1   **Working Title**: Elaborate expansion of syntenic V1R hotspots correlates with high species

2   diversity in nocturnal mouse and dwarf lemurs

Authors: Kelsie E. Hunnicutt[1,8][†], George P. Tiley[1][†], Rachel C. Williams[1,2], Peter A. Larsen[1,9],

Marina B. Blanco[2], Rodin M. Rasoloarison[3,4], C. Ryan Campbell[1], Kevin Zhu[5], David W.

Weisrock[8], Hiroaki Matsunami[5,7] & Anne D. Yoder[1*]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

[2]Duke Lemur Center, Duke University, Durham, NC 27705

[3]Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology Unit, German Primate Centre, 37077 Göttingen,

Germany

[4]Département de Biologie Animale, Université d'Antananarivo, BP 906, Antananarivo 101,

Madagascar

[5]Department of Molecular Genetics and Microbiology, Duke University Medical Center,

Durham, NC 27710

[6]Department of Biology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506

[7]Department of Neurobiology, Duke Institute for Brain Sciences, Duke University Medical

Center, Durham, NC 27710

[8]Current address: Department of Biological Sciences, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208

[9]Current address: Department of Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, University of Minnesota,

Saint Paul, MN 55108

[†]Equal contributors

*Author for Correspondence: Anne D. Yoder, Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, USA, 919-660-7366, anne.yoder@duke.edu

Keywords (6): speciation, pheromone receptors, synteny, gene family evolution, nocturnality, vomeronasal

Abstract

Sensory gene families are of special interest, both for what they can tell us about

molecular evolution, and for what they imply as mediators of social communication. The

vomeronasal type-1 receptors (V1Rs) have often been hypothesized as playing a fundamental

role in driving or maintaining species boundaries given their likely function as mediators of

intraspecific mate choice, particularly in nocturnal mammals. Here, we employ a comparative

genomic approach for revealing patterns of V1R evolution within primates, with a special focus

on the small-bodied nocturnal mouse and dwarf lemurs of Madagascar (genera *Microcebus* and

Cheirogaleus, respectively). By doubling the existing genomic resources for strepsirrhine

primates (i.e., the lemurs and lorises), we find that the highly-speciose and morphologically-

cryptic mouse lemurs have experienced an elaborate proliferation of V1Rs that we argue is

functionally related to their capacity for rapid lineage diversification. Contrary to a previous

study that found equivalent degrees of V1R diversity in diurnal and nocturnal lemurs, our study

finds a strong correlation between nocturnality and V1R elaboration, with nocturnal lemurs

showing elaborate V1R repertoires and diurnal lemurs showing less diverse repertoires.

Recognized subfamilies among V1Rs show unique signatures of diversifying positive selection,

as might be expected if they have each evolved to respond to specific stimuli. Further, a detailed

syntenic comparison of mouse lemurs with mouse (genus *Mus*) and other mammalian outgroups

shows that orthologous mammalian subfamilies, predicted to be of ancient origin, tend to cluster

in a densely populated region across syntenic chromosomes that we refer to as V1R "hotspots."

Introduction

  The evolutionary dynamics of sensory gene families are of fundamental interest as a model for how molecular evolutionary processes can shape the content and structure of genomes and for their ability to characterize the life history and ecological traits of organisms. Vomeronasal type-1 receptor genes (V1Rs) comprise one such gene family and have been the subject of increasing interest in both the molecular genetics (e.g., Adipietro et al. 2012) and evolutionary genetics (e.g., Yohe and Brand 2018) communities. Vomerolfaction is a form of chemosensation that mediates semiochemical detection and occurs in the vomeronasal organ (VNO) of mammals (Leinders-Zufall et al. 2000). V1Rs are expressed on vomeronasal sensory neurons in the VNO and have been demonstrated to detect pheromones in mice (Boschat et al. 2002; Haga-Yamanaka et al. 2014). For example, impaired vomeronasal function in mice, either through a knockout of V1Rs or removal of the VNO, alters appropriate chemosensory behaviors such as conspecific avoidance of sick animals, interspecies defensive cues, male sexual behavior, and maternal aggression (Del Punta et al. 2002; Papes et al. 2010; Boillat et al. 2015). Thus, the evolution of V1Rs can have direct consequences for both the emitter and the receiver of pheromone signals, with ample evidence indicating that molecular evolution of V1Rs is associated with the speciation process (Lane et al. 2002; Kurzweil et al. 2009; Hohenbrink et al. 2012; Nikaido et al. 2014).

  V1Rs are ideally suited for study within the context of "sensory drive" wherein mate preferences in communication systems diverge in the face of novel environmental opportunity (Boughman 2002). Communication mechanisms for mate recognition have been recognized as an important component for driving rapid reproductive isolation (Mendelson 2003; Dopman et al. 2010; Servedio and Boughman 2017; Brand et al. 2019) and with the reinforcement of species

boundaries (Servedio and Noor 2003). Sensory drive can affect diverging populations in two

ways by targeting the pheromone receptors and/or their signaling molecules. As examples,

adaptation of a likely V1R signal in mice, androgen binding protein, is associated with

assortative mating between *Mus musculus* subspecies (Karn et al. 2010; Chung et al. 2017; Hurst

et al. 2017) just as fixation of nonsynonymous polymorphisms among V1Rs is associated with

the speciation of *Mus spretus* and *Mus musculus* (Kurzweil et al. 2009). Moreover, it has been

shown that differential expression of vomeronasal and olfactory receptor genes, including V1Rs,

is associated with assortative mating in a pair of house mouse subspecies (Loire et al. 2017) and

is likely reinforcing the subspecies along their hybrid zone.

The V1R gene family has experienced many duplications and losses in the evolutionary

history of mammals, and the availability of duplicate copies can allow for divergence among

sequences, gene expression, and ultimately function (e.g. Lynch and Conery 2000; Des Marais

and Rausher 2008). Though not directly addressed in this study, it is worth noting that changes in

gene expression often occur rapidly after gene duplication events (Makova and Li 2003; Keller

and Yi 2014; Guschanski et al. 2017) and are often accompanied by shifts in rates of molecular

evolution (Chen et al. 2010; Yang and Gaut 2011). Although the mechanisms that explain

variable rates of molecular evolution, specifically the nonsynonymous to synonymous

substitution rate ratio (*dN/dS*), are complex, there is some interdependence on expression levels

(O'Toole et al. 2018) and genome architecture (Dai et al. 2014; Xie et al. 2016). The V1R gene

family demonstrates structural complexity (Ohara et al. 2009; Yohe et al. 2018), and gene family

expansions and directional selection acting on duplicate copies may be important for the

maintenance of species boundaries where vomerolfaction is linked with assortative mating (Luo

et al. 2003; Isogai et al. 2011; Fu et al. 2015).

Here, we present a comparative genomic study of V1R evolution within the lemuriform

primates, primarily focusing on the mouse lemurs of Madagascar (genus *Microcebus*). Mouse

lemurs are perhaps the most species-rich clade of living primates (Hotaling et al. 2016), and are

well-known for high levels of interspecific genetic divergence though with nearly uniform

morphological phenotypes. They have thus come to be regarded as a classic example of a

cryptic species radiation, perhaps related to their nocturnal lifestyle (Yoder et al. 2016). Mouse

lemurs, and the closely-related dwarf lemurs, have elaborate olfactory communication behaviors

that are associated with adaptive strategies such as predator recognition (Sündermann et al.

2008), fecundity (Drea 2015), and even biased sex ratios (Perret 1996; Perret and Colas 1997).

V1Rs take on particular interest in mouse lemurs as we hypothesize that their observed role in

both speciation and in the maintenance of species boundaries within *Mus* may also apply to this

speciose clade of primates (Smadja et al. 2015; Loire et al. 2017). We hypothesize that among

primates, mouse lemurs will show signatures of sensory drive via genomic elaboration of the

V1R complex and evidence of positive selection acting on V1R genes.

There are numerous lines of evidence to lead us to this hypothesis: 1) Previous studies

have indicated that V1Rs within the lemuriform clade have evolved under pervasive positive

selection 5/22/19 3:35:00 PM, 2) that the majority of gene copies are intact (Young et al. 2010;

Larsen et al. 2014), and 3) that the differential expression of a large number of vomeronasal

receptors in both the VNO and main olfactory epithelium of mouse lemurs are associated with

different behaviors and chemical signals (Hohenbrink et al. 2014). In fact, along with murids,

opossums, and platypus, mouse lemurs have been reported to have among the largest V1R

repertoires found in mammals (Young et al. 2010). Even so, numerous obstacles such as

complexities of chemical background, chemical signals, and the genetic basis of chemosensation

complicate both ecological and experimental approaches for differentiating between cause and

effect in the speciation process (Yohe and Brand 2018). This is particularly problematic for

studies of mouse lemurs given their remote geographic distribution, nocturnal life history, and

endangered status. Thus, we take a comparative genomic approach for reconstructing the

evolutionary dynamics of the V1R gene family within the small-bodied and nocturnal mouse and

dwarf lemurs (family, Cheirogaleidae).

A Comparative Genomic Approach

V1R loci are highly repetitive and they, along with their surrounding regions, are

notoriously challenging for genome assembly. Though previous studies have used targeted

sequencing or short-read sequencing to examine the evolutionary dynamics of V1R expansions

in a limited number of species (Young et al. 2010; Hohenbrink et al. 2012; Yoder et al. 2014),

strepsirrhine primates have until recently remained woefully underrepresented in genomic

databases (Perry et al. 2012; Meyer et al. 2015; Larsen et al. 2017; Hawkins et al. 2018). Here,

we take advantage of the chromosome-level assembly of the gray mouse lemur, *Microcebus*

murinus, along with short-read sequencing in related species, to characterize the V1R repertoires

for lemuriform primates. Recent improvements using long-read sequencing of the mouse lemur

genome (Larsen et al. 2017) improve our ability to characterize the V1R repertoire (Larsen et al.

2014) and allow for comparisons of the genomic architecture of V1R-containing regions in

expanded and contracted V1R repertoires across mammals.

In this study, we have sequenced and assembled seven new cheirogaleid genomes, with a

particular focus on the mouse lemurs. Further, to explore intraspecific copy number variation and

evaluate the effects of assembly error on V1R repertoire counts, we resequenced and *de novo*

assembled genomes from eight *M. murinus* individuals from a captive breeding colony. Our

study thus serves as a timely companion to two recent overviews of comparative genomic studies

for illuminating the evolutionary and life-history dynamics of chemosensory gene family

evolution in vertebrates (Bear et al. 2016; Hughes et al. 2018). A comparative genomic approach

allows us to explore classic predictions of gene-family evolution, namely, that genomic drift can

operate at very fine scales to produce high intraspecific copy number variation (Nozawa et al.

2007) and that gene-family evolution is often marked by a strong birth-death process over

phylogenetic time scales (Nei et al. 1997; Csűrös and Miklos 2009; Hughes et al. 2018). The

latter question is of particular interest for V1R evolution given that adaptive pressures on these

genes makes them highly vulnerable to pseudogenization in cases of relaxed selection, thus

yielding the observed correlations between levels of V1R ornamentation and diverse adaptive

regimes. An overview of primates shows that those with elaborate representation of subfamilies

have a strong reliance on chemosensory communication whereas those with depauperate V1R

representation rely on alternative mechanisms for inter- and intra-specific communication (Yoder

and Larsen 2014).

These new genomic resources have also allowed us to address a number of questions

regarding rates of molecular evolution in V1Rs. Divergent gene function following gene

duplication predicts that some signature of positive selection should be evident in the gene

sequences (Zhang et al. 1998), but it remains unknown if selection has acted pervasively over

time or has occurred in episodic bursts prior to the diversification of mouse lemurs. We might

anticipate episodic positive selection to be the primary mechanism if purifying selection has been

operating at more recent time scales to preserve gene function among duplicate copies. For

strepsirrhine primates (i.e., the lemurs and lorises), pervasive positive selection has been detected

at the interspecific level (Hohenbrink et al. 2012; Yoder et al. 2014), while strong purifying

selection has been found within populations. Here we disentangle pervasive versus episodic

positive selection among V1Rs and show that both gene duplication and rates of molecular

evolution have been active in shaping expanded V1R repertoires among the dwarf and mouse

lemurs. Moreover, through comparison with *Mus* and other mammals, we show that orthologous

subfamilies tend to cluster in a densely populated region on syntenic chromosomes that we refer

to as V1R "hotspots."

Results and Discussion

Novel genome assemblies of several strepsirrhine primates

We *de novo* assembled seven novel strepsirrhine genomes: *Microcebus griseorufus*, *M.*

ravelobensis, *M. mittermeieri*, *M. tavaratra*, *Mirza zaza*, *Cheirogaleus sibreei* and *C. medius*.

These efforts have doubled the number of publicly available genomes for the Strepsirrhini with a

specific focus on the dwarf and mouse lemur clade. Excluding *C. medius*, the seven genomes

were sequenced to an average depth of coverage between 26x and 45x with scaffold N50s of 17-

76kb (Supplementary Table S1). The *C. medius* reference genome was assembled using Dovetail

Genomics to an average depth of coverage of 110x and a scaffold N50 of approximately 50Mb

(Williams et al. 2019). We evaluated assembly completeness using the Benchmarking Universal

Single-Copy Orthologs tool, BUSCO (Simão et al. 2015), which assesses genomes for the

presence of complete near-universal single-copy orthologs (Supplementary Figure S1). The

assemblies recovered between 77.2% and 92.3% of the mammalian BUSCO gene set. We also

resequenced eight *M. murinus* individuals, with one duplicate individual (Campbell et al. 2019),

and here have *de novo* assembled genomes for each individual with 21x-29x effective coverage

using the 10x Genomics Supernova pipeline. The additional scaffolding information provided by

the 10x Genomics linked-reads resulted in scaffold N50s of 0.6-1.2 Mb. BUSCO analyses

revealed that the resequenced assemblies recovered between 89.9% and 95.5% of the

mammalian gene set. A denser sampling of genomes within Cheirogaleidae not only provides an

opportunity for illuminating patterns of V1R gene family evolution but also promotes greater

understanding of the molecular evolution of primate and strepsirrhine-specific genomes. Genome

resequencing of *M. murinus* individuals has allowed investigation of intraspecific V1R copy

number variation as well as questions regarding microevolutionary processes and gene family

evolution (Park et al. 2011).

The monophyletic genus *Microcebus* contains 24 named species (Hotaling et al. 2016),

and our results clearly demonstrate that the clade has a uniquely complex V1R repertoire

compared to other primates thus far characterized (Figure 1A and B). Contrary to a previous

study suggesting that V1R expansion is ubiquitous across the lemuriform clade (Yoder et al.

2014), increased sampling reveals that expansion has been profound in the nocturnal dwarf and

mouse lemurs. This is consistent with the original hypothesis that local V1R expansions may

play a role in forming or maintaining speciation boundaries within *Cheirogaleus* and *Microcebus*

as might be predicted given their nocturnal lifestyle. Phylogenetic analyses revealed that

expanded V1R repertoires in mouse lemurs demonstrate a remarkably higher rate of duplicate

gene retention in comparison to other primates (Figure 1A and B; Table 1). The common

ancestor of mouse lemurs is not associated with novel subfamily birth though the diversity and

number of V1R gene copies is striking (Figure 1A; Table 1). Although genomes generated

exclusively from short-read data are vulnerable to collapsing loci in assemblies (Larsen et al.

2014), our inference of increased V1R retention in *M. murinus* relative to non-cheirogaleid

primates was robust to assembly strategies and data sources (Supplementary Table S2). Further,

the resequenced *M. murinus* individuals reveal low intraspecific variation in copy number

(Figure 2), suggesting that the observed differences in repertoire size between mouse lemurs and

other non-nocturnal lemurs is not an artifact of individual sampling or assembly error (Figure 3).

The expansion dynamics of V1Rs within Cheirogaleidae do not support a simple linear

correlation between species richness and repertoire size. Although all cheirogaleid repertoires

had full primate subfamily membership, there was variation in subfamily proportions between

species, which is consistent with our hypothesis that species-specific V1R repertoires and

chemosensation may be important for species diversity of cheirogaleids in comparison to diurnal

strepsirrhines. Dwarf lemurs, genus *Cheirogaleus*, are hypothesized to have as many as 18

species (Lei et al. 2014) though have the smallest V1R repertoires within the cheirogaleids

examined here. Conversely, the genus *Mirza*, with only two recognized species, has a repertoire

size that is nearly equal to that of *Microcebus murinus*. It is notable, however, that the *Mirza*

genome's expanded repertoire is primarily enriched for subfamily III (Figure 1A). The

differential subfamily enrichment among species suggests that despite the similarity in size to

Microcebus repertoires, the V1R repertoire of *Mirza* has experienced independent selective

pressures on gene retention and may ultimately fulfill a different functional role compared to

Microcebus.

V1R repertoire estimation across primates

We estimated V1R repertoire size evolution across strepsirrhine primates as well as for

several well-annotated primate and mammalian genomes for outgroup comparison. Notably,

repertoire estimates of extant primates are comparable to previous studies that used trace archive

fragments and earlier draft genome versions (Figure 3; Supplemental Table S2; Young et al.

2010; Moriya-Ito et al. 2018). The expanded V1R repertoire within the gray mouse lemur is not

ubiquitous across the Strepsirrhini, however. Rather, repertoire size expanded gradually from a

reduced set in the strepsirrhine common ancestor to its peak in the mouse lemur clade. This

expansion is characterized by a reduced repertoire in the early diverging aye-aye lineage (genus

Daubentonia), moderate repertoires among diurnal lemurs, and an expansion that likely occurred

in the common ancestor of Cheirogaleidae (Figure 3). If the origins of many V1R copies in

mouse lemur date to the Cheirogaleidae common ancestor, this means that at least some of those

duplicates have remained functional and intact since their origins 30 million years ago, as would

be consistent with divergence time estimates for the cheirogaleid radiation (Yang and Yoder

2003; dos Reis et al. 2018).

Within Cheirogaleidae, repertoire sizes ranged from a low of 58 intact V1Rs in *C. medius*

to highs between 102-143 intact V1Rs in the genus *Microcebus*. The mouse lemurs have

universally large V1R repertoires (102-146 intact genes) with notable intragenus variation. Prior

to this study, *M. murinus* had been identified as having one of the largest V1R repertoires within

mammals (Young et al. 2010). Additional sampling from *Microcebus* reveals, however, that

among the five mouse lemur species here characterized, *M. murinus* actually has the smallest

repertoire with only 102 intact V1Rs. We also estimated the percent of intact V1Rs contained

within the total repertoire for each species. Most haplorrhine primates (Anthropoidea plus

Tarsius) species have repertoires with low percentages of intact receptors (<37% intact). Within

Lemuroidea, the diurnal lemurs also have small and pseudogenized repertoires (26% to 49%

intact) containing only 22-27 intact V1Rs. In contrast, among nocturnal species excluding aye-

aye, we observe intact repertoires between 58% to 66% within Cheirogaleidae, and 61% for the

nocturnal lorisiform *Otolemur garnetti*.

These comparisons do not, however, provide definitive evidence that expanded V1R

repertoires in primates are strictly associated with nocturnal life history (Wang et al. 2010;

Moriya-Ito et al. 2018). Although *Otolemur garnetti* shows a proportion of intact V1R copies

similar to dwarf and mouse lemurs (Figure 3), subfamilies VII and IX are absent from *O.*

garnetti (Figure 1B). By comparison, the genomes of both the aye-aye and the tarsier (Schmitz et

al. 2016) contain low numbers of intact V1R gene copies, which appears to contradict the

hypothesis that a nocturnal life history alone is sufficient for explaining V1R elaboration in

mouse lemurs. Though it is true that both aye-aye and tarsier have more V1R copies than the

diurnal primates compared here, they also show a high proportion of putative pseudogenes and

an absence of some V1R subfamilies found in Cheirogaleidae (Figure 1A and B).

Our phylogenetic approach reveals a pattern of gene family evolution compatible with

active gene birth and death (Nei et al. 1997; Csűrös and Miklos 2009; Hughes et al. 2018) with

an independent V1R expansion isolated to Cheirogaleidae with three subfamily gains rather than

a single more ancient expansion followed by losses in diurnal lineages (Table 1). Although the

gain and loss dynamics of V1Rs over time is complex with uncertainty in the origins of specific

subfamilies, variation in subfamily membership among species suggests that nocturnal primates

possess more diverse repertoires than their diurnal counterparts (Figure 1A and B). These results

are suggestive of an association between nocturnal life histories and V1R repertoire evolution, as

well as the importance of chemosensation generally among nocturnal primates. Our findings are

not conclusive, however, as the pattern observed in aye-aye deviates from this expectation,

though it must be noted that the quality of the aye-aye genome assembly is considerably poorer

than the others compared with the lowest contig/scaffold N50 and most incomplete BUSCO

results (Supplementary Figure S1and Table S1). An improved genome for aye-aye, a notably

solitary primate (Sterling and Richard 1995), as well as genomes for species within the diurnal

nest-dwelling genus, *Varecia*, will allow for more formal tests of how life history traits are

correlated with V1R copy number.

259
260
261   **Subfamily membership and ancestral repertoire reconstruction**
262
For each genome analyzed, we classified repertoire subfamily membership based on

homology inferred from a maximum likelihood (ML) tree (Figure 4) and previously-described

subfamily designations (Hohenbrink et al. 2012). During alignment, sequences that introduced

excessive gaps to transmembrane regions were iteratively removed, resulting in alignments of

increasing conservatism (see Materials and Methods "V1R repertoire estimation and ancestral

count reconstruction"). We tested whether these varying alignments affected our estimates of

subfamily composition and found little impact. Regardless of the number of sequences removed

from the alignment, the relative proportions of subfamily membership within each species

remained constant (Supplementary Figure S2). Although topological errors may contribute to

uncertainty in gene count reconstructions, the ML tree shows 70% or greater bootstrap support

for 63% of nodes (Figure 4), with little additional improvement possible due to the limitations of

a single-exon gene family (Supplementary Table S3). Our results suggest that both the ancestral

primate and the ancestral lemur had repertoires more limited in size and diversity than many

living strepsirrhine primates, further supporting the controversial hypothesis that the ancestral

primate was diurnal rather than nocturnal (Tan et al. 2005; Borges et al. 2018).

Subfamily membership varies among the other extant strepsirrhines examined (Figure 1A

and B). While *Otolemur garnetti* contains a very diverse repertoire, it lacks subfamily VII and IX

membership. The diurnal lemurs lack receptors belonging to a few subfamilies, most consistently

IV, VIII, and IX. The basal lineage within the lemuriform radiation, *Daubentonia*

madagascariensis, lacks membership for most subfamilies, including *Strep*/I, II, IV, V, and VII.

Subfamily I, referred to as "V1R*strep*" in Yoder et al. (2014), is used synonymously here for

distinction from the mouse subfamily "I". The repertoires of cheirogaleids are highly enriched

for subfamily III, V, and IX membership, while the diurnal lemurs are enriched for subfamilies

Strep/I, II, and III. In haplorrhine primates, repertoires contain only one or a few subfamilies.

Ancestral state reconstruction with asymmetric parsimony (Csűrös and Miklos 2009; Csűrös

2010) revealed that the stem primate possessed only a subset of now extant V1R subfamilies,

Strep/I, II, III, IV and VIII (Figure 1B). Subfamily IX has undergone a notable expansion in

Cheirogaleidae, but the aye-aye repertoire also contains members from subfamily IX thus,

subfamily IX is the only subfamily exclusive to nocturnal strepsirrhines, despite its absence in

Otolemur garnetti (Figure 1A and B).

294   Copy number variation in intraspecific *Microcebus murinus* repertoires

We resequenced eight *M. murinus* individuals of known pedigree from the colony at the

Duke Lemur Center in Durham, North Carolina. Using these genomes, we estimated

intraspecific variation in V1R repertoire size (Figure 2). For the eight resequenced *M. murinus*

individuals, we observed low levels of intraspecific V1R repertoire size variation relative to size

variation between taxonomic families with individual repertoires ranging from 86 to 105 intact

V1R loci. Though one might expect that levels of intraspecific variation in V1R repertoire size in

a captive population may be reduced relative to wild populations of *M. murinus*, the colony at the

Duke Lemur Center shows signs of admixture from two distinct evolutionary lineages, *M.*

murinus and *M. ganzhorni* (Larsen et al., 2017), presently recognized as distinct species

(Hotaling et al., 2016). Therefore, the intraspecific variation observed here may actually be

exaggerated, rather than reduced, which increases our confidence in the robustness of repertoire

size estimates among species through sampling of single individuals. To test for the potentially

confounding effects of sequencing and assembly error, one individual, DLC7033, was sequenced

twice as a technical replicate. The duplicate genome assemblies respectively contained 92 or 96

intact loci indicating that sequencing and assembly error likely play a measurable role in

generating variation among observed repertoire counts, though the effect appears to be modest.

Thus, taking the results of the pedigree analysis as largely accurate, this emphasizes the highly

dynamic nature of V1R repertoire size evolution, even over generational timescales.

Complex history of diversifying positive selection in the dwarf and mouse lemurs

Our results agree with previous studies in finding that selection has acted pervasively

across the V1R gene family over time (Hohenbrink et. al. 2012). Pervasive positive selection was

revealed for all subfamilies identified in this study, even when analyzing the genus *Microcebus*

alone (Supplementary Tables S4 and S5) and additional genome sequences for dwarf and mouse

lemurs have likely increased the power of the sites tests. For example, positive selection was not

evident for subfamily VII in a previous study limited to only *Microcebus murinus* (Hohenbrink

et al. 2012). Furthermore, some subfamilies have unique profiles of sites under selection (Figure

5). Although lineage-specific rate variation is a confounding factor in V1R gene family evolution

(Yoder et al. 2014), our analyses, spanning a range of taxon sampling schemes, show that our

ability to characterize the V1R selection profiles are robust to such rate variation (Figure 5).

We performed two different model comparisons to differentiate between hypotheses of

neutrality versus selection, and for the latter, for differentiating between the effects of rate

constancy versus heterogeneity among sites. The M7 and M8 model comparisons always

recovered more sites under selection than the more conserved M1a and M2a comparisons, but

individual sites under selection detected by Bayes empirical Bayes with M2a were subsets of

those detected by M8. Both model comparisons use likelihood ratio tests (LRTs) to detect

positive selection and assume dN/dS is constant across branches, but the M2a and M1a

comparison (Zhang et al. 2005) uses three finite mixtures of dN/dS while the M8 and M7

comparison (Yang et al. 2000) accounts for heterogeneity in dN/dS among nearly neutral sites

with a beta distribution. Tests of pervasive positive selection were also performed on data

realigned by subfamily, and similar estimates of proportions of sites under positive selection

suggested that our site models were not misled by alignment errors (Supplementary Tables S6

and S7). Most individual sites under positive selection are unique to different subfamilies

(Supplementary Figure S3) and reflect biases in selective pressures across different loop and

transmembrane domains (Supplemental Figure S4). However, some selection profiles were more

differentiated than others, such as *Strep*/I, II, V, and IX (Figure 5). The divergent selection

profiles among subfamilies leads us to interpret positive selection acting on V1R genes in

primates to be largely diversifying. Differentiated selection profiles among subfamilies are

explained by biases among transmembrane and loop domains (Supplementary Material;

Supplementary Figure S5; Supplementary Tables S8-S10).

Previous studies have indicated that extracellular loops have been primary targets of

positive selection in V1Rs (Hohenbrink et al. 2012), and our results agree with these findings.

Positive selection acting on extracellular loops two and three from Hohenbrink et al. (2012),

identified here simply as loops three and five respectively, is evident (Supplementary Figure S5).

These specific domains are probable regions where V1Rs bind to semiochemicals (Hohenbrink

et al. 2012). Our results also show the transmembrane domains themselves, whether directly or

by linkage, have also been under variable levels of positive selection (Supplementary Material;

Supplementary Table S8). We find limited evidence for an enriched number of sites under

positive selection in transmembrane domains four and five, and a depletion in transmembrane

domain three, which have been previously predicted to form the ligand binding pocket of V1Rs

(Kobilka et al. 1988; Pilpel and Lancet 1999; Palczewski et al. 2000; Yoder et al. 2014). These

results prompt us to hypothesize that pervasive diversifying positive selection has accompanied

selection for divergent function among V1R subfamilies, although additional evidence is needed

for hypothesis testing.

Branch-site models detected evidence of episodic positive selection in the evolution of all

V1R subfamilies except for lemur VIII (Supplementary Figure S6; Supplementary Table S11).

Tests of episodic positive selection across the V1R subfamilies in the house mouse have been of

little interest (Karn et al. 2010) and our tests of episodic selection here are generally not

associated with the expansion of V1Rs in dwarf and mouse lemurs. However, subfamily IX

would be a candidate for further investigation, given that it was the only subfamily to show

notable levels of episodic positive selection, and is the only subfamily specific to nocturnal

strepsirrhines. Further, many of the sites identified to be under positive selection correspond to

the previously identified ligand binding domains (Supplementary Figure S6, Supplementary

Table S12). Exploration of alternative topologies revealed that branches showing episodic

positive selection were likely not due to topological errors (Supplementary Material;

Supplementary Figure S6).

Comparative evolution of V1R repertoires and genome architecture across Mammalia

Here we take advantage of the recently published chromosome-level assembly for *M*.

murinus and other chromosome-level mammalian assemblies in an effort to identify genomic

features that are generally associated with V1R expansion. The molecular environment of V1Rs

is predicted to play a role in their regulation and has previously been studied only in mouse, rat,

and pig (Lane et al. 2002; Stewart and Lane 2007; Kambere and Lane 2009; Michaloski et al.

2011; Dinka and Le 2017). We compared the expanded V1R repertoires of mouse and mouse

lemur with the putatively contracted V1R repertoires of horse, cow, dog, and human. As

predicted from previous studies (Kambere and Lane 2007; Kambere and Lane 2009), enrichment

for repetitive LINE elements is associated with expansion of V1Rs in mammals (Supplementary

Figure S7). We find that mouse lemur V1Rs primarily cluster by subfamily at chromosomal

locations across the genome as is also characteristic of the V1R repertoire in mouse. Only mouse

lemur subfamily VIII does not form a cluster but is instead uniquely dispersed across three

different chromosomes (Figure 6). We also analyzed the locations of all regions demonstrating

V1R homology to determine if there are any potential pseudogenized subfamilies or clusters in

the genome and found no evidence for pseudogenized clusters of V1Rs in mouse lemur

(Supplemental Figure S12). Both LINE enrichment and physical clustering of V1R loci have

been predicted to be associated with proper regulation of V1Rs (Lane et al. 2002; Kambere and

Lane 2007) and may be characteristic of expanded V1R repertoires in general.

To investigate whether homologous subfamilies have retained chromosomal synteny in

species with expanded repertoires and across mammals broadly, we evaluated chromosomal

synteny for each species relative to mouse using the SynChro software (Drillon et al. 2014;

Figure 6, Figure 7A and B, Supplementary Figures S8-S11). In mouse and mouse lemur, most

homologous V1R subfamilies retain chromosomal synteny (Figure 6, Figure 7A and B). Mouse

subfamily D is most closely related to mouse lemur subfamily IV, and both subfamilies share

mouse chromosome 7 synteny. Subfamilies J/K and V as well as subfamilies G and *Strep*/I also

share mouse chromosome 7 synteny. Lemur subfamily III is syntenic with mouse E and F on

mouse chromosomes 6 and 7. Lemur subfamilies VI and VII are syntenic with mouse

subfamilies H and I on chromosome 13. Lemur subfamilies not sharing synteny with any mouse

subfamily include subfamilies II, VIII, and IX. The expanded subfamilies in Cheirogaleidae, IV,

VII, and IX, all map to different chromosomal regions of the *M. murinus* genome and were not

linked on an ancestral syntenic block based on comparisons between *M. murinus* and mouse.

Therefore subfamily expansions have occurred independently and not as tandem duplications of

a single genomic region.

Interestingly, when comparing all mammalian species examined, our results reveal that in

each species, one chromosome contains a very dense block of highly homologous subfamilies on

a backbone of mouse chromosome 7 synteny, referred to here as "V1R hotspots" (Figure 7B).

These hotspots usually contain receptors of the EF/III, D/IV, JK/V, and Strep/G subfamilies, and

cluster order is maintained with a few species-specific subfamily deletions. The chromosomal

synteny of the "hotspots" is rarely interrupted, and if interrupted, it is almost exclusively

interrupted by a stretch of synteny from another mouse chromosome containing V1Rs. These

interleaving regions in hotspots are usually chromosome 13 or 17, indicating that genomic

regions where V1Rs cluster are also subject to increased gene duplication rates. Interestingly, the

only putative intact members of the contracted human V1R repertoire are also contained within

this "hotspot" location and share homology with hotspot subfamilies.

Previous studies of Laurasiatheria have predicted that the V1R repertoires of cow, horse,

and dog consist mostly of highly orthologous loci with evolutionary conserved functions (Yohe

et al. 2018). While conserved function remains to be shown experimentally, retained synteny of

these Laurasiatherian V1Rs within hotspots across Mammalia supports the hypothesized ancient

origin of these subfamilies and reinforces the idea that V1Rs in these subfamilies are orthologous

in function (Ohara et al. 2009; Yohe et al. 2018). Mouse lemur V1Rs show striking structural

similarities to the functionally diverse repertoire of mouse and considering the independent gains

in copy number and novel subfamily evolution, coupled with variable rates of molecular

evolution and selective pressures, V1Rs in mouse lemurs may serve as an ideal system for

elucidating pheromone evolution in primates. Similar patterns of deep synteny have been

described for ~80 My of odorant receptor evolution in bees (Brand and Ramirez 2017).

Considered in this context, our results suggest that chemosensory gene family evolution may

follow similar molecular "rules" in organisms with vastly different natural histories, even when

evolved independently from different ancestral gene families, as would be the case comparing

mammals to insects.

Conclusions

We revealed that an expansion of the V1R gene family is shared across the dwarf and

mouse lemurs, and that duplicate V1R gene copies have been evolving under strong selective

pressures. Divergent patterns of molecular evolution among V1R subfamilies and diversity in

subfamily membership and abundance suggests that V1Rs may serve as a test case for studying

the evolution of sensory drive in primates. Pheromone detection among nocturnal primates,

especially the morphologically cryptic mouse lemurs, may be more important for driving and

maintaining species boundaries than previously appreciated. Syntenic analyses with improved

genomic resources revealed strikingly similar genetic architecture between the expanded V1R

repertoires of mouse and mouse lemur, and that some V1R subfamilies have been maintained in

V1R "hotspots" across ~184 million years of mammalian evolution (dos Reis Mario et al. 2012).

Characterizing additional features of V1R hotspots across species will be important for future

studies translating experimental genetic studies in mice to primates such as mouse lemur.

Materials and Methods

449
Sampling and DNA extraction

To improve the resolution of the V1R repertoire expansion in lemurs, we sequenced the

genomes of *Microcebus griseorufus*, *M. mittermeieri*, *M. ravelobensis*, *M. tavaratra*, and *Mizra*

zaza. Tissue biopsies were taken from wild individuals in Madagascar from 1997-2015 and from

captive individuals at the Duke Lemur Center (Supplemental Table S13). To investigate within

species variation in V1R repertoires, we also resequenced eight individuals from the Duke

Lemur Center *Microcebus murinus* colony. Blood and tissue samples were collected in 2016 in

accordance with IACUC guidelines. For the novel strepsirrhine genomes, DNA was extracted

following manufacturer instructions using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue kit, while DNA

from the *Microcebus murinus* resequenced individuals was extracted using the Qiagen

MagAttract Kit (Qiagen, Germantown, MD, USA).

Genome Sequencing and Assembly

The genomes of *Microcebus griseorufus*, *M. mittermeieri*, *M. tavaratra,* and *Mizra*

zaza were sequenced at the Baylor College of Medicine as approximately 400bp insert libraries

on a single lane of an Illumina HiSeq 3000 with paired-end 150bp reads. We sequenced

the *Microcebus ravelobensis* genome from two libraries, one with an average insert size of

570bp on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 at Florida State University and the other with a 500bp insert

library on 5.5% of both lanes of an Illumina NovaSeq at the Duke University GCB Sequencing

Core. We also generated two additional cheirogaleid assemblies for *Cheirogaleus sibreei* and *C.*

medius (Williams et al. 2019). *Cheirogaleus sibreei* was sequenced from a 300bp insert library

on the Illumina HiSeq 4000 at the Duke University GCB Sequencing Core with paired-end

150bp reads. A reference genome was generated and assembled for *Cheirogaleus medius* using

Dovetail Genomics. All other genomes were assembled using MaSuRCA v3.2.2 (Zimin et al.

2013). We assumed an insert size standard deviation of 15% and used automatic kmer selection.

However, we did not use MaSuRCA's scaffolds for annotation and downstream analyses.

Scaffolds were obtained from SSPACE (Boetzer et al. 2010), which also attempted to correct

assembly errors and extend contigs from MaSuRCA. *De novo* assembly statistics are available in

the supplementary material (Supplementary Table S1) as well as annotation details

(Supplementary Table S14) and SRA identifiers (Supplementary Table S15).

The eight *Microcebus murinus* individuals were resequenced from high molecular weight

DNA prepared using the 10X Genomics Chromium platform. Briefly, high-molecular weight

molecules of DNA are partitioned into gel beads with unique barcodes then prepared for Illumina

sequencing (Weisenfeld et al. 2017). The resulting short-read libraries are barcoded such that

individual "linked reads" can be traced back to their molecule of origin assisting the genomic

scaffolding process. The libraries were size selected to approximately 550bp and sequenced on

the Illumina HiSeq 4000 system at the Duke University GCB Sequencing Core. We then used

the 10X Genomics Supernova assembly software to *de novo* assemble the resequenced genomes

(version 2.0.1, 10x Genomics, San Francisco, CA, USA). One replicate individual was

sequenced twice, and genomes were assembled *de novo* from each individual library.

BUSCO version 3.0.2 and Assemblathon2 scripts were used to assess genome quality

statistics (Supplementary Figure S1; Supplementary Table S16; Simão et al. 2015). Additional

genomes analyzed in this study were downloaded from the NCBI genome database and include

all available Strepsirrhine genomes and additional high-quality primate and mammalian genomes

for phylogenetic coverage (Supplementary Table S16).

V1R repertoire estimation and ancestral count reconstruction

To assess total V1R repertoires in each species, tblastn searches (e-value cut-off = 0.001)

were conducted with the blast+ software suite (version ncbi-blast-2.6.0+; Altschul et al. 1990)

using available mouse and mouse lemur V1R query protein sequences downloaded from NCBI

GenBank against the genomes analyzed in this study (Camacho et al. 2009). Duplicate protein

sequences were removed from the query database using CD-HIT version 4.6 (Li and Godzik

2006). Bedtools merge (version 2.27.1) was used to merge overlapping hits within a genome, and

bedtools slop and getFasta were used to extract receptor candidate regions longer than 600bp

with 50 bp of upstream and downstream surrounding sequence (Quinlan and Hall 2010). For a

full list of V1R containing regions analyzed see Supplementary File X).

To remove potential pseudogenes from further analyses, we used Geneious version 9.0.5

to predict open reading frames (ORFs) and considered sequences intact if they contained an ORF

longer than 801bp. We then used MAFFT version 7.187 with the E-INS-i algorithm to align

intact sequences from all species using the iterative approach described in Yoder 2014 (Katoh

and Standley 2013; Yoder et al. 2014). The MAFFT algorithm is recommended for approaches

analyzing ancestral sequence reconstruction (Vialle et al. 2018). A gene phylogeny was

constructed using RAxML version 7.2.8 using the GTRGAMMAI nucleotide model with the

rapid bootstrapping and search for best ML scoring tree algorithm with 500 bootstraps

(Stamatakis 2014). We then assigned primate sequences to the subfamilies *Strep*/I-IX designated

in Hohenbrink 2012 (Hohenbrink et al. 2012). The number of intact V1Rs, percentage of intact

V1Rs, and the total V1R count were calculated for each species as well as subfamily

membership. We then used Count version 10.04 with the Wagner parsimony algorithm and a

gain penalty of 2 to infer total ancestral vomeronasal repertoire size and ancestral subfamily

membership (Csűrös and Miklos 2009; Csűrös 2010).

Establishing synteny of V1Rs across mammalian species

Genomes with chromosome level scaffolding information (*Mus musculus*, *Microcebus*

murinus, *Homo sapiens*, *Equus caballus*, *Bos taurus*, and *Canis familiaris*) were used to assess

chromosomal synteny of vomeronasal subfamilies among mammalian species. SynChro (Drillon

et al. 2014) version SynChro_osx (January 2015) was used to reconstruct synteny blocks

between each genome with *Mus musculus* as reference with a delta parameter of 2 using

GenBank annotation files from Ensembl release 93 (Figure 6; Supplemental Figures S8-S11;

Drillon et al. 2014). Orthologous block information was compared with vomeronasal receptor

location for each species (Figure 7A and B).

Detecting evidence of positive selection

Evidence for positive selection in V1R repertoires was evaluated with PAML 4.8e (Yang

2007). We used two different tests to detect both individual sites under pervasive positive

selection throughout the tree (sites models) and individual branches that show an episodic burst

of positive selection (branch-site models). For sites models, we applied two tests to each of the

nine subfamily trees and alignments: 1) Comparison of the null hypothesis that all sites are a

mixture of purifying and neutral rates of molecular evolution (M1a) and the alternative that

allows for a third class of sites under positive selection (M2a; Zhang et al. 2005). 2) A null

hypothesis that allows for a mixture of ten discretized beta-distributed site classes (M7), while

the alternative hypothesis allows an extra component under positive selection (M8;Yang et al.

2000). Each of the recognized lemur subfamilies were analyzed separately. The ggtree R

package (Yu et al. 2017) was used to extract subtrees for each subfamily and alignments were

parsed with Perl scripts. Because signatures of positive selection may be time-dependent

(Peterson and Masel 2009; Pegueroles et al. 2013), we explored variation in sites under positive

selection using six different taxonomic filters: 1) *Microcebus*, 2) Cheirogaleidae, 3)

Lemuriformes, 4) Strepsirrhini, 5) Primates, and 6) Euarchontoglires. For each site test, we

assumed the LRT was $\sim X^2_1$ and individual sites were detected using the Bayes empirical Bayes

procedure where the posterior probability of selection for each site was determined using the

MLE *dN/dS* for the positive selection rate class (Yang et al. 2005). Individual sites were

considered to have sufficient evidence for positive selection if the posterior probability was

greater than 0.95. Enrichment of sites under selection in transmembrane domains used simple

chi-square tests and Fisher exact tests in R (R Core Team 2018) for individual transmembrane

and loop domains. Transmembrane domains were predicted using *M*. *murinus* sequences from

subfamilies *Strep*/I through IX with TMHMM (Krogh et al. 2001) through the TMHMM server

(http://www.cbs.dtu.dk/services/TMHMM/; last accessed 29 January 2019). Since V1R genes

are expected to have seven transmembrane domains (Dulac and Axel 1995), only predicted

structures with seven transmembrane domains were used to determine transmembrane domain

boundaries in our alignment of the entire V1R repertoire. Predictions that had fewer or more than

seven transmembrane domains are assumed to be due to inaccuracies of TMHMM (Melén et al.

2003) and not real domain losses or gains.

Of important note, the entire V1R repertoire was prohibitively large for ML optimization

over the entire tree; we applied tests for selection to individual subfamilies to circumvent this

limitation. This strategy also provided a way to evaluate contributions of alignment and

topological errors to evidence of positive selection. First, we evaluated if the ML topology

estimated from the entire repertoire was a plausible hypothesis using AU tests (Shimodaira

2004). First, we estimated the ML topology and branch lengths for each subfamily using the

parsed alignments (i.e. the data was not re-aligned) using the same RAxML model and search

strategy as the first analysis. We then re-aligned translated amino acid data with MAFFT and

estimated phylogeny once more. Site log-likelihoods were then optimized for the three

topologies with RAxML and AU p-values computed with CONSEL using the default multiscale

bootstrapping strategy (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 2001). Bootstrap trees were also collected for

the re-aligned data, but bipartitions were drawn onto the topologies parsed from the entire V1R

repertoire tree. The ratio of bootstrap support values was used to identify potential topological

errors; bipartitions in the original topology that are absent when the sequences for each

subfamily were re-aligned. Site tests were run for both the parsed and re-aligned data to check

for consistency in the inference of sites under positive selection across alignments.

Branch-site tests (Zhang et al. 2005) were performed for each branch for each subfamily,

except subfamily III, which was still computationally limiting. Each test assumed the LRT was

$\sim X^2_1$, but we applied the Benjamini-Hochberg multiple testing correction (Benjamini and

Hochberg 1995). With this correction, we do expect some false positives, but the family-wise

error rate should be below 5% (Anisimova and Yang 2007) while not underpowering tests

towards the tips of the trees (dos Reis and Yang 2011). Tests were only performed on the parsed

topology without removing any species, but branches with evidence of episodic positive

selection and the bootstrap ratios with re-aligned data were mapped to nodes of the subtree

topologies using ggtree to help identify cases where topological errors might lead to false

signatures of positive selection (Mendes and Hahn 2016). Individual sites with evidence of

episodic positive selection were evaluated using the Bayes empirical Bayes procedure (Yang et

al. 2005).

Data Access

Newly sequenced genome data will be made available through NCBI upon publication.

Complete record information is given in Supplementary Material (Supplementary Table S15).

Acknowledgements

We thank the Malagasy authorities for permission to conduct this research and Duke Lemur

Center staff, especially Erin Ehmke, Bobby Schopler, and Cathy Williams, for providing the

Microcebus murinus and *Mirza zaza* tissue samples. We are grateful to our colleagues at Baylor

College of Medicine, Jeff Rogers and Kim Worley, for many insightful discussions of mouse

lemur genomics. Phillip Brand and Jeff Thorne provided critical review of the manuscript

leading to its significant improvement. We thank Simon Gregory's lab for preparing the 10x

Genomics libraries. We are grateful for the support of Duke Research Computing and the Duke

Data Commons (NIH 1S10OD018164-01) and appreciate the donation of free sequencing for

Microcebus ravelobensis provided by the Duke GCB Sequencing Core. ADY gratefully

acknowledges support from the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation and the Alexander von

Humboldt Foundation during the writing phase of this project. The study was funded by a

National Science Foundation Grant DEB-1354610 to ADY and DWW and Duke University

startup funds to ADY. This is Duke Lemur Center publication no. XXX.

References

Adipietro KA, Matsunami H, Zhuang H. 2012. Functional Evolution of Primate Odorant
    Receptors. In: Hirai H, Imai H, Go Y, editors. Post-Genome Biology of Primates. Tokyo:
    Springer Tokyo. p. 63–78. Available from:
    http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/978-4-431-54011-3_5

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

Anisimova M, Yang Z. 2007. Multiple Hypothesis Testing to Detect Lineages under Positive
    Selection that Affects Only a Few Sites. Molecular Biology and Evolution 24:1219–
    1228.

Bear DM, Lassance J-M, Hoekstra HE, Datta SR. 2016. The Evolving Neural and Genetic
    Architecture of Vertebrate Olfaction. Current Biology 26:R1039–R1049.

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and
    Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B
    (Methodological) 57:289–300.

Boetzer M, Henkel CV, Jansen HJ, Butler D, Pirovano W. 2010. Scaffolding pre-assembled
    contigs using SSPACE. Bioinformatics 27:578–579.

Boillat M, Challet L, Rossier D, Kan C, Carleton A, Rodriguez I. 2015. The Vomeronasal
    System Mediates Sick Conspecific Avoidance. Current Biology 25:251–255.

Borges R, Johnson WE, O'Brien SJ, Gomes C, Heesy CP, Antunes A. 2018. Adaptive genomic
    evolution of opsins reveals that early mammals flourished in nocturnal environments.
    BMC Genomics [Internet] 19. Available from:
    https://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12864-017-4417-8

Boschat C, Pelofi C, Randin O, Roppolo D, Luscher C, Broillet M-C, Rodriguez I. 2002.
    Pheromone detection mediated by a V1r vomeronasal receptor. Nat Neurosci 5:1261–
    1262.

Boughman JW. 2002. How sensory drive can promote speciation. Trends in Ecology &
    Evolution 17:571–577.

Brand P, Hinojosa-Díaz IA, Ayala R, Daigle M, Yurrita Obiols CL, Eltz T, Ramírez SR. 2019.
    An olfactory receptor gene underlies reproductive isolation in perfume-collecting orchid
    bees. bioRxiv:537423.

Brand P, Ramirez SR. 2017. The Evolutionary Dynamics of the Odorant Receptor Gene Family
    in Corbiculate Bees. Genome Biology and Evolution 9: 2023-2036.

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

Chen F-C, Chen C-J, Chuang T-J, Li W-H. 2010. Gene Family Size Conservation Is a Good
Indicator of Evolutionary Rates. Molecular Biology and Evolution 27:1750–1758.

Chung AG, Belone PM, Bímová BV, Karn RC, Laukaitis CM. 2017. Studies of an *Androgen-*
Binding Protein Knockout Corroborate a Role for Salivary ABP in Mouse
Communication. Genetics 205:1517–1527.

Csűrös M. 2010. Count: evolutionary analysis of phylogenetic profiles with parsimony and
likelihood. Bioinformatics 26:1910–1912.

Csűrös M, Miklos I. 2009. Streamlining and Large Ancestral Genomes in Archaea Inferred with
a Phylogenetic Birth-and-Death Model. Molecular Biology and Evolution 26:2087–2095.

Dai Z, Xiong Y, Dai X. 2014. Neighboring Genes Show Interchromosomal Colocalization after
Their Separation. Mol Biol Evol 31:1166–1172.

Del Punta K, Leinders-Zufall T, Rodriguez I, Jukam D, Wysocki CJ, Ogawa S, Zufall F,
Mombaerts P. 2002. Deficient pheromone responses in mice lacking a cluster of
vomeronasal receptor genes. Nature 419:70–74.

Des Marais DL, Rausher MD. 2008. Escape from adaptive conflict after duplication in an
anthocyanin pathway gene. Nature 454:762–765.

Dinka H, Le MT. 2017. Analysis of Pig Vomeronasal Receptor Type 1 (V1R) Promoter Region
Reveals a Common Promoter Motif but Poor CpG Islands. Animal Biotechnology:1–8.

Dopman EB, Robbins PS, Seaman A. 2010. COMPONENTS OF REPRODUCTIVE
ISOLATION BETWEEN NORTH AMERICAN PHEROMONE STRAINS OF THE
EUROPEAN CORN BORER. Evolution 64:881–902.

dos Reis Mario, Inoue Jun, Hasegawa Masami, Asher Robert J., Donoghue Philip C. J., Yang
Ziheng. 2012. Phylogenomic datasets provide both precision and accuracy in estimating
the timescale of placental mammal phylogeny. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
Biological Sciences 279:3491–3500.

Drea CM. 2015. D'scent of man: A comparative survey of primate chemosignaling in relation to
sex. Hormones and Behavior 68:117–133.

Drillon G, Carbone A, Fischer G. 2014. SynChro: A Fast and Easy Tool to Reconstruct and
Visualize Synteny Blocks along Eukaryotic Chromosomes.Fairhead C, editor. PLoS ONE
9:e92621.

Dulac C, Axel R. 1995. A novel family of genes encoding putative pheromone receptors in
mammals. Cell 83:195–206.

Fu X, Yan Y, Xu PS, Geerlof-Vidavsky I, Chong W, Gross ML, Holy TE. 2015. A Molecular
Code for Identity in the Vomeronasal System. Cell 163:313–323.

Guschanski K, Warnefors M, Kaessmann H. 2017. The evolution of duplicate gene expression in
mammalian organs. Genome Research [Internet]. Available from:
http://genome.cshlp.org/content/early/2017/08/04/gr.215566.116.abstract

Haga-Yamanaka S, Ma L, He J, Qiu Q, Lavis LD, Looger LL, Yu CR. 2014. Integrated action of
pheromone signals in promoting courtship behavior in male mice. Elife 3:e03025.

Hawkins MTR, Culligan RR, Frasier CL, Dikow RB, Hagenson R, Lei R, Louis EE. 2018.
Genome sequence and population declines in the critically endangered greater bamboo
lemur (Prolemur simus) and implications for conservation. BMC Genomics [Internet] 19.
Available from: https://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12864-018-
4841-4

Hohenbrink P, Dempewolf S, Zimmermann E, Mundy NI, Radespiel U. 2014. Functional
promiscuity in a mammalian chemosensory system: extensive expression of vomeronasal
receptors in the main olfactory epithelium of mouse lemurs. Frontiers in Neuroanatomy
[Internet] 8. Available from:
http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnana.2014.00102/abstract

Hohenbrink P, Radespiel U, Mundy NI. 2012. Pervasive and Ongoing Positive Selection in the
Vomeronasal-1 Receptor (V1R) Repertoire of Mouse Lemurs. Molecular Biology and
Evolution 29:3807–3816.

Hotaling S, Foley ME, Lawrence NM, Bocanegra J, Blanco MB, Rasoloarison R, Kappeler PM,
Barrett MA, Yoder AD, Weisrock DW. 2016. Species discovery and validation in a
cryptic radiation of endangered primates: coalescent-based species delimitation in
Madagascar's mouse lemurs. Molecular Ecology 25:2029–2045.

Hughes GM, Boston ESM, Finarelli JA, Murphy WJ, Higgins DG, Teeling EC. 2018. The Birth
and Death of Olfactory Receptor Gene Families in Mammalian Niche Adaptation.Satta
Y, editor. Molecular Biology and Evolution 35:1390–1406.

Hurst JL, Beynon RJ, Armstrong SD, Davidson AJ, Roberts SA, Gómez-Baena G, Smadja CM,
Ganem G. 2017. Molecular heterogeneity in major urinary proteins of Mus musculus
subspecies: potential candidates involved in speciation. Scientific Reports [Internet] 7.
Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/srep44992

Isogai Y, Si S, Pont-Lezica L, Tan T, Kapoor V, Murthy VN, Dulac C. 2011. Molecular
organization of vomeronasal chemoreception. Nature 478:241–245.

Kambere MB, Lane RP. 2007. Co-regulation of a large and rapidly evolving repertoire of
odorant receptor genes. BMC Neuroscience 8:S2.

Kambere MB, Lane RP. 2009. Exceptional LINE Density at V1R Loci: The Lyon Repeat
Hypothesis Revisited on Autosomes. Journal of Molecular Evolution 68:145–159.

Karn RC, Young JM, Laukaitis CM. 2010. A Candidate Subspecies Discrimination System
718   Involving a Vomeronasal Receptor Gene with Different Alleles Fixed in M. m.
719   domesticus and M. m. musculus. PLoS ONE 5:e12638.

720   Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software Version 7:
721   Improvements in Performance and Usability. Mol Biol Evol 30:772–780.

722   Keller TE, Yi SV. 2014. DNA methylation and evolution of duplicate genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci
723   USA 111:5932.

724   Kobilka BK, Kobilka TS, Daniel K, Regan JW, Caron MG, Lefkowitz RJ. 1988. Chimeric alpha
725   2-,beta 2-adrenergic receptors: delineation of domains involved in effector coupling and
726   ligand binding specificity. Science 240:1310–1316.

727   Krogh A, Larsson B, von Heijne G, Sonnhammer ELL. 2001. Predicting transmembrane protein
728   topology with a hidden markov model: application to complete genomes11Edited by F.
729   Cohen. Journal of Molecular Biology 305:567–580.

730   Kurzweil VC, Getman M, Comparative Sequencing Program N, Green ED, Lane RP. 2009.
731   Dynamic evolution of V1R putative pheromone receptors between Mus musculus and
732   Mus spretus. BMC Genomics 10:74.

733   Lane RP, Cutforth T, Axel R, Hood L, Trask BJ. 2002. Sequence analysis of mouse vomeronasal
734   receptor gene clusters reveals common promoter motifs and a history of recent
735   expansion. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 99:291–296.

736   Larsen PA, Harris RA, Liu Y, Murali SC, Campbell CR, Brown AD, Sullivan BA, Shelton J,
737   Brown SJ, Raveendran M, et al. 2017. Hybrid de novo genome assembly and centromere
738   characterization of the gray mouse lemur (Microcebus murinus). BMC Biology [Internet]
739   15. Available from: https://bmcbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12915-017-
740   0439-6

741   Larsen PA, Heilman AM, Yoder AD. 2014. The utility of PacBio circular consensus sequencing
742   for characterizing complex gene families in non-model organisms. BMC Genomics
743   15:720.

744   Lei R, Frasier CL, McLain AT, Taylor JM, Bailey CA, Engberg SE, Ginter AL,
745   Randriamampionona R, Groves CP, Mittermeier RA, et al. 2014. Revision of
746   Madagascar's Dwarf Lemurs (Cheirogaleidae: *Cheirogaleus*): Designation of Species,
747   Candidate Species Status and Geographic Boundaries Based on Molecular and
748   Morphological Data. Primate Conservation 28:9–35.

749   Leinders-Zufall T, Lane AP, Puche AC, Ma W, Novotny MV, Shipley MT, Zufall F. 2000.
750   Ultrasensitive pheromone detection by mammalian vomeronasal neurons. Nature
751   405:792–796.

752   Li W, Godzik A. 2006. Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of protein
753   or nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics 22:1658–1659.

Loire E, Tusso S, Caminade P, Severac D, Boursot P, Ganem G, Smadja CM. 2017. Do changes
in gene expression contribute to sexual isolation and reinforcement in the house mouse?
Molecular Ecology 26:5189–5202.

Luo M, Fee MS, Katz LC. 2003. Encoding Pheromonal Signals in the Accessory Olfactory Bulb
of Behaving Mice. Science 299:1196–1201.

Lynch M, Conery JS. 2000. The Evolutionary Fate and Consequences of Duplicate Genes.
Science 290:1151–1155.

Makova KD, Li W-H. 2003. Divergence in the Spatial Pattern of Gene Expression Between
Human Duplicate Genes. Genome Res. 13:1638–1645.

Melén K, Krogh A, von Heijne G. 2003. Reliability measures for membrane protein topology
prediction algorithms. J Mol Biol. 327:735-744.

Mendelson TC. 2003. Evidence of Intermediate and Asymmetrical Behavioral Isolation Between
Orangethroat and Orangebelly darters (Teleostei:Percidae). The American Midland
Naturalist 150:343–348.

Mendes FK, Hahn MW. 2016. Gene Tree Discordance Causes Apparent Substitution Rate
Variation. Systematic Biology 65:711–721.

Meyer WK, Venkat A, Kermany AR, van de Geijn B, Zhang S, Przeworski M. 2015.
Evolutionary history inferred from the de novo assembly of a nonmodel organism, the
blue-eyed black lemur. Molecular Ecology 24:4392–4405.

Michaloski JS, Galante PAF, Nagai MH, Armelin-Correa L, Chien M-S, Matsunami H, Malnic
B. 2011. Common Promoter Elements in Odorant and Vomeronasal Receptor
Genes.Meyerhof W, editor. PLoS ONE 6:e29065.

Moriya-Ito K, Hayakawa T, Suzuki H, Hagino-Yamagishi K, Nikaido M. 2018. Evolution of
vomeronasal receptor 1 (V1R) genes in the common marmoset (Callithrix jacchus).
Gene 642:343–353.

Nei M, Gu X, Sitnikova T. 1997. Evolution by the birth-and-death process in multigene families
of the vertebrate immune system. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 94:7799.

Nikaido M, Ota T, Hirata T, Suzuki H, Satta Y, Aibara M, Mzighani SI, Sturmbauer C, Hagino-
Yamagishi K, Okada N. 2014. Multiple Episodic Evolution Events in V1R Receptor
Genes of East-African Cichlids. Genome Biol Evol 6:1135–1144.

Nozawa M, Kawahara Y, Nei M. 2007. Genomic drift and copy number variation of sensory
receptor genes in humans. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104:20421.

Ohara H, Nikaido M, Date-Ito A, Mogi K, Okamura H, Okada N, Takeuchi Y, Mori Y, Hagino-
Yamagishi K. 2009. Conserved repertoire of orthologous vomeronasal type 1 receptor
genes in ruminant species. BMC Evolutionary Biology 9:233.

O'Toole ÁN, Hurst LD, McLysaght A. 2018. Faster Evolving Primate Genes Are More Likely to
Duplicate. Mol Biol Evol 35:107–118.

Palczewski K, Kumasaka T, Hori T, Behnke CA, Motoshima H, Fox BA, Trong IL, Teller DC,
Okada T, Stenkamp RE, et al. 2000. Crystal Structure of Rhodopsin: A G Protein-
Coupled Receptor. Science 289:739–745.

Papes F, Logan DW, Stowers L. 2010. The Vomeronasal Organ Mediates Interspecies Defensive
Behaviors through Detection of Protein Pheromone Homologs. Cell 141:692–703.

Park SH, Podlaha O, Grus WE, Zhang J. 2011. The Microevolution of V1r Vomeronasal
Receptor Genes in Mice. Genome Biology and Evolution 3:401–412.

Pegueroles C, Laurie S, Albà MM. 2013. Accelerated Evolution after Gene Duplication: A
Time-Dependent Process Affecting Just One Copy. Molecular Biology and Evolution
30:1830–1842.

Perret M. 1996. Manipulation of sex ratio at birth by urinary cues in a prosimian primate.
Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 38:259–266.

Perret M, Colas S. 1997. Manipulation of sex ratio at birth and maternal investment in female
mouse lemurs (Microcebus murinus, Primates). Applied Animal Behaviour Science
51:275–283.

Perry GH, Reeves D, Melsted P, Ratan A, Miller W, Michelini K, Louis EE, Pritchard JK,
Mason CE, Gilad Y. 2012. A Genome Sequence Resource for the Aye-Aye (Daubentonia
madagascariensis), a Nocturnal Lemur from Madagascar. Genome Biology and Evolution
4:126–135.

Peterson GI, Masel J. 2009. Quantitative Prediction of Molecular Clock and Ka/Ks at Short
Timescales. Molecular Biology and Evolution 26:2595–2603.

Pilpel Y, Lancet D. 1999. The variable and conserved interfaces of modeled olfactory receptor
proteins. Protein Science 8:969–977.

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

dos Reis M, Gunnell GF, Barba-Montoya J, Wilkins A, Yang Z, Yoder AD. 2018. Using
Phylogenomic Data to Explore the Effects of Relaxed Clocks and Calibration Strategies
on Divergence Time Estimation: Primates as a Test Case.Ho S, editor. Systematic
Biology 67:594–615.

dos Reis M, Yang Z. 2011. Approximate Likelihood Calculation on a Phylogeny for Bayesian
Estimation of Divergence Times. Molecular Biology and Evolution 28:2161–2172.

Schmitz J, Noll A, Raabe CA, Churakov G, Voss R, Kiefmann M, Rozhdestvensky T, Brosius J,
Baertsch R, Clawson H, et al. 2016. Genome sequence of the basal haplorrhine primate
Tarsius syrichta reveals unusual insertions. Nature Communications 7:12997.

Servedio MR, Boughman JW. 2017. The Role of Sexual Selection in Local Adaptation and
Speciation. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 48:85–109.

Servedio MR, Noor MAF. 2003. The Role of Reinforcement in Speciation: Theory and Data.
Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 34:339–364.

Shimodaira H. 2004. Approximately unbiased tests of regions using multistep-multiscale
bootstrap resampling. The Annals of Statistics 32:2616–2641.

Shimodaira H, Hasegawa M. 2001. CONSEL: for assessing the confidence of phylogenetic tree
selection. Bioinformatics 17:1246–1247.

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

Smadja CM, Loire E, Caminade P, Thoma M, Latour Y, Roux C, Thoss M, Penn DJ, Ganem G,
Boursot P. 2015. Seeking signatures of reinforcement at the genetic level: a hitchhiking
mapping and candidate gene approach in the house mouse. Molecular Ecology 24:4222–
4237.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of
large phylogenies. Bioinformatics 30:1312–1313.

Sterling EJ, Richard AF. 1995. Social Organization in the Aye-Aye (Daubentonia
Madagascariensis) and the Perceived Distinctiveness of Nocturnal Primates. In: Alterman
L, Doyle GA, Izard MK, editors. Creatures of the Dark: The Nocturnal Prosimians.
Boston, MA: Springer US. p. 439–451. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-
4757-2405-9_26

Stewart R, Lane RP. 2007. V1R promoters are well conserved and exhibit common putative
regulatory motifs. BMC Genomics 8:253.

Sündermann D, Scheumann M, Zimmermann E. 2008. Olfactory predator recognition in
predator-naïve gray mouse lemurs (Microcebus murinus). Journal of Comparative
Psychology 122:146–155.

Tan Y, Yoder AD, Yamashita N, Li W-H. 2005. Evidence from opsin genes rejects nocturnality
in ancestral primates. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 102:14712–
14716.

Vialle RA, Tamuri AU, Goldman N. 2018. Alignment Modulates Ancestral Sequence
Reconstruction Accuracy.Thorne J, editor. Molecular Biology and Evolution 35:1783–
1797.

Wang G, Shi P, Zhu Z, Zhang Y -p. 2010. More Functional V1R Genes Occur in Nest-Living
and Nocturnal Terricolous Mammals. Genome Biology and Evolution 2:277–283.

Weisenfeld NI, Kumar V, Shah P, Church DM, Jaffe DB. 2017. Direct determination of diploid
genome sequences. Genome Res. [Internet]. Available from:
http://genome.cshlp.org/content/early/2017/03/15/gr.214874.116

Williams RC, Blanco MB, Poelstra JW, Hunnicutt KE, Comeault AA, Yoder AD. 2019.
Conservation genomic analysis reveals ancient introgression and declining levels of
genetic diversity in Madagascar's hibernating dwarf lemurs. bioRxiv doi:
https://doi.org/10.1101/620724
868
Xie T, Yang Q-Y, Wang X-T, McLysaght A, Zhang H-Y. 2016. Spatial Colocalization of
Human Ohnolog Pairs Acts to Maintain Dosage-Balance. Mol Biol Evol 33:2368–2375.

Yang L, Gaut BS. 2011. Factors that Contribute to Variation in Evolutionary Rate among
Arabidopsis Genes. Mol Biol Evol 28:2359–2369.

Yang Z. 2007. PAML 4: Phylogenetic Analysis by Maximum Likelihood. Molecular Biology
and Evolution 24:1586–1591.

Yang Z, Nielsen R, Goldman N, Pedersen A-MK. 2000. Codon-Substitution Models for
Heterogeneous Selection Pressure at Amino Acid Sites. Genetics 155:431.

Yang Z, Wong WSW, Nielsen R. 2005. Bayes Empirical Bayes Inference of Amino Acid Sites
Under Positive Selection. Molecular Biology and Evolution 22:1107–1118.

Yang Z, Yoder AD. 2003. Comparison of Likelihood and Bayesian Methods for Estimating
Divergence Times Using Multiple Gene Loci and Calibration Points, with Application to
a Radiation of Cute-Looking Mouse Lemur Species. Systematic Biology 52:705–716.

Yoder AD, Chan LM, dos Reis M, Larsen PA, Campbell CR, Rasoloarison R, Barrett M, Roos
C, Kappeler P, Bielawski J, et al. 2014. Molecular Evolutionary Characterization of a
V1R Subfamily Unique to Strepsirrhine Primates. Genome Biology and Evolution 6:213–
227.

Yoder AD, Larsen PA. 2014. The molecular evolutionary dynamics of the vomeronasal receptor
(class 1) genes in primates: a gene family on the verge of a functional breakdown.
Frontiers in Neuroanatomy [Internet] 8. Available from:
http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnana.2014.00153/abstract

Yoder AD, Weisrock DW, Rasoloarison RM, Kappeler PM. 2016. Cheirogaleid diversity and
evolution: big questions about small primates. In: Lehman SM, Radespiel U,
Zimmermann E, editors. The Dwarf and Mouse Lemurs of Madagascar. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press. p. 3–20. Available from:
https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/CBO9781139871822A010/type/book
_part

Yohe LR, Brand P. 2018. Evolutionary ecology of chemosensation and its role in sensory
drive.Fuller R, editor. Current Zoology 64:525–533.

Yohe LR, Davies KT, Rossiter SJ, Davalos L. 2018. Expressed vomeronasal type-1 receptors
(V1rs) in bats uncover conserved mechanisms of social chemical signaling. bioRxiv
[Internet]. Available from: http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2018/04/05/293472.abstract

Young JM, Massa HF, Hsu L, Trask BJ. 2010. Extreme variability among mammalian V1R gene
families. Genome Research 20:10–18.

Yu G, Smith DK, Zhu H, Guan Y, Lam TT-Y. 2017. ggtree: an r package for visualization and
annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other associated data. Methods
in Ecology and Evolution 8:28–36.

Zhang J, Nielsen R, Yang Z. 2005. Evaluation of an Improved Branch-Site Likelihood Method
for Detecting Positive Selection at the Molecular Level. Molecular Biology and
Evolution 22:2472–2479.

Zhang J, Rosenberg HF, Nei M. 1998. Positive Darwinian selection after gene duplication in
primate ribonuclease genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 95:3708.

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

Figure 1. V1R subfamily membership across the primate phylogeny. Membership was

assessed for available strepsirrhine genomes (A) and for select primate outgroups (B) and

estimated using the Count software for ancestral lineages. Bar graphs show absolute gene count

for each subfamily. Predicted gene subfamily origins are annotated with arrows. Tree adapted

from dos Reis 2018 (dos Reis et al. 2018). Circled node numbers correspond with Table 1.

 Figure 2. Intraspecific variation in V1R repertoire size estimates across eight closely-

 related *Microcebus murinus* individuals. Genomes were *de novo* assembled and mined for loci

 with significant V1R homology and an ORF longer than 801bp. Individual DLC7033 was

 sequenced twice and repertoire size estimates are reported for both assemblies. Squares

 represent males and circles represent females. Horizontal lines indicate mate pairs (mother and

 father) and vertical or slanted lines indicate parent to offspring relationshiop. Numbers inside

 the symbols represent repertoire size estimates. Individuals represented by grey symbols were

 not sequenced.

	Intact (%)	Total
Microcebus tavaratra	143 (62%)	232
Microcebus mittermeieri	146 (61%)	239
Microcebus ravelobensis	129 (66%)	194
Microcebus griseorufus	137 (62%)	222
Microcebus murinus	102 (61%)	168
Mirza zaza	95 (64%)	149
Cheirogaleus medius	58 (58%)	100
Cheirogaleus sibreei	70 (65%)	107
Propithecus coquereli	27 (46%)	59
Eulemur flavifrons	23 (48%)	48
Eulemur macaco	25 (49%)	51
Prolemur simus	22 (26%)	84
Daubentonia madagascarensis	17 (20%)	83
Otolemur garnetti	54 (61%)	89
Gorilla gorilla	2 (6%)	32
Homo sapiens	2 (4%)	48
Nomascus leucogenys	1 (3%)	30
Callithrix jacchus	7 (23%)	30
Carlito syrichta	28 (20%)	142
Galeopterus variegatus	32 (37%)	87
Tupaia chinensis	15 (31%)	48
Mus musculus	238 (75%)	319

Figure 3. V1R repertoire size estimates across the strepsirrhine phylogeny. Sequences with V1R homology were mined from available strepsirrhine and select outgroup genomes. Total V1Rs consist of all genomic regions with V1R homology that are ≥ 600bp in length. Intact genes are defined by vomeronasal homology and a ≥ 801bp ORF. Nocturnal species are highlighted in gray. Tree adapted from dos Reis 2018 (dos Reis et al. 2018).

Figure 4. ML topology of V1R repertoire. V1R subfamilies in primates are highlighted and

circumscribed based on Hohenbrink et al. (2012). There are nine described subfamilies in

lemurs, L *Strep*/I through L IX, although not all lemur sequences fall into these subfamilies.

Clades of V1R subfamilies with known function in mice are shown in burnt orange (M AB

through M JK). Circles at nodes represent bootstrap support. Black nodes have 100% bootstrap

support, dark grey nodes are supported with 70% or more bipartitions from bootstrap trees, and

light grey nodes are weak or unsupported with less than 70% of bipartitions across bootstrap

replicates. The topology is arbitrarily rooted for visualization. Solid lines represent dwarf and

mouse lemur V1Rs (or branches subtending clades of dwarf and mouse lemur V1Rs). Dashed

lines represent V1R lineages that are not within Cheirogaleidae.

Figure 5. Sites under selection across the V1R alignment. Subfamilies are given at the top

along with numbers that correspond to taxonomic filters. The first aligned codon starts at the top

and the aligned codon position 588 at the bottom, with boundaries of transmembrane domains to

the right. Sites under selection are colored. Missing columns means that the filter was redundant.

Numbers along the bottom are counts of sites under selection detected by both model

comparisons and their overlap. The boundaries of loop domains (L) and transmembrane domains

(T) are shown along the aligned V1R repertoire. A PCA of sites under selection treated all

codons as a binary character, determined by whether the site was under selection or not. Circle

are 95% CIs for centroids of subfamily variation by taxonomic filters.

970 **Figure 6. Chromosomal synteny between mouse and mouse lemur V1R-containing regions.**

971 Synteny between *Mus musculus* and *Microcebus murinus* was estimated using the SynChro

972 software. Chromosomes are colored relative to V1R-containing mouse chromosomes. V1R loci

973 are indicated with red lines and are labelled by subfamily identity. Regions outlined in black are

974 enriched for V1R loci and are examined in further detail in Figure 7B.

Figure 7. Highly orthologous loci on "hotspot" V1R chromosome. (A) RAxML tree of *Mus*

musculus V1R cDNA sequences with intact V1R sequences from the *Microcebus murinus*

genome. Mouse subfamilies are encircled in black and labelled by chromosomal location. Mouse

lemur subfamilies are labelled in black and encircled in the color corresponding to the syntenic

mouse chromosomal location. (B) Chromosomal "hotspot" regions enriched in V1R loci from

several mammalian taxa. Orthologous regions are shaded by syntenic mouse chromosome. V1Rs

loci are labelled by phylogenetic relationship to mouse/lemur subfamilies. Starting and end

genomic positions are given for each species, and all regions are 23Mb long with tick marks

representing 5 Mb intervals.

Tables

Table 1. Inference of V1R birth-death process within primates.

Node/lineage	Clade	Gains - Losses	Subfamilies Retained	Subfamilies Gained	Subfamilies Lost
Node 1	Euarchonta	NA	I, II, III, IV, VIII	NA	NA
Node 2	Primates plus Dermoptera	0 - 1	I, II, III, VIII	-	IV
Node 3	Euprimates	1 - 0	I, II, III, VIII	V	-
Node 4	Haplorrhini	0 - 2	I, III, V	-	II, VIII
Node 5	Anthropoidea	0 - 1	III, V	-	I
Node 6	Hominoidea	0 - 1	III	-	V
N. leucogenys	white-cheeked gibbon	1 - 1	-	VII	V
Node 7	Strepsirrhini	1 - 0	I, II, III, V, VIII	VI	-
Node 8	Lemuriformes	1 - 0	I, II, III, V, VI, VIII	IV	-
D. madagascariensis	aye-aye	1 - 3	III, VI, VIII	IX	I, II, V
Node 9	Lemuridae	0 - 1	I, II, III, V, VI	-	VIII
Node 10	*Eulemur*	1 - 0	I, II, III, V, VI	VII	-
Node 11	Cheirogaleidae	3 - 0	I, II, III, V, VI, VIII	IV, VII, IX	-

Note - Node numbers correspond to Figure 1. Gains and losses cannot be evaluated for Node 1 because it is the root node of the species tree.