect of linkage on limits to artificial selection. *Genet.*

Res. **8,** 269–294 (1966).

49. Fisher, R. A. *The genetical theory of natural selection*. **154,** (Clarendon Press, 1930).

50. Muller, H. J. Some genetic aspects of sex. *Am. Nat.* 118–138 (1932).

51. Neiman, M., Meirmans, P. G., Schwander, T. & Meirmans, S. Sex in the wild: How and

why field-based studies contribute to solving the problem of sex. *Evolution* **72,** 1194–

1203 (2018).

52. Bast, J. *et al.* Consequences of asexuality in natural populations: insights from stick

insects. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35,** 1668–1677 (2018).

53. Hollister, J. D. *et al.* Recurrent loss of sex is associated with accumulation of deleterious

mutations in Oenothera. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **32,** 896–905 (2015).

54. Ament-Velásquez, S. L. *et al.* Population genomics of sexual and asexual lineages in

fissiparous ribbon worms (Lineus, Nemertea): hybridization, polyploidy and the

Meselson effect. *Mol. Ecol.* **25,** 3356–3369 (2016).

55. Schön, I., Martens, K. & Dijk, P. van. *Lost sex: the evolutionary biology of*

parthenogensis. (Springer, 2009).

56. Hartl, D. L. & Clark, A. G. *Principles of population genetics*. **116,** (Sinauer associates

Sunderland, 1997).

57. Glover, N. M., Redestig, H. & Dessimoz, C. Homoeologs: what are they and how do we

infer them? *Trends Plant Sci.* **21,** 609–621 (2016).

58. Mark Welch, D. B., Mark Welch, J. L. & Meselson, M. Evidence for degenerate

tetraploidy in bdelloid rotifers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **105,** 5145–5149 (2008).

59. Weir, W. *et al.* Population genomics reveals the origin and asexual evolution of human

infective trypanosomes. *Elife* **5,** 1–14 (2016).

60. Rozen, S. *et al.* Abundant gene conversion between arms of palindromes in human and

ape Y chromosomes. *Nature* **423,** 873–876 (2003).

61. Marais, G. A. B., Campos, P. R. A. & Gordo, I. Can intra-Y gene conversion oppose the

degeneration of the human Y chromosome? A simulation study. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **2,**

347–357 (2010).

62. Trombetta, B. & Cruciani, F. Y chromosome palindromes and gene conversion. *Hum.*

Genet. **136,** 605–619 (2017).

63. Fan, S. & Meyer, A. Evolution of genomic structural variation and genomic architecture

in the adaptive radiations of African cichlid fishes. *Front. Genet.* **5,** 163 (2014).

64. Chen, L., Chamberlain, A. J., Reich, C. M., Daetwyler, H. D. & Hayes, B. J. Detection

and validation of structural variations in bovine whole-genome sequence data. *Genet.*

Sel. Evol. **49,** 13 (2017).

65. Hum, Y. F. & Jinks-Robertson, S. Mitotic gene conversion tracts associated with repair

of a defined double-strand break in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics* **207,** 115–128

(2017).

66. Lee, P. S. *et al.* A fine-structure map of spontaneous mitotic crossovers in the yeast

Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *PLoS Genet.* **5,** e1000410 (2009).

67. Keith, N. *et al.* High mutational rates of large-scale duplication and deletion in Daphnia

pulex. *Genome Res.* **26,** 60–69 (2016).

68. Wicker, T., Sabot, F., Hua-Van, A. & Bennetzen, J. L. A unified classification system for

eukaryotic transposable elements. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **8,** 973–982 (2007).

69. Burt, A. & Trivers, R. *Genes in conflict: the biology of selfish genetic elements*.

(Belknapp Press, 2006).

70. Doolittle, W. F. & Sapienza, C. Selfish genes, the phenotype paradigm and genome

evolution. *Nature* **284,** 601–603 (1980).

71. Le Rouzic, A., Boutin, T. S. & Capy, P. Long-term evolution of transposable elements.

Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **104,** 19375–19380 (2007).

72. Hua-Van, A., Le Rouzic, A., Boutin, T. S., Filée, J. & Capy, P. The struggle for life of the

genome's selfish architects. *Biol. Direct* **6,** 19 (2011).

73. Zeyl, C., Bell, G. & Green, D. M. Sex and the spread of retrotransposon Ty3 in

experimental populations of Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics* **143,** 1567–1577

(1996).

74. Nuzhdin, S. V. & Petrov, D. A. Transposable elements in clonal lineages: lethal

hangover from sex. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond.* **79,** 33–41 (2003).

75. Wright, S. & Finnegan, D. Genome evolution: Sex and the transposable element. *Curr.*

Biol. **11,** R296–R299 (2001).

76. Arkhipova, I. & Meselson, M. Transposable elements in sexual and ancient asexual

taxa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **97,** 14473–14477 (2000).

77. Canapa, A., Barucca, M., Biscotti, M. A., Forconi, M. & Olmo, E. Transposons, genome

size, and evolutionary insights in animals. *Cytogenet. Genome Res.* **147,** 217–239

(2015).

78. Kofler, R., Betancourt, A. J. & Schlötterer, C. Sequencing of pooled DNA samples (Pool-

Seq) uncovers complex dynamics of transposable element insertions in Drosophila

melanogaster. *PLoS Genet.* **8,** e1002487 (2012).

79. Aravin, A. a., Hannon, G. J. & Brennecke, J. The Piwi-piRNA pathway provides an

adaptive defense in the transposon arms race. *Science* **318,** 761–764 (2007).

80. Agren, J. A., Greiner, S., Johnson, M. T. & Wright, S. I. No evidence that sex and

transposable elements drive genome size variation in evening primroses. *Evolution* **69,**

1053–1062 (2015).

81. Agren, J. A. & Wright, S. I. Co-evolution between transposable elements and their

hosts: a major factor in genome size evolution? *Chromosome Res.* **19,** 777–786 (2011).

82. Romero-Soriano, V. *et al.* Transposable element misregulation is linked to the

divergence between parental piRNA pathways in Drosophila hybrids. *Genome Biol.*

Evol. **9,** 1450–1470 (2017).

83. van der Kooi, C. J. & Schwander, T. On the fate of sexual traits under asexuality. *Biol.*

Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc. **89,** 805–819 (2014).

84. Schwander, T., Crespi, B. J., Gries, R. & Gries, G. Neutral and selection-driven decay of

sexual traits in asexual stick insects. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **280,** 20130823 (2013).

85. Schurko, A. M. & Logsdon, J. M. Using a meiosis detection toolkit to investigate ancient

asexual 'scandals' and the evolution of sex. *Bioessays* **30,** 579–589 (2008).

86. Tvedte, E. S., Forbes, A. A. & Logsdon, J. M., Jr. Retention of core meiotic genes

across diverse Hymenoptera. *J. Hered.* **108,** 791–806 (2017).

87. Danchin, E. G. J. *et al.* Multiple lateral gene transfers and duplications have promoted

plant parasitism ability in nematodes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107,** 17651–17656

(2010).

88. Gladyshev, E. A., Meselson, M. & Arkhipova, I. R. Massive horizontal gene transfer in

bdelloid rotifers. *Science* **320,** 1210–1213 (2008).

89. Boschetti, C. *et al.* Biochemical Diversification through Foreign Gene Expression in

Bdelloid Rotifers. *PLoS Genet.* **8,** e1003035 (2012).

90. Boto, L. Horizontal gene transfer in the acquisition of novel traits by metazoans. *Proc.*

Biol. Sci. **281,** 20132450 (2014).

91. Lespinet, O., Wolf, Y. I., Koonin, E. V. & Aravind, L. The role of lineage-specific gene

family expansion in the evolution of eukaryotes. *Genome Res.* **12,** 1048–1059 (2002).

92. Wallach, J. D., Boyack, K. W. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. Reproducible research practices,

transparency, and open access data in the biomedical literature, 2015-2017. *PLoS Biol.*

16, e2006930 (2018).

93. Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D. & Simonsohn, U. False-positive psychology: undisclosed

flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant.

Psychol. Sci. **22,** 1359–1366 (2011).

94. Gelman, A. & Loken, E. The garden of forking paths: Why multiple comparisons can be

a problem, even when there is no 'fishing expedition' or 'p-hacking' and the research

hypothesis was posited ahead of time. (2013).

95. Veresoglou, S. D., Halley, J. M. & Rillig, M. C. Extinction risk of soil biota. *Nat. Commun.*

6, 8862 (2015).

96. Norton, R. A. & Palmer, S. C. The distribution, mechanisms and evolutionary

significance of parthenogenesis in oribatid mites. in *The Acari: Reproduction,*

development and life-history strategies (eds. Schuster, R. & Murphy, P. W.) 107–136

(Springer Netherlands, 1991).

97. Archetti, M. Complementation, genetic conflict, and the evolution of sex and

recombination. *J. Hered.* **101,** 21–33 (2010).

98. Archetti, M. Recombination and loss of complementation: a more than two-fold cost for

parthenogenesis. *J. Evol. Biol.* **17,** 1084–1097 (2004).

99. Szövényi, P. *et al.* Efficient purging of deleterious mutations in plants with haploid

selfing. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **6,** 1238–1252 (2014).

100.Glémin, S. & Ronfort, J. Adaptation and maladaptation in selfing and outcrossing

species: new mutations versus standing variation. *Evolution* **67,** 225–240 (2013).

101.Stapley, J., Feulner, P. G. D., Johnston, S. E., Santure, A. W. & Smadja, C. M.

Recombination: the good, the bad and the variable. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol.*

Sci. **372,** (2017).

102.Bachtrog, D. Y-chromosome evolution: emerging insights into processes of Y-

chromosome degeneration. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **14,** 113–124 (2013).

103.Jiang, H., Lei, R., Ding, S.-W. & Zhu, S. Skewer: a fast and accurate adapter trimmer for

next-generation sequencing paired-end reads. *BMC Bioinformatics* **15,** 182 (2014).

104.Vurture, G. W. *et al.* GenomeScope: fast reference-free genome profiling from short

reads. *Bioinformatics* **33,** 2202–2204 (2017).

105.Goubert, C. *et al.* De novo assembly and annotation of the Asian tiger mosquito (Aedes

albopictus) repeatome with dnaPipeTE from raw genomic reads and comparative

analysis with the yellow fever mosquito (Aedes aegypti). *Genome Biol. Evol.* **7,** 1192–

1205 (2015).

106.Wang, Y. *et al.* MCScanX: a toolkit for detection and evolutionary analysis of gene

synteny and collinearity. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **40,** e49 (2012).

107.Handoo, Z. A. *et al.* Morphological, molecular, and differential-host characterization of

Meloidogyne floridensis n. sp. (Nematoda: Meloidogynidae), a root-knot nematode

parasitizing peach in Florida. *J. Nematol.* **36,** 20–35 (2004).

108.Lahl, V., Sadler, B. & Schierenberg, E. Egg development in parthenogenetic

nematodes: variations in meiosis and axis formation. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* **50,** 393–398

(2006).

109.Waterhouse, R. M. *et al.* BUSCO applications from quality assessments to gene

prediction and phylogenomics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35,** 543–548 (2017).

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Philipp H. Schiffer, Jean-Francois Flot, Reuben

W. Nowell, Yuko Ulrich, Dave Lunt, Julian Gutekunst and Mark Blaxter for comments and

discussions. We would also like to thank all the authors who deposited their data in public

databases with correct metadata and all the authors who were helpful when we asked for

data or clarifications.

Funding: This study was supported by funding from Swiss SNF grants PP00P3_170627

and CRSII3_160723.

Author contributions: K.S.J. and T.S. conceived the study, K.S.J. and J.B. collected the

data; K.S.J. and T.R.R.B. performed the analyses; K.S.J., J.B. and T.S. reviewed the

literature; K.S.J., T.S., J.B. and M.R.R. wrote the manuscript; All authors were involved in

discussions about results and interpretations.

Competing interests: None declared.

979 Supplementary materials

980 S1 Ploidy and reproductive mode of *M. floridensis*

The nematode *M. floridensis* was reported as a diploid species with a mechanism of

asexuality functionally equivalent to terminal fusion (absence of the 2nd meiotic division),

based on cytological analyses [107]. Our analyses indicate that *M. floridensis* is triploid rather

than diploid (**Supplementary Figure 1**), and the heterozygosity detected in our and previous

studies [107] is inconsistent with classical terminal fusion (which should result in largely

homozygous genomes, see Box 2 and **Figure 2**). Terminal fusion can be associated with

high heterozygosity under inverted meiosis (which is most likely the case in nematodes of

the genus *Acrobeloides* [108]. However, inverted meiosis in *M. floridensis* is rather unlikely

given that all other meiotic species in the genus have regular meiosis. We therefore believe

that the study of Handoo et al is either based on an unusual *M. floridensis* strain that has not

been used in any genome study thus far or that the cytology inferred by Handoo et al is not

correct. These interpretations are further supported by the fact that Handoo et al report on
analyses of large numbers of males of *M. floridensis*, while males are unknown/unusual for
the strains used in the genome studies. Unfortunately, it is impossible to evaluate the
evidence that supported diploidy and terminal fusion in *M. floridensis* as the study by
Handoo et al does not include pictures of karyotypes or egg cells (which is very unusual for
this type of research). Given the genomic evidence is very clear, we consider *M. floridensis*
to be triploid for all our analyses and the cellular mechanism of asexuality as "unknown".

Supplementary Figure 1: Genomic evidence of triploidy in *M. floridensis*. a | the
smudgeplot shows dominance of a triploid (AAB) genome structure. The smudges
corresponding to higher ploïdies are likely originating from paralogs. The diploid kmer pairs
(AB) represent situations where the third allele is diverged from the two more than one
nucleotide. **b |** kmer spectra analysis of *M. floridensis* shows a typical triploid genome
structure with haploid, diploid and triploid peaks and expected distances from each other.

S2 Palindrome detection

Palindromes are formed by two homologous reverse complementary sequences on the
same chromosome (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Palindromes can facilitate gene conversion
and therefore help to escape mutational meltdown via Muller's ratchet [61,62]. To test if they
play such a role in asexual organisms we identify palindromes using colinearity analysis
imlplemented in program MCScanX [106]. The default parameters of the software (used in the
genome studies of asexual species, personal communication of the authors of [17,23]) define a
collinear block as a sequence of at least 5 genes that are no more than 25 genes apart from
each other and then search for such blocks with palindromic arrangement. We have
reanalysed the genomes allowing for short palindromes of a single gene because a

palindrome could carry fewer than five genes and still be biologically relevant. Detected

collinear blocks were filtered to contain only reverse complementary collinear blocks on the

same chromosome, since only such structures have the capacity to form a hairpin

(**Supplementary Figure 2**).

1020

We note that it is important to check consistency between the biological interpretation of

results, and the methods used to infer them. The bioinformatics pipelines used to detect

palindromes are geared towards detecting large repeated blocks with large gaps. We argue

that small blocks (as small as one gene), but with no gaps within the inverted repeat may

also generate gene conversion. Thus, re-screening the published genomes for palindromes

allowed us to provide a more robust and unbiased view of the importance of palindromes for

the evolution of asexual species. (cit).

1028

1029

1030   **Supplementary Figure 2: Palindrome structure.** The two homologous reverse

1031   complementary regions (arms) of a palindrome are located on the same chromosome. This

1032   organisation allows for the formation of a hairpin and can facilitate gene conversion between

1033   the palindrome arms.

1034

Transposable elements

1035
1036

1037   **Supplementary Figure 3: Transposable elements with respect to reproduction mode**

1038   **and hybrid origin.** Neither hybrid origin (p-value = 0.36) nor cellular mechanism of

1039   asexuality (p-value = 0.84) are strong drivers of the TE content in asexual animals.

1040   ## S3 Conserved gene content

1041

We aimed to provide insights into gene duplications and losses by quantifying conserved

single copy orthologs (BUSCO genes) [109]. BUSCO genes are defined as a set of genes that

are present as a single copy in at least 90% of species inventoried in a curated database. All

of the species used to build this database are sexual, and we initially hypothesised that both

higher duplication rates and gene losses in asexual as compared to sexual species could be

reflected in the percentages of missing and duplicated BUSCO genes in the analyzed

asexual genomes. However, organisms that are highly heterozygous are prone to separate

assembly of homologous haplotypes. In such split genome assemblies, BUSCO genes will

falsely appear to be duplicated. To investigate whether split haplotype assemblies are of

concern in the analyzed asexual genomes, we deduced the level of haplotype splitting in the

assembled genomes by dividing the length of each assembly by the haploid genome size

estimated from the read data with genomescope (higher frequencies of separate haplotype

assemblies result in higher assembly length to haploid genome size ratios). We indeed

found that BUSCO genes appear to be duplicated in genome assemblies consisting of split

haplotypes, with the highest level of "artificial duplication" found in polyploid species of hybrid

origin (**Supplementary Figure 4a**).

1058

1059
1060 **Supplementary Figure 4: Conserved single copy orthologs. a** | the fraction of duplicated

1061 BUSCO genes is correlated to the ratio of assembly length to haploid genome size. **b** |

1062 yellow bars show a proportion of BUSCO genes found in individual genomes. The dashed

1063 line indicates the expected level.

1064

1065 **Supplementary Table 1: Overview of analysed species.** This information was collected

1066 directly from the cited literature.

1067

Supplementary Table 2: Genomic features calculated from raw data. We used unified

methods to estimate basic genomic properties directly from sequencing reads. Ploidy was

estimated using smudgeplot for all species but *A. vaga* (see section **Heterozygosity**

structure in polyploids for details). Genome size, heterozygosity and repeats were

estimated using GenomeScope. Repeats denote the fraction of the genome occurring in

more than one copy. The classified repeats, TEs and other types of classified repeats, were
estimated using DnaPipeTE.

1075

1076   https://github.com/KamilSJaron/genomic-features-of-asexual-
1077   animals/blob/master/tables/genome_table_infered_from_reads.tsv

1078

Supplementary Table 3: genome assemblies: size, number of scaffolds, N50, BUSCO,
number of annotated genes. Statistics were calculated from the published genome
assemblies and genome annotations shared by authors. BUSCO genes were searched
using the metazoan database for all the non-nematode species. Nematodes are notoriously
known for the high turnover of genes and we therefore used nematode specific BUSCO
genes. The number of annotated genes were calculated as the number of lines in the
annotation with the tag "gene"

1086

1087   https://github.com/KamilSJaron/genomic-features-of-asexual-
1088   animals/blob/master/tables/assembly_table.tsv