A Willow Sex Chromosome Reveals Convergent Evolution of Complex Palindromic Repeats

Ran Zhou[1], David Macaya-Sanz[1], Craig H. Carlson[2], Jeremy Schmutz[3,4], Jerry W. Jenkins[3], David Kudrna[5], Aditi Sharma[4], Laura Sandor[4], Shengqiang Shu[4], Kerrie Barry[4], Gerald A. Tuskan[6,7], Tao Ma[8], Jianquan Liu[8,9], Matthew Olson[10], Lawrence B. Smart[2], Stephen P. DiFazio[1,11]

[1]Department of Biology, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506-6057

[2]Horticulture Section, School of Integrative Plant Science, Cornell University, New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, NY 14456

[3]HudsonAlpha Institute of Biotechnology, Huntsville, Alabama, USA

[4]Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute, Walnut Creek, California, USA

[5]Arizona Genomics Institute, School of Plant Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

[6]Biosciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA

[7]DOE-Center for Bioenergy Innovation (CBI), Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA

[8]Key Laboratory of Bio-Resource and Eco-Environment of Ministry of Education, College of Life Sciences, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

[9]State Key Laboratory of Grassland Agro-Ecosystem, Institute of Innovation Ecology & College of Life Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China

[10]Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Box 43131, Lubbock, TX 79409-3131, USA

[11]Corresponding Author: spdifazio@mail.wvu.edu

R.Z.: razhou@mix.wvu.edu; D.M.-S.: david.macayasanz@mail.wvu.edu; C.H.C.: chc89@cornell.edu; J.S.: jschmutz@hudsonalpha.org; J.W.J.: jjenkins@hudsonalpha.org; D.K.: dkudrna@email.arizona.edu; A.S.: AditiSharma@lbl.gov; L.S.: LCSandor@lbl.gov; S.S.: SQShu@lbl.gov; K.B.: kwbarry@lbl.gov; G.A.T: tuskanga@ornl.gov; T.M.: matao.yz@gmail.com; J.L.: liujq@nwipb.cas.cn; M.O.: matt.olson@ttu.edu; L.B.S.: lbs33@cornell.edu

**Abstract**

**Background**

Sex chromosomes in a wide variety of species share common characteristics, including the

presence of suppressed recombination surrounding sex determination loci. They have arisen

independently in numerous lineages, providing a conclusive example of convergent evolution.

Mammalian sex chromosomes contain multiple palindromic repeats across the non-recombining

region that facilitate sequence conservation through gene conversion, and contain genes that are

crucial for sexual reproduction. Plant sex chromosomes are less well understood, and in

particular it is not clear how coding sequence conservation is maintained in the absence of

homologous recombination.

**Results**

Here we present the first evidence of large palindromic structures in a plant sex chromosome,

based on a highly contiguous assembly of the W chromosome of the dioecious shrub *Salix*

*purpurea*. Two consecutive palindromes span over a region of 200 kb, with conspicuous 20 kb

stretches of highly conserved sequences among the four arms. The closely-related species *S.*

*suchowensis* also has two copies of a portion of the palindrome arm and provides strong

evidence for gene conversion. Four genes in the palindrome are homologous to genes in the SDR

of the closely-related genus *Populus*, which is located on a different chromosome. These genes

show distinct, floral-biased expression patterns compared to paralogous copies on autosomes.

**Conclusion**

The presence of palindromic structures in sex chromosomes of mammals and plants highlights

the intrinsic importance of these features in adaptive evolution in the absence of recombination.

Convergent evolution is driving both the independent establishment of sex chromosomes as well

as their fine-scale sequence structure.

**Keywords**

Sex, gene conversion, W chromosome, palindrome, genome, *Salix*

**Introduction**

Sex chromosomes are fascinating not only because they contain the master regulatory

genes that confer sex-specific traits, but also because of their unique evolutionary history [1]. In

theory, the heterogametic (sex-specific) sex chromosome evolved from an autosome. There are

two important features in sex determination regions (SDRs): suppressed recombination and the

presence of sequences that only occur in one sex [1]. Furthermore, many sex chromosomes have

lost most of their original genes over evolutionary time, and accumulated repetitive sequences

such as transposable elements and tandem gene duplications [2,3]. Consequently, ancient sex

chromosomes are difficult to sequence because they are often highly heterochromatic and have a

large amount of repetitive and ampliconic DNA [1,4].

A striking characteristic of animal Y chromosomes is the presence of large palindromes

in Y-ampliconic regions consisting of large inverted repeats with highly identical sequences that

are undergoing gene conversion [5]. These palindromes are enriched for genes that are expressed

in the testes and are important for male sexual development in mammals [4,6–8]. Palindromes

have also been found on the W chromosomes of New World sparrows and blackbirds, suggesting

that this may be a widespread feature of sex chromosomes [9]. However, such structures have

not yet been described in plants.

Plant sex chromosomes have been identified in approximately 40 species but fewer than half of them are heteromorphic (readily discernable by cytology) [10,11]. In plants, male-specific Ys (MSYs) have been studied in papaya and persimmon. Both of these contain a female suppressor on the Y chromosome [12–14]. Recently, a female suppressing gene in asparagus has been identified on the Y chromosome using long-read sequencing technology with optical mapping [15]. Another study on octoploid strawberry found repeated translocations of a female-specific gene cassette [16]. RNA-seq was applied to study the switches in heterogamety in two *Silene* species as well [17]. These dynamic sexual systems provide an excellent opportunity to study the drivers of sex chromosome evolution.

Sex determination is similarly diverse within the Salicaceae family. SDRs have been consistently found on chromosome 15 with female heterogamety in multiple *Salix* species [18–20]. This is quite different from the closely-related genus *Populus* where sex determining regions consistently occur on chromosome 19, with most species showing male heterogamety [21,22]. Previously, we reported that the SDR occupies a large portion of the W chromosome in *S. purpurea*, because a large region on Chr15 shows lack of recombination and a large number of female-biased alleles [18,23]. This is different from the small SDR observed in *P. trichocarpa* and *P. balsamifera* [22,24]. However, due to the structural complexity of the SDRs, none of these studies have thus far included an in-depth analysis of the sequence composition and structure of the SDRs, and it is unclear whether there is a common underlying mechanism of sex determination. Here we present a much more complete assembly of the *S. purpurea* W chromosome and report for the first time in plants a palindromic repeat structure that is similar to the one found on mammalian Y chromosomes. We also demonstrate that shared homologous

genes occur in the *Salix* and *Populus* SDRs, suggesting a potentially shared underlying

mechanism of sex determination in this family.

**Results**

**Genome assembly**

We present here highly contiguous genome assemblies of a female and a male *S.*

*purpurea*. The female assembly (94006 v4) consists of 452 contigs with an N50 of 5.1 Mb,

covering a cumulative total of 317.1 Mb. Similarly, the male assembly (Fish Creek v3), has 351

contigs and an N50 of 5.6 Mb, covering 312.9 Mb (Additional File 1: Table S1). Both assemblies

are partially phased in genomic regions where the two haplotypes are divergent. Alternative

haplotypes are represented by 421 contigs totaling 72.4 Mb in the female assembly, and 497

contigs totaling 149 Mb for the male. Using a genetic map from a large family derived from

progeny of the sequenced male genotype, we created assemblies representing the 19

chromosomes, containing 108 contigs totaling 288.3 Mb for the female, and 96 contigs totaling

288.5 Mb for the male. These represent over 90% of the assembled sequence in both cases,

though 344 and 255 contigs remained unplaced by the genetic map for the female and male,

respectively (Additional File 1:Table S2).

Because we expected the female-specific haplotype to be differentiated from the shared

haplotype in the SDR, we anticipated that much of this region would be assembled as separate

contigs, corresponding to W and Z haplotypes in the SDR. These can be readily differentiated by

examining the relative depth of coverage when aligning male versus female short read sequences

against these references. After identifying the location of the SDR based on the presence of sex-

biased markers [18], the initial Chromosome 15 assembly appeared to consist of a mix of Z and

W scaffolds in the SDR (Additional File 2: Figure S1a).  We therefore sought to create a new

assembly with Z and W haplotypes assembled to separate chromosomes. To do this we first

identified the female-specific contigs (putative W contigs) using sex association and sex-specific

depth as criteria. This resulted in identifying 23 contigs that were putatively comprised primarily

of female-specific sequence (Additional File 1: Table S3). One scaffold was excluded because it

mostly consisted of an alternative haplotype of a longer contig in the PAR of Chr15W.

Many of these contigs lacked markers from our intercross map, particularly for those that

came from female-specific W (FSW) regions that were absent on the Z chromosome. We

therefore created new genetic maps that had a mix of SNP and indel markers that would be more

suited to capturing these hemizygous portions of the genome. The new genetic maps converged

to 19 major linkage groups representing the 19 chromosomes. The male backcross map

contained 8,715 markers, while the female backcross map contained 8,560 markers (Additional

File 1: Table S4). We used these to assemble a Z and a W version of Chr15 (Additional File 1:

Table S5). Thus, the current assembly (release ver5) contains 20 chromosomes, including

Chr15Z and Chr15W. A total of 6.56 Mb (95.7%) of the W-specific contig sequence, contained

in 17 contigs, was assembled to Chr15W using these maps. Four putative W scaffolds totaling

297 kb in length lacked mapped markers and could not be placed unambiguously.

**Location of the SDR**

We repeated sex association analysis with our new assembly with Chr15Z removed.

Among 54,959 tested SNPs, all 105 significantly sex-associated SNPs were present only on

Chr15W (Fig. 1a; Additional File 2: Figure S2a-c), and markers from PARs and other scaffolds

in the main genome did not show any sex association (Additional File 2: Figure S2a). The eight

top-ranking sex-associated markers were distributed from 7.66 Mb to 8.66 Mb. Sex-associated

markers were primarily heterozygous in females and homozygous in males, confirming our

previously-reported observation of ZW sex determination in *S. purpurea* [18].

**Composition of the sex chromosomes 15W and 15Z**

Chr15W is 15.7 Mb in length, composed of 22 contigs placed with the new genetic map.

For comparison, Chr15Z is only 13.3 Mb and is comprised of 16 contigs (Additional File 1:

Table S5; Figure 1). There are two pseudoautosomal regions (PARs) at each end of Chr15W that

are indistinguishable from the corresponding regions on Chr15Z. PAR1 is 2.7 Mb long and is

composed of two contigs, and PAR2 is 6.5 Mb and is comprised of three contigs (Fig. 1). These

regions are unphased and are therefore identical in the two assemblies.

The sex-determining region (SDR) spans from 2.7 Mb to 9.1 Mb on Chr15W and

occupies nearly 40% of the chromosome (hereafter referred to as the W-SDR). This region

undergoes minimal recombination in the mapping population (Additional File 2: Figure S3).

Reexamining sex-specific depth of the W-SDR, it is clear that this region of the genome is

mostly phased to separate the male and female haplotypes (Additional File 2: Figure S1b). One

contig (ws9) in the W-SDR is clearly chimeric based on the distribution of female-specific

sequence (Fig. 1c), and the depth profile (Additional File 2: Figure S1b). However, this contig is

only 300 kb in length, so it doesn't change the overall conclusion that the FSW is largely phased.

The region corresponding to the W-SDR on Chr15Z is about 4 Mb in length, and only occupies

28.2% of the chromosome (hereafter referred to as the Z-SDR). The size discrepancy is primarily

due to the FSW regions. Based on the depth ratios, the Z-degenerate regions are about 3.5 Mb

and W insertions are about 3.1 Mb in the W-SDR.

The W-SDR has lower gene density and higher repeat density than other portions of the

genome (Table 1). More specifically, both the W-SDR and the Z-SDR show lower gene density

on average than the PARs or other autosomes. Similarly, both the W-SDR and Z-SDR show

higher accumulation of Gypsy retrotransposons. Interestingly, Copia-LTRs occur at higher

density in the W-SDR region compared to the Z-SDR (15 per 100 kb vs 9 per 100 kb), (Kruskall-

Wallis test, P<2.2e-16) (Table 1), suggesting that these inserted following cessation of

recombination between these haplotypes.

**Gene content of the W chromosome**

There are 269 genes in PAR1, 778 genes in PAR2, and 488 genes in the W-SDR. In

contrast, the Z-SDR only contains 317 genes (Fig. 2; Additional File 1: Table S6-7). An

additional 29 genes are present on scaffold_844, which is likely derived from the Z haplotype,

but which lacked genetic markers to properly place it. There were 146 single copy mutual best

hits between the W-SDR and Z-SDR, referred to hereafter as Z degenerate genes (Fig. 2). The

SDR also contains 47 genes in tandem duplications, while the corresponding tandem repeats in

the Z-SDR contain 78 genes. Additionally, the Chr15W SDR contains 65 genes that have mutual

best hits on other autosomes, and 33 of these are tandemly duplicated in the SDR. In contrast, the

Z-SDR region contains only 14 such genes, only four of which are tandemly duplicated. These

putatively translocated genes comprise 13% of the W-SDR and only 4% of the Z-SDR, and

account for nearly half of the discrepancy in gene content between the haplotypes. An additional

52 genes in the W-SDR had a top hit to other genes in the genome, but the best hit was not

mutual, so these are lower confidence candidates for translocations or Z-degenerate genes. The

Z-SDR contained 20 such genes. The remaining genes had no significant hits to other genes in

the genome, presumably due to loss by deletion, or gaps in the sequence or annotation (125 in

the W-SDR and 58 in the Z-SDR).

**Z-degenerate Genes and Strata**

We used syntenic gene pairs identified through MCScanX between Chr15W and Chr15Z

to test if there are strata with different levels of synonymous substitutions (Ks), which would

indicate different phases of cessation of recombination [25]. There was little evidence to support

the presence of strata based on 151 pairs of Z-degenerate genes (Fig. 3 and Additional File 1:

Table S8).  The average of Ks was 0.028. For comparison, the Ks between syntenic genes on

Chr01 for *S. purpurea* and *S. suchowensis* was 0.027, and the Ks between *S. purpurea* and *P.*

*trichocarpa* was 0.156 (Fig. 3).

**Translocations to the W-SDR and palindromic repeats**

The recently translocated genes are of particular interest because of the insights they can

provide into the evolutionary history of the sex chromosome. Among 65 genes putatively

translocated from autosomes to the W-SDR, 10 have best hits on Chr19 (manually annotated

genes excluded) (Additional File 1: Table S9). Contig ws19 is particularly enriched for

translocated genes, and merits a closer examination (Fig. 1). Contig ws19 contains 11

translocated genes, including four genes from Chr19 and four genes from Chr17 (Fig. 1). Many

of these translocated genes occur in two to four copies on ws19 in striking inverted repeat

configurations that are similar to the palindromic repeats that occur on mammalian Y

chromosomes (Fig. 4).

In *S. purpurea*, this region is female-specific and is composed of two palindromes.

Palindrome W.P1 spans about 42.7 Kb with a 2.6 kb spacer in the center, and Palindrome W.P.2

is immediately adjacent and spans over 165 kb (Table 2; Fig. 4a). A 20 kb sequence occurs in

inverted orientation and shows high sequence identity across the four arms of both palindromes

(Table 2; Fig. 5a). In palindrome W.P1 these are referred to as arm1 and arm2, and in

Palindrome W.P2 these are referred to as arm3a and arm4a (Table 2; Fig. 4a). Sequence identity

180 among these four arms is greater than 99% on average. The regions of high identity are disrupted

181 by a ~500 bp insertion in the center of arm4. Furthermore, arm3 has a 6.9 kb deletion at 11.7 kb,

182 followed by a stretch of 1.6 kb that can be aligned to the other arms in the same orientation (Fig.

183 5a). Additionally, there is a 12 kb stretch upstream of arm1 that shows high identity to portions

184 of arms 1 and 2. We call this the pre-arm for convenience (Table 2).

185  Palindrome W.P2 contains an additional inverted repeat that is missing from W.P1. We

186 refer to this as arm3b and arm4b (Table 2; Fig. 4a). Sequence conservation is somewhat lower

187 between these two arms compared to the other four, ranging from 96% to 99% over most of their

188 length. Furthermore, the regions of high identity are disrupted by numerous insertions and

189 deletions (Fig. 5b).

190 **Gene content of the palindromes**

191  There are five genes duplicated across arms 1, 2, 3a and 4a of both palindromes. These

192 are the Small Muts-Related protein (SMR), a Type-A cytokinin response regulator (RR), two

193 genes that contain an NB-ARC domain (R1 and R2), and a Hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA shikimate/

194 hydroxycinnamoyl transferase (HCT) (Table 3). All of these genes except R2 have clear

195 paralogous copies on Chr19. There is very little sequence divergence among most of these

196 paralogs in the palindromes (Fig. 5).

197  The cytokinin response regulator is of particular interest because an ortholog of this gene

198 has also been found to be associated with sex in *Populus* [22], and is therefore an excellent

199 candidate as a master regulator of sex in the Salicaceae. The RR gene is highly conserved across

200 all four palindrome arms on the W-SDR (Fig. 5a,c). Interestingly, we also found a pseudogene

201 copy of the RR gene on the Z-SDR. This is the only one of the five genes that is present in some

202 form on the W-SDR, the Z-SDR, Chr19, and also in the SDR of *Populus*. There is a 2.6 kb

sequence inserted upstream of all RR copies in the palindrome, and not in the Z-SDR

pseudogene or on Chr19 (Additional File 2: Figure S4). This suggests that the W-SDR

palindrome formed after translocation from Chr19. Interestingly, the RR gene also occurs as

inverted repeats in all three locations in the genome (W-SDR, Z-SDR, and Chr19). However,

alignment of the W-SDR, Z-SDR and Chr19 versions demonstrates that the palindromes likely

formed independently, because the palindromic regions are different (Additional File 2: Figure

S4).

There are an additional five genes in the W.P2 palindrome. Three of these genes occur as

inverted repeats: a DNA-directed primase/polymerase protein (*DRBM*), a DNA primase

(*DPRIM*), and a protein containing Domain of Unknown Function 789 (*DUF789*). In addition,

there is a homolog of ARGONAUTE 4 (*TF2C*) and a CBS domain protein (*ACDP*) in single

copy. Four of these genes were apparently translocated from Chr17 (Table 3). This leads us to

the hypothesis that after these genes were translocated to the W-SDR they underwent several

rounds of structural rearrangements, including duplications, inversions, and deletions.

**Multiple LTR retrotransposons in the palindrome**

To gain further insight into the composition and history of the W-SDR, we used

LTRharvest and LTRdigest to annotate LTR retrotransposons in the palindromic region. We

identified one LTR retrotransposon in the pre-Arm region and 12 LTR retrotransposons in

palindrome W.P2 that have terminal repeats identified with coding regions (Fig.6a). These 13

retrotransposons are likely to be independent insertion events given that they have different long

terminal repeats  as well as different target site duplications and do not occur in the same

position in the opposite arm of the palindrome (Additional file 1: Table S10). Given that there

are varying numbers of substitutions within the LTRs of the same retrotransposon, it appears that

these insertions have occurred repeatedly after establishment of the palindromes. Using a

previous estimation of the mutation rate in *P. tremula* ($2.5 \times 10^{-9}$ per year)[26], we estimate that

the oldest insertion occurred at least $8.6 \pm 2.9$ s.d. MYA from a nonautonomous LTR

retrotransposon, *Ltr-p2-a* (Fig. 6a and Additional file 1: Table S10). This is likely an

underestimate, since the *Salix* substitution rate is substantially higher than that of *Populus* [27].

Since the oldest substitutions occurred in Palindrome W.P2, we infer that this element became

established first (Fig. 6a). The LTRs of the nonautonomous elements *Ltr-p2-a* and *Ltr-p2-k* flank

the *SMR* and *RR* genes (Fig. 6c,d; Additional file 2: Figure S5), which raises the intriguing

possibility that these LTRs were involved in the translocation of these genes to this region. We

also found two highly identical LTRs from the same family in W.P1 (*Ltr-p2-b3* on arm3 and the

*Ltr-p2-b4* on arm4; Fig. 6a-c; Additional file 1: Table S10). There are truncated parts of this LTR

in the pre-arm and the spacer between arm1 and arm2 as well (Fig. 6b, c). These copies might be

a direct consequence of duplications and inversions that occurred during the formation of the

palindrome instead of independent insertions.

**Evidence for gene conversion in the palindromes**

We have shown that the palindromes are likely to be millions of years old, yet sequence

identity of portions of the palindrome arms remains high (Fig. 5a). A likely explanation for this

is gene conversion among the palindrome arms, as has been observed in the mammalian Y

chromosome palindromes [5]. To test for this, we searched for regions that had interspecific

polymorphisms relative to *S. suchowensis*, a closely-related species with ZW sex determination

[20]. If regions with interspecific polymorphisms lack paralogous sequence variation (PSV)

across the palindrome arms, then this would be excellent evidence of gene conversion. We

detected a 3 kb region within the palindromes where there are no PSVs in *S. purpurea* and only

one PSV in *S. suchowensis*, but substantial interspecific polymorphisms (Fig. 7). The depth of

this region is 4N as expected for the four copies of the palindrome arms in *S. purpurea*. In *S.*

*suchowensis*, the depth is between 2N and 3N, which indicates that there might be a palindrome

structure as well, though it might be incomplete. We also applied the same methods with

resequencing reads of two female and two male *S. viminalis* individuals (another *Salix* with ZW

sex determination) [19], but the palindromic region was not well covered by reads of either sex.

This may indicate that *S. viminalis* lacks the palindrome, though it is more distantly related to *S.*

*purpurea* than is *S. suchowensis*, so this may simply be due to excessive sequence divergence in

this region.

**Expression patterns of genes in the palindromes**

We examined expression profiles in multiple tissues of the two reference genomes to

validate the predicted transcripts and to determine how the expression patterns of genes in the

palindromes differ from their autosomal counterparts. As expected, most genes in the

palindromes show female-limited expression while the autosomal copies are generally not sex-

biased (Fig. 8a). The cytokinin response regulator (*RR*) (Sapur.15W073500) shows the highest

expression in catkin tissue, followed by expression in shoot tips and stems. On the contrary, two

autosomal copies on Chr19 show lower expression, limited to female catkins and male buds. The

four copies of the *SMR* gene show low expression in female catkins and other tissues, but the

autosomal copy on Chr19 (Sapur.019G001500) is expressed in all tissues (Fig. 8a). All five

copies of the *HCT* gene from the palindromes showed low expression in female catkins and roots

and higher expression in leaf tissues, shoot tips, and stems, all of which were female-biased. Two

copies of the DNA Primase gene from palindrome W.P2 also show high expression in leaf

tissues while the original copy on the autosome (Sapur.017G119600) was expressed across all

sampled tissues. Similarly, analysis of transcriptomic data of catkins from 10 females and 10

males in the $F_2$ family confirms that the genes in the palindromes are primarily expressed in

female tissue, in contrast to their autosomal paralogs (Fig. 8b).

**Discussion**

**The W chromosome in *S. purpurea***

Using male and female specific depth from a controlled cross pedigree, we have been

able to identify Z and W haplotypes from the SDR of a highly heterozygous species from a

standard PacBio assembly. We also show how presence-absence markers generated from

sequence depth in controlled cross progeny can be used to genetically map hemizygous portions

of the SDR. In a similar study of a young Y chromosome in asparagus, BioNano optical maps for

a YY individual were generated to improve genome contiguity, and sequence depth of coverage

was also treated as a QTL to aid the assembly because of the presence of large indels in the sex

chromosome [15]. Here, we showed that by combining long-read sequencing with GBS marker

data from a large $F_2$ family, we could efficiently identify the sex-specific regions of the sex

chromosome. However, unlike strategies like single-haplotype iterative mapping and sequencing

(SHIMS) that have been used in assemblies of mammalian Y chromosomes [4,6–8], our map-

based strategy could not provide a definitive order for the female-specific contigs due to lack of

recombination in the SDR.

Our W chromosome assembly has helped explain why sex association analyses

sometimes detect multiple unlinked loci on different chromosomes [18,22,28]. GWAS with a

nearly exhaustive collection of W contigs in the reference genome yields a single sex association

peak (Additional File 2: Figure S2). We have shown that the SDR contains many translocations

from autosomes. If those translocated segments are absent from the reference genome, W-

specific reads from a female individual align to the original source of those sequences, resulting

in false association peaks on the autosomes. This may also explain the multiple peaks detected in

*P. trichocarpa* and *P. balsamifera*, both of which have XY sex determination systems. In this

case, SNPs were identified based on alignments to a female reference genome, which lacks the

SDR [22].

Autosomal translocations are likely to be important contributors to the evolutionary

history of the sex chromosome in *S. purpurea*. The W chromosome is approximately 2.5 Mb

larger than the Z chromosome due to expansion of the SDR, including a substantial expansion of

gene content, driven in part by numerous translocations and subsequent expansion of autosomal

genes. Autosomal translocations have also been demonstrated in other sex chromosomes. For

example, ampliconic sequences on the human Y chromosome were acquired through

transpositions from diverse sources, and then amplified [4]. These ampliconic sequences account

for about 30% of the male-specific Y euchromatin [4]. These translocations and other structural

rearrangements may also suppress recombination and  cause linkage between autosomal and sex-

linked genes [2]. In plants, the large sizes of young Y chromosomes have been attributed to the

accumulation of retrotransposons (reviewed in  [29]).

Initial analyses in *P. trichocarpa* suggested that the SDR is much younger than the whole

genome duplication event that is shared by *Populus* and *Salix*, suggesting that the SDR became

established well after these genera diverged [22]. The SDR of *S. purpurea* also appears to be

established relatively recently. Furthermore, W and Z alleles in the nonrecombining SDR have

similar Ks values compared to those for orthologous autosomal genes from *S. purpurea* and *S.*

*suchowensis*. Given that the SDR is located in approximately the same portion of Chr15 in both

species, and both have ZW systems [18,20], it is reasonable to assume that the SDR became

established in this lineage prior to divergence of these two species, but well after divergence

from *Populus*.

Sex chromosomes commonly show evidence of "evolutionary strata" with markedly

different Ks values that represent different epochs of expansion of the SDR [30]. Under one

common model of sex chromosome evolution, these strata are the result of gradual SDR

expansion as sexually antagonistic alleles become incorporated into the SDR [25,31]. We

detected little evidence for the existence of such strata in *S. purpurea*. This corroborates a

previous analysis that failed to detect strata in *S. suchowensis* using an integrated segmentation

and clustering method, which was successful in finding strata in multiple other species, including

*P. trichocarpa* [32]. The failure of this method in *S. suchowensis* was hypothesized to be due to

the small size of the SDR [32]. However, the identified SDR in *S. purpurea* is about 6-7 Mb,

occupying more than one third of the W chromosome assembly. It appears instead that cessation

of recombination has not been a gradual long-term process in the *S. purpurea* SDR. One

explanation for the large size of this region is it partially overlaps with the centromere of Chr15,

as we previously reported [18]. It's possible that the repressed recombination in this region pre-

dated the translocation of a relatively small SDR cassette, as has been observed in octoploid

*Fragaria* [16]. This is consistent with the apparently small size of the region in *Populus* [22].

This is also consistent with the structure and composition of the palindromic repeats that we

discovered in *S. purpurea*, as detailed below.

**Sex chromosome palindrome repeats**

We have reported here the first observation of a large inverted repeat in a plant sex

chromosome, similar to the palindromic structures observed in mammalian sex chromosomes.

W.P1 and W.P2 of *S. purpurea* have a similar arrangement of arms as P1 and P3 in humans due

to the presence of highly homologous regions between the two palindromes. Similar palindromes

have been discovered on Y chromosomes of several mammals and avian W chromosomes

(reviewed by [5]). Large mammalian palindromes developed as a series of accumulations of

insertions from autosomes and maintained through arm-to-arm gene conversion. This

intrachromosomal gene conversion provides an essential function in maintaining coding

sequence integrity which otherwise would be compromised by the continuous accumulation of

deleterious mutations in the absence of homologous recombination (i.e., Muller's Ratchet)

[5,33,34]. The fact that these structures have independently evolved in non-recombining regions

of sex chromosomes is an intriguing case of convergent evolution of chromosome structure. It is

interesting to note that the chloroplast genome, another non-recombining chromosome in plants,

also contains a different large inverted repeat that undergoes gene conversion [35] and helps

maintain structural integrity of the genome, suggesting that this phenomenon may be common in

regions of the genome that lack recombination [36].

The *S. purpurea* palindromes are considerably smaller than mammalian palindromes, and

have only accumulated two major autosomal translocations, possibly reflecting their young age.

Another difference between the human palindrome and the one in *S. purpurea* is that the gene

conversion seems to be quite efficient across all the eight palindromes in humans, but the

observed regions under gene conversion in *S. purpurea* are much more limited. This is

particularly obvious in W.P2, compared to human P1, which has high sequence identity over

several Mb (Fig. 4).

LTR retrotransposons found in the palindrome are important at least for two reasons. The

observation of nonautonomous LTR retrotransposons suggests that translocations mediated

through transposable elements could provide  a means of movement of genes (such as sex-

determining gene(s)), similar to what has been observed in octoploid *Fragaria* [16]. Secondly,

illegitimate intrachromosomal recombination events could be mediated by LTR retrotransposons

that have accumulated in the SDR [37], resulting in complex rearrangements like the

palindromic structures. Our observation of a truncated copy of a copia LTR located at the spacer

between arm1 and arm2 lends some support to this (Fig. 6). However, gene conversion prevents

us from properly inferring relationships between these LTRs and structural variation in the

palindrome by eliminating informative paralogous variations. Inferences about the order of

formation of palindromic arms will require analysis in a comparative phylogenetic framework.

**Type A Response Regulator is a sex determination candidate gene**

The Y chromosome palindromes in humans contain eight gene families that are expressed

predominantly in the testes and which are essential for spermatogenesis [5,38,39]. These genes

undergo extensive gene conversion and have high sequence conservation among the copies [5],

and they also show evidence of dosage sensitivity [40,41]. It is therefore reasonable to suspect

that the multi-copy genes in the *S. purpurea* palindrome might play important roles in sex

determination and/or sex dimorphism. Support for this hypothesis is provided by the type A

cytokinin response regulator homologs that occur in palindrome arms 1,2,3a, and 4a (Table 3).

The best ortholog of these genes in *P. trichocarpa* is Potri.019G133600. This gene grouped with

the Arabidopsis type A response regulators *ARR16* and *ARR17* in the original phylogenetic

analysis of this family in *Populus* [42]. Note that this gene was originally designated *PtRR11*, but

it is referred to as *RR9* in subsequent publications [43–45], so we will adopt that nomenclature

here to avoid confusion. *PtRR9* is expressed primarily in reproductive tissues in *Populus* [42,45],

and is also associated with sex in several *Populus* species [22,43,44]. Further supporting its

possible role in sex determination, it was the only gene in the *P. balsamifera* genome that

showed clear sex-specific differences in promoter and gene body methylation [43]. This raises

the intriguing possibility that this gene provides a shared mechanism of sex determination that

plays an essential role in the Chr19 SDR in *Populus* as well as the Chr15 SDR in *Salix*. This is

contrary to previous reports that detected no shared sequence composition of these two SDRs,

leading to a hypothesis of independent evolution of the sex chromosomes in these genera [20]

The cytokinin signaling pathway has emerged in recent years as a prominent candidate

for regulating floral development and sex expression in plants [46,47]. Cytokinin signaling in

Arabidopsis functions as a His-Asp phosphorelay system that transduces the signal from dual

function membrane-bound histidine kinases in the endoplasmic reticulum, through histidine

phosphotransferases to the type B response regulators (ARR). The type B ARR genes contain

both the Asp receiver domain that receives the phosphate from the AHP intermediates, as well as

a myb-like DNA binding domain that recognizes conserved motifs in the cytokinin response

pathways. The type A response regulators are activated by the Type B ARRs. Type A ARRs

contain the receiver domain but lack the DNA binding domain, and are generally negative

regulators of the cytokinin response (reviewed in [48]).

In Arabidopsis, disruption of this pathway at multiple stages has resulted in modified

reproductive development, with cytokinin typically being implicated in enhancing development

of female floral parts [46]. For example,  it has recently been shown that the Type B response

regulators ARR1 and ARR10 bind to the promoter region of the floral homeotic gene

*AGAMOUS*, and down-regulation of these genes inhibits carpel regeneration in an in vitro assay

[49]. Similarly, triple mutants of *ARR1*, *ARR10*, and *ARR12* have severely compromised

gynoecial development [50]. Proper patterning of the gynoecium is hypothesized to depend upon

coordinated expression of genes that are positively regulated by cytokinin in the medial domain

of the developing gynoecium, and suppression of these genes in the lateral domains of the

gynoecium, potentially by *ARR16* [50]. Intriguingly, *ARR16* is one of the closest orthologs of

*PtRR9* [42].

The potential role of cytokinin signaling in dioecy has recently been highlighted by the

groundbreaking study by Akagi et al in kiwifruit (*Actinidia spp*) [47]. The authors identified a

Type C response regulator (*Shy Girl, SyGI*) on the Y chromosome that was associated with

maleness. Overexpression of this gene in Arabidopsis and *Nicotiana tabacum* caused suppression

of carpel development, supporting its potential role as a suppressor of female function [14].  This

work has some interesting parallels with the results reported here for *Salix* and *Populus*. First,

type C response regulators are essentially similar in structure to Type A response regulators, with

the main difference being that Type C is not induced by cytokinin. Interestingly, *PtRR9* also was

not induced by exogenous cytokinin application [42], though this has not yet been tested with

floral tissue.  Second, *SyGI* was duplicated from an autosomal gene and subsequently gained a

new function on the Y chromosome, much like *SpRR9* has been duplicated from Chr19 in *S.*

*purpurea* and established a distinct pattern of expression, and presumably new functions.

However, *RR9* and *SyGI* are clearly not orthologous and likely perform different roles in

cytokinin signal transduction. This supports the view that there are numerous ways to achieve

separate sexes in plants, and it is likely that a myriad of mechanisms underlie the hundreds of

independent occurrences of dioecy in the angiosperms [51], even if a relatively small number of

pathways are involved [11,14].

**Conclusion**

We have shown that the SDR of *S. purpurea* contains large palindromic repeats that are

similar to the prominent palindromes on mammalian Y chromosomes. We further demonstrated

that the *Salix* palindrome is undergoing gene conversion, suggesting some functional similarities

to the mammalian sex chromosomes, a striking example of convergent evolution in chromosome

structure. We have also demonstrated that the coding sequence undergoing gene conversion in

the palindrome, *SpRR9*, is orthologous to a gene that is also associated with sex in *Populus*. This

gene is an excellent candidate for controlling sex determination through modulation of the

cytokinin signaling pathway. However, much remains to be determined about the underlying

mechanism of sex determination. Most importantly, it is currently unclear how the same gene is

functioning in an XY system in *Populus* and a ZW system in *Salix*. It is possible that the W

chromosome version acts as a dominant promoter of female function, while the Y version is a

dominant suppressor of female function, based on the putative roles of cytokinin and the type A

response regulators in female development in Arabidopsis. A detailed model should emerge

through comparative analysis of the W and Y chromosomes of multiple species in the

Salicaceae, which is currently underway.

**Methods**

***Initial assembly of the genome***

Whole genome assemblies were produced for two *S. purpurea* clones: female clone

94006, and a male offspring of this clone, "Fish Creek" (clone 9882-34), which was derived from

a controlled cross between clone 94006 and male *S. purpurea* clone 94001. Clones 94001 and

94006 were collected from naturalized populations in upstate New York, USA. Sequencing reads

were collected using the Illumina and PACBIO platforms at the Department of Energy (DOE)

Joint Genome Institute (JGI) in Walnut Creek, California and the HudsonAlpha Institute in

Huntsville, Alabama.  Illumina reads were sequenced using the Illumina HISeq platform, and the

PACBIO reads were sequenced using the RS platform.  One 400bp insert 2x250 Illumina

fragment library was sequenced for total coverage of 183x in clone 94006 and 153x in Fish

Creek. Prior to use, Illumina reads were screened for mitochondria, chloroplast, and ΦX174

contamination. Reads composed of >95% simple sequence were removed. Illumina reads <50bp

after trimming for adapter and quality (q<20) were removed. For the PACBIO sequencing, a

total of 47 P6C4 chips (10 hour movie time) were sequenced for each genome with a p-read

yield of 39 Gb and a total coverage of ~110x per genome (Additional File 1: Table S11). The

assembly was performed using FALCON-UNZIP [52]and the resulting sequence was polished

using QUIVER [53]. Finally, homozygous SNPs and INDELs were corrected in the release

consensus sequence using ~80x of the 2x250 Illumina reads by aligning the reads using bwa

mem and identifying homozygous SNPs and INDELs with the GATK's UnifiedGenotyper tool

[54](Additional File 1: Table S12).

Chromosome-scale assemblies were created using a genetic map derived from 3,697 GBS

markers generated for a family of 497 $F_2$ progeny from a cross in which the male reference is the

father and the female reference is the grandmother. This map is described more completely in a

previous publication [55]. This intercross map was used to identify misjoins, characterized by an

abrupt change in the *S. purpurea* linkage group. Scaffolds were then oriented, ordered, joined,

and numbered using the intercross map and the existing 94006 v1 release assembly [18].

Adjacent alternative haplotypes were identified on the joined contigs, and these regions were

then collapsed using the longest common substring between the two haplotypes. Significant

telomeric sequence was identified using the $(TTTAGGG)_n$ repeat, and care was taken to make

sure that it was properly oriented in the production assembly. The remaining scaffolds were

screened against bacterial proteins, organelle sequences, GenBank nr and removed if found to be

a contaminant. Completeness of the euchromatic portion of the assembly was assessed by

aligning *S. purpurea* var 94006 v1 annotated genes to the assemblies. In both cases, 99.7% of the

genes were found.

***Identification of W contigs***

Contigs derived from the W chromosome are expected to contain some large indels

compared to contigs from the Z chromosome due to the lack of recombination between W and Z.

These hemizygous regions should exclusively occur in the female specific SDR. To identify

these regions, we aligned 2x250 bp Illumina resequencing reads from female clone 94006 and

male clone Fish Creek to the new reference using Bowtie2 [56]. Depth of coverage was extracted

using samtools-1.2[57]. Median depth was calculated using a non-overlapping sliding window of

10 kb.

To verify if these hemizygous regions are strictly inherited in only female individuals, we

used the GBS data from the $F_2$ family. GBS reads of 195 offspring of each sex were aligned to

the v5 reference with Bowtie2. Due to low coverage and depth of the GBS markers per locus per

individual, bam files were merged according to sex in samtools-1.2. Depth was then called in

Samtools-1.2 with and max depth was limited to 80,000. Regions continuously covered by GBS

reads were defined as GBS intervals. Then, the median of each sex was calculated across all of

the intervals. We defined markers as female-specific by integrating the depth from both the $F_2$

GBS and 2x250 datasets (restricted to the GBS intervals) using two rules: 1) $\log_2(\frac{M_{195}+1}{F_{195}+1})<L$,

where $L$ is the lower bounds of the distribution, defined by the fifth percentile divided by the

number of intervals tested (Additional File 2: Figure S6); and 2) $\log_2(\frac{94006_{2by250}+1}{Fish\ Creek_{2by250}+1})>5$. The

cutoff for the second criterion was based on the occurrence of a distinct peak in the distribution

of the ratios (Additional File 2: Figure S7). Scaffolds that contained at least three female-specific

markers were selected as candidate W-female-specific scaffolds (unmapped W pieces). Based on

these criteria, only two contigs from the original Chr15 assembly were from W contigs, and the

rest were from Z (Additional File 1: Table S5; Additional File 2: Figure S1a).

### Assembly of the Z and W chromosomes

Raw GBS reads used for the original map were demultiplexed and trimmed down to 64

bp for each read by process_radtags (in Stacks 1.44 [58]) with -c -q -r -t 64.  Then, trimmed

reads of each sequenced individual from the $F_2$ family were aligned to the 19 chromosomes and

unmapped scaffolds from the main genome and alternative haplotypes from the v4 reference of

94006 using Bowtie 2 [56] with the --very-sensitive flag (-D 20 -R 3 -N 0 -L 20 -i S,1,0.50) to

maintain a balance between sensitivity and accuracy. Upon examining the distribution of SNPs

in the genome, it became clear that the alternative haplotypes were preventing us from retrieving

markers in some regions in the genome, so we repeated the alignments using three different

reference sequences: 1) the 19 chromosomes, 2) unmapped scaffolds, and 3) alternative

haplotypes. Then, a wrapper script ref_map.pl in Stacks was used to call genotypes with -m 5

(minimum number of reads to create a tag for parents) and -P 3 (minimum number of reads to

create a tag for an offspring) on all progeny. Cross type "CP" was chosen since it was the one

closest to our cross. Offspring with poor coverage were removed from the downstream analysis.

Once all genotypes were retrieved through Stacks, markers from different loci showing

the exact same genotype/segregation across the progeny were binned and only markers from the

main genome were kept for mapping. Markers with severe segregation distortion or excessive

missing data were excluded, along with twelve offspring with very low call rate. Genotypes were

imputed and corrected based on inferring haplotypes in the two F1 parents from segregation of

the markers in the progeny.

The grandparents of the $F_2$ cross have extensive stretches of shared haplotypes, possibly

due to historic inbreeding in this naturalized population. This results in long runs of

heterozygosity and homozygosity in the $F_1$ progeny. This inhibits integration of backcross and

intercross markers by available mapping algorithms like those in the Onemap package [59]. To

circumvent this problem, all intercross markers were translated to female and male backcross

markers by identifying the parental origins of alleles based on parental phases and physical

position in the assembly. Also, putatively hemizygous markers were recoded as backcross

markers using sequence depth to infer genotypes. For example, markers with the segregation

pattern +/- x -/- were recoded as AB x BB. These genotypes were also imputed and corrected

based on the inferred haplotypes of the two F1 parents.

Onemap v2.1.1 was used to form initial linkage groups. For each chromosome, there are

two phased linkage groups from each backcross type. However, this phase information derived

from the $F_2$ family is only for the F1 parents, which cannot be directly used for phasing

haplotypes in the grandmother, clone 94006. By comparing parental genotypes from one LG to

those of the grandparents, we inferred which of the 94006 haplotypes were inherited by each $F_1$.

These results were used as a piece of evidence for identifying W-linked scaffolds/contigs, as well

as estimating the overall occurrence of chimeric contigs in the assembly. After building a

framework genetic map using markers from the main genome, non-distorted markers from

unmapped main scaffolds and alternative scaffolds were added.

All unmapped scaffolds were manually checked to see if they matched the phase

information or contained female-specific markers. Those that were identified as Z

scaffolds/contigs were excluded from the W map. The new W and Z were assembled using the

python package ALLMAPS [60] to order and orient scaffolds and reconstruct chromosomes

based on the genetic map. Only the order of the female backcross map was used to assemble the

W, and ALLMAPS was set not to break contigs. This new map-based assembly containing two

versions of chromosome 15 (Chr15Z and Chr15W) is version 5 of the *S. purpurea* var. 94006

genome.

To identify Z-degenerate regions and insertions in the female specific W (FSW), we

realigned the 2x250 reads of 94006 and Fish Creek to the 94006 v5 reference as described above,

except we removed Chr15Z out of the reference. Depth was calculated using samtools, and the

median depth of 50kb non-overlapping windows across was calculated with an in-house script.

Regions where medians of Fish Creek depth are no greater than 10 were considered as insertions

in the FSW, and regions with greater depth were considered Z-degenerate regions. This analysis

was repeated with a 10 kb window as well to enhance the resolution of the analysis.

***Annotation of the genome***

Transcript assemblies were constructed from ~126M pairs of 2x76bp (94006) or 2x150bp

(Fish Creek) paired-end Illumina RNA-seq reads using PERTRAN. 188,628 transcript

assemblies were constructed using PASA from the RNA-seq transcript assemblies. Loci were

determined by transcript assembly alignments and/or EXONERATE alignments of proteins from

*Arabidopsis thaliana*, soybean, poplar, cassava, brachypodium, grape, and Swiss-Prot proteomes,

and high confidence *Salix purpurea* Fish Creek gene model peptides to repeat-soft-masked *S.*

*purpurea* 94006 genome using RepeatMasker with up to 2K BP extension on both ends unless

extending into another locus on the same strand. Gene models were predicted by homology-

based predictors, FGENESH+, FGENESH_EST (similar to FGENESH+, EST as splice site and

intron input instead of protein/translated ORF), and EXONERATE, PASA assembly ORFs (in-

house homology constrained ORF finder) and from AUGUSTUS via BRAKER1. The best

scored predictions for each locus were selected using multiple positive factors including EST and

protein support, and one negative factor: overlap with repeats. The selected gene predictions

were improved by PASA. Improvement includes adding UTRs, splicing correction, and adding

alternative transcripts. PASA-improved gene model proteins were subject to protein homology

analysis to the above mentioned proteomes to obtain Cscore and protein coverage. Cscore is a

protein BLASTP score ratio to MBH (mutual best hit) BLASTP score and protein coverage is

the highest percentage of protein aligned to the best homolog. PASA-improved transcripts were

selected based on Cscore, protein coverage, EST coverage, and its CDS overlapping with

repeats. The transcripts were selected if its Cscore is larger than or equal to 0.5 and protein

coverage larger than or equal to 0.5, or it has EST coverage, but its CDS overlapping with

repeats is less than 20%. For gene models whose CDS overlaps with repeats for more than 20%,

its Cscore must be at least 0.9 and homology coverage at least 70% to be selected. The selected

gene models were subject to Pfam analysis and gene models whose protein is more than 30% in

Pfam TE domains were removed. Incomplete gene models, low homology supported without

fully transcriptome supported gene models and short single exon (< 300 BP CDS) without

protein domain, or good expression gene models were manually filtered out.

To annotate potential genes or coding regions in the palindrome that were missed by the

automated annotation, the full nucleotide sequence of arm1 (about 20 kb) was submitted to the

Fgenesh online service (http://www.softberry.com/berry.phtml?topic=fgenesh) with specific

gene-finding parameters for *Populus trichocarpa*. The predicted peptide sequences were

searched against predicted proteins from *Populus trichocarpa* v3.0, and *Arabidopsis thaliana*

TAIR10 in Phytozome 12 (https://phytozome.jgi.doe.gov/) to find the closest homologous

annotation. The protein domains were identified using hmmscan in HMMER (v3.1b1,

http://hmmer.org/) against the Pfam-A domains (release 32, https://pfam.xfam.org).

*Comparison of Z and W orthologous genes*

Allelic genes on the Z and W chromosomes were identified by performing a reciprocal

blastp of all primary annotated peptide sequences in the main genome with default parameters.

Mutual best hits were identified with over 95% identity over at least 80% of the transcript.

Tandem duplications were identified as genes with expectation values of $1x10^{-10}$ that occurred

within a 500 kb window. In these cases, one representative gene from each tandem array was

used as a representative sequence, and the mutual best hit outside the tandem array was identified

as above.

To identify allelic gene pairs for calculation of synonymous substitutions between the Z

and W alleles, a reciprocal blast of all primary annotated peptide sequences was run with

"blastall –p blastp -i -e 1e-20 -b 5 -v 5 -m 8", and MCscanX was run with default parameters

[61]. The synonymous and nonsynonymous substitution rate of each gene pair in each syntenic

block was estimated by aligning the sequences with CLUSTALW [62] and using the

calc_all_KaKs_pairs script in MCscanX. Only pairs between Chr15W and Chr15Z, and

scaffold_844 were used for estimating the divergence between Z and W.

*Identification of sex-associated loci*

Loci associated with sex were identified using 60 non-clonal individuals from a

naturalized  population of *S. purpurea* [63]. GBS reads from each individual were aligned to the

94006v5 genome without Chr15Z using Bowtie2. Genotypes were called in Stacks 1.14 using

the ref_map.pl wrapper and the populations module with a minimum minor allele frequency of

0.1 and a genotyping rate of 0.1. Loci with greater than 40% missing data were removed.

Association with sex was performed using emmax [64] as described previously [18].

*Detection of palindromic repeats*

We conducted a systematic scan of large highly identical inverted regions. Each

chromosome and scaffold in the main genome was aligned to itself with LASTZ 1.03.66 with the

following flags: --gapped --exact=100 --step=20. An exact value of 100 means that 100-base

exact match is required to qualify as an High Scoring Pair in the output. Using a 1-kb sliding

window and 100-bp steps, an intrachromosomal hit was kept if it matched the following criteria:

1) the hit has the highest identity in the window, 2) greater than 2 kb in length, 3) aligned regions

are not further apart than 500 kb, and 4) there is a corresponding hit on the negative strand.

Candidate palindromes also satisfied the following criteria: 1) identity greater than 99.0%, 2) the

total number of hits from both strands should be less than 4, with at least one on the negative

strand, and 3) large inverted hits are at least 8 kb in length. Each region was manually checked

and assembly artifacts (e.g., corresponding to contig boundaries) and complex repetitive regions

were excluded.

Paralogous gene copies on autosomes were retrieved from the reciprocal blastp results

described above. Paralogous genes within the palindrome arms were aligned along with

paralogous copies from the autosomes using Muscle using default parameters provided in

MEGA 5. In a few cases, the resulting alignments were adjusted manually (Supplemental

Materials: AdditionalFile3). A Neighbor-Joining tree with default parameters was built using

MEGA 5 [65].

To identify recent insertions of transposable elements within the palindrome, LTRharvest

[66] was run with the sequence of the palindromic on Chr15W from 8,778 kb to 9,015 kb with

the target site duplication restricted to 5 bp to 20 bp. To find the protein domains in the coding

region, a protein domain search against Pfam-A domains (release 32) was performed using the

hidden Markov model methods implemented in LTRdigest (–hmms flag) [67]. Predicted LTR

retrotransposons were determined to be non-automonous when coding regions did not contain

any *gag* or *pol* related domains.

To estimate the substitution rate between the flanking LTR repeats, 5' and 3' repeats of

each LTR retrotransposon predicted from LTRharvest were aligned by MUSCLE using default

parameters provided in MEGA 5. After all gaps were removed, both number of differences and

substitution rate were estimated in MEGA5. For number of differences, transitions and

transversions were both included with a uniform rate. Substitution rate was modeled using the

Kimura 2-parameter model provided in MEGA5, and the rate variation among sites was modeled

with a gamma distribution (shape parameter = 1).

***Detection of gene conversion***

As evidence of gene conversion, we searched for regions that were differentiated

between species but concordant among the palindrome arms. To accomplish this, we aligned

paired-end reads from a female clone of *S. suchowensis* (srx1561933) to the 94006 v5 female

reference, plus alternative haplotypes. This yielded an 82.9% overall alignment rate on average.

Mis-mapped reads originating from the autosomes were manually identified by scrutinizing the

alignments, and only reads that mapped exclusively to the palindromic regions were retained.

These reads were re-aligned to Arm1. SNPs and indels were called using mpileup with a

minimum mapping quality of 20 and depth less than 300.

***Expression Profiling***

RNAseq data was obtained from catkins of 10 female and 10 male $F_2$ progeny. RNAseq

data was also obtained from multiple tissues of clones 94006 and Fish Creek. All sequences were

Illumina 2x150 bp reads, except for 94006, which were 2x76 bp reads. Transcripts from the

palindrome can be highly identical among arms and with other paralogous sequences on the

autosomes, which can complicate estimation of gene expression. Thus, all predicted coding

sequences from the same gene family in the palindrome were aligned to the autosomal paralogs,

and conserved sequences were masked in the reference genome. Salmon-0.11.3 [68] was used to

quantify (salmon quant) the raw read count for each sample mentioned above with the gcBias

flag as suggested by the developers. Heatmaps were generated separately for each group of

palindrome genes, using $\log_2$ transformed data normalized with respect to library size or by

variance stabilizing transformations (VST) using the R packages pheatmap and Deseq2 [69].

**Availability of Data and Materials**

All sequence data used in this manuscript have been deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read

Archive (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra). Accession numbers are available in Additional File

1: Table S13. The genome assemblies and annotations are available through Phytozome

(https://phytozome-next.jgi.doe.gov).

**Competing Interests**

None.

**Acknowledgements**

We thank Fred Gouker and the teams at the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station and

West Virginia University for help with management and phenotyping of the field trials used in

this study. We also thank the teams at Phytozome and JGI for facilitating public distribution of

the data. We also thank Niels Müller and Mathias Fladung for helpful discussions.

**Funding**

This work was supported by the NSF Dimensions of Biodiversity Program (DEB-1542509 to S.D. and DEB-1542599 to M.O.). Support was also provided by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31590821, 31561123001, 31500502, 41871044), National Key Research and Development Program of China (2017YFC0505203, 2016YFD0600101), and the National Key Project for Basic Research (2012CB114504). The work conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

**Author Contributions**

R.Z. and D.M.-S. assembled and analyzed the W chromosome; J.S. and J.W.J. assembled the genome; D.K., A.S., L.S., G.A.T., C.C., and K.B. sequenced the genome and transcriptomes; S.S. annotated the genome; S.D., L.B.S., T.M., J.L., and M.O. designed and led the study. S.D, R.Z., and D.M.-S. wrote the manuscript.

**Table 1** Density of genes and LTR retrotransposons in different areas of the genome. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations of frequency per 100 kb window.

| Count per 100 kb | SDR | Z-SDR | PAR | Autosomes* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Genes | 7.7(3.9) | 7.3(3.4) | 12.0(4.2) | 11.4(4.2) |
| Gypsy-LTR | 20.7(12.9) | 21.8(13.4) | 8.3(9.1) | 10.0(11.0) |
| Copia-LTR | 15.0(10.0) | 9.0(6.7) | 6.9(5.4) | 7.9(7.0) |

* All 18 chromosomes are included.

**Table 2** Coordinates of palindromes in the female SDR.

| | name | Start (bp) | End (bp) | Size (bp) | Gene families |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Palindrome W.P1 | pre-arm | 8,778,973 | 8,791,042 | 12,070 | R2,HCT |
| | arm1 | 8,790,932 | 8,811,002 | 20,071 | SMR,RR,R1,R2,HCT |
| | Spacer1 | 8,811,003 | 8,814,588 | 3,586 | |
| | arm2 | 8,814,589 | 8,834,138 | 19,550 | SMR,RR,R1,R2,HCT |
| Palindrome W.P2 | arm3a | 8,836,813 | 8,850,772 | 13,960 | SMR,RR,R1,HCT |
| | arm3b | 8,850,773 | 8,920,527 | 69,755 | DRBM,TF2C,DPRIM,DUF789 |
| | Spacer2 | Unidentified | | | |
| | arm4b | 8,920,528 | 8,993,098 | 72,571 | DRBM,ACDP,DPRIM,DUF789 |
| | arm4a | 8,993,099 | 9,013,390 | 20,292 | SMR,RR,R1,R2,HCT |

**Table 3** Genes present in Palindromes 1 and 2.

| | Gene Symbol | Number of Copies | GeneID | Chromosome of the non-W best hit | Best Hit in *A. thaliana* | Arabidopsis name or description (function) | Best Hit in *P. trichocarpa* v3 | Identity *of P. trichocarpa* Best Hit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Palindromes W.P1 and W.P2** | *SMR* | 4[a] | Manually annotated | Chr19 | AT5G23520 | *SMR* (Small MutS Related) domain-containing protein) | Potri.T013000 | 90.70 |
| | *RR* | 4 | Sapur.15WG073500 Sapur.15WG073900 Sapur.15WG074000 Sapur.15WG075200 | Chr19 | AT3G56380 | *ARR17* (type A cytokinin response regulator) | Potri.019G133600 | 92.81 |
| | *R1* | 4[a] | Sapur.15WG073800 Sapur.15WG074100 | Chr15Z | AT4G27220 | NB-ARC domain-containing disease resistance protein | Potri.T012900 | 81.00 |
| | *R2* | 3(1)[a] | Manually annotated | Chr17 | AT4G27220 | NB-ARC domain-containing disease resistance protein | Potri.T013300 | 61.23 |
| | *HCT* | 4(1) | Sapur.15WG073400 Sapur.15WG073600 Sapur.15WG073700 Sapur.15WG074200 Sapur.15WG075100 | Chr19[b] | AT5G48930 | *HCT* (hydroxycinnamoyl-coa shikimate/quinate hydroxycinnamoyl transferase) | Potri.018G104700 | 58.02 |
| **Palindrome W.P2 only** | *DRBM* | 2 | Sapur.15WG074300 Sapur.15WG075000 | Chr17 | AT1G09700 | *ATDRB1* (dsRNA binding protein) | Potri.017G126700 | 61.95 |
| | *TF2C* | 1 | Sapur.15WG074400 | Chr08[c] | AT2G27040 | *AGO4* (*ARGONAUTE 4*, siRNA mediated gene silencing) | NA | NA |
| | *ACDP* | 1 | Sapur.15WG074900 | Chr17 | AT5G52790[d] | CBS domain protein with DUF21 (transmembrane transporter) | Potri.017G147900 | 83.33 |
| | *DPRIM* | 2 | Sapur.15WG074500 Sapur.15WG074800 | Chr17 | AT5G52800 | DNA primase | Potri.017G148000 | 92.52 |
| | *DUF789* | 2 | Sapur.15WG074600 Sapur.15WG074700 | Chr17 | AT1G03610 | *DUF789* (protein of unknown function) | Potri.017G152600 | 86.03 |

[a] Manually annotated transcripts were included in the count. Numbers in the parenthesis are from a fragment in the upstream portion of W.P1 that is homologous to part of W.P1.

[b] This cluster of tandem duplications on Chr19 in *S. purpurea* is not present on Chr19 in *P. trichocarpa*.

[c] The palindrome gene contains only a truncated blast hit to Sapur.008G005800 on Chr08.

[d] This best hit with an expected value of $8 \times 10^{-3}$ due to a sequence length of 84 aa. Expected values of the remaining *A. thaliana* were less than $1 \times 10^{-10}$.

**References**

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

degeneration. Nat. Rev. Genet. 2013;14:113–24.

2. Charlesworth D. Plant sex chromosome evolution. J. Exp. Bot. 2013;64:405–20.

3. Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. A Model for the evolution of dioecy and gynodioecy. Am.

Nat. 1978;112:975–97.

4. Skaletsky H, Kuroda-Kawaguchi T, Minx PJ, Cordum HS, Hillier L, Brown LG, et al. The

male-specific region of the human Y chromosome is a mosic of discrete sequence classes.

Nature. 2003;423:825–37.

5. Trombetta B, Cruciani F. Y chromosome palindromes and gene conversion. Hum. Genet.

2017;136:605–19.

6. Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Pyntikova T, Graves TA, Van Daalen SKM, Minx PJ, et al.

Chimpanzee and human y chromosomes are remarkably divergent in structure and gene content.

Nature. 2010;463:536–9.

7. Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Brown LG, Pyntikova T, Graves T, Fulton RS, et al. Strict

evolutionary conservation followed rapid gene loss on human and rhesus Y chromosomes.

Nature. 2012;483:82–6.

8. Soh YQS, Owens E, Brown LG, Alföldi J, Fulton RS, Wilson RK, et al. Sequencing the

Mouse Y Chromosome Reveals Convergent Gene Acquisition and Amplification on Both Sex

Chromosomes. Cell. 2014;159:800–13.

9. Davis JK, Thomas PJ, Thomas JW. AW-linked palindrome and gene conversion in New

World sparrows and blackbirds. Chromosom. Res. 2010;18:543–53.

10. Ming R, Bendahmane A, Renner SS. Sex chromosomes in land plants. Annu. Rev. Plant

Biol. 2011;62:485–514.

11. Renner SS. Pathways for making unisexual flowers and unisexual plants: Moving beyond the

"two mutations linked on one chromosome" model. Am. J. Bot. 2016;103:587–9.

12. Wang J, Na J, Yu Q, Gschwend AR, Han J, Zeng F, et al. Sequencing papaya X and Y$^h$

chromosomes reveals molecular basis of incipient sex chromosome evolution. Proc. Natl. Acad.

Sci. 2012;109:13710–5.

13. Akagi T, Henry IM, Kawai T, Comai L, Tao R. Epigenetic Regulation of the Sex

Determination Gene MeGI in Polyploid Persimmon. Plant Cell. 2016;28:2905–15.

14. Henry IM, Akagi T, Tao R, Comai L. One Hundred Ways to Invent the Sexes: Theoretical

and Observed Paths to Dioecy in Plants. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. 2018;69:553–75.

15. Harkess A, Zhou J, Xu C, Bowers JE, Van der Hulst R, Ayyampalayam S, et al. The

asparagus genome sheds light on the origin and evolution of a young Y chromosome. Nat.

Commun. 2017;8:1279.

16. Tennessen JA, Wei N, Straub SCK, Govindarajulu R, Liston A, Ashman T-L. Repeated

translocation of a gene cassette drives sex-chromosome turnover in strawberries. PLOS Biol.

2018;16:e2006062.

17. Balounova V, Gogela R, Cegan R, Cangren P, Zluvova J, Safar J, et al. Evolution of sex

determination and heterogamety changes in section *Otites* of the genus *Silene*. Sci. Rep.

2019;9:1045.

18. Zhou R, Macaya-Sanz D, Rodgers-Melnick E, Carlson CH, Gouker FE, Evans LM, et al.

Characterization of a large sex determination region in *Salix purpurea* L. (Salicaceae). Mol.

Genet. Genomics. 2018;293:1437–52.

19. Pucholt P, Rönnberg-Wästljung A-C, Berlin S. Single locus sex determination and female

heterogamety in the basket willow (*Salix viminalis* L.). Heredity. 2015;114:575–83.

20. Hou J, Ye N, Zhang D, Chen Y, Fang L, Dai X, et al. Different autosomes evolved into sex

chromosomes in the sister genera of *Salix* and *Populus*. Sci. Rep. 2015;5:9076.

21. Tuskan GA, DiFazio S, Faivre-Rampant P, Gaudet M, Harfouche A, Jorge V, et al. The

obscure events contributing to the evolution of an incipient sex chromosome in *Populus*: a

retrospective working hypothesis. Tree Genet. Genomes. 2012;8:559–71.

22. Geraldes A, Hefer CA, Capron A, Kolosova N, Martinez-Nuñez F, Soolanayakanahally RY,

et al. Recent Y chromosome divergence despite ancient origin of dioecy in poplars (*Populus*).

Mol. Ecol. 2015;

23. Carlson CH, Choi Y, Chan AP, Serapiglia MJ, Town CD, Smart LB. Dominance and sexual

dimorphism pervade the *Salix purpurea* L. transcriptome. Genome Biol. Evol. 2017;9:2377–94.

24. McKown AD, Klápště J, Guy RD, Soolanayakanahally RY, La Mantia J, Porth I, et al.

Sexual homomorphism in dioecious trees: extensive tests fail to detect sexual dimorphism in

*Populus*. Sci. Rep. 2017;7:1831.

25. Bergero R, Charlesworth D. The evolution of restricted recombination in sex chromosomes.

Trends Ecol. Evol. 2009;24:94–102.

26. Ingvarsson PK. Multilocus patterns of nucleotide polymorphism and the demographic history

of *Populus tremula*. Genetics. 2008;180:329–40.

27. Hou J, Ye N, Dong Z, Lu M, Li L, Yin T. Major chromosomal rearrangements distinguish

willow and poplar after the ancestral "Salicoid" genome duplication. Genome Biol. Evol.

2016;8:1868–75.

28. Pucholt P, Hallingbäck HR, Berlin S. Allelic incompatibility can explain female biased sex

ratios in dioecious plants. BMC Genomics. 2017;18:251.

29. Hobza R, Cegan R, Jesionek W, Kejnovsky E, Vyskot B, Kubat Z. Impact of Repetitive

Elements on the Y Chromosome Formation in Plants. Genes. 2017;8:302.

30. Charlesworth D. Plant Sex Chromosomes. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. 2016;67:397–420.

31. Scotti I, Delph LF. Selective trade-offs and sex-chromosome evolution in *Silene latifolia*.

Evolution. 2006;60:1793–800.

32. Pandey RS, Azad RK. Deciphering evolutionary strata on plant sex chromosomes and fungal

mating-type chromosomes through compositional segmentation. Plant Mol. Biol. 2016;90:359–

73.

33. Rozen S, Skaletsky H, Marszalek JD, Minx PJ, Cordum HS, Waterston RH, et al. Abundant

gene conversion between arms of palindromes in human and ape Y chromosomes. Nature.

2003;423:873–6.

34. Lange J, Skaletsky H, van Daalen SKM, Embry SL, Korver CM, Brown LG, et al.

Isodicentric Y Chromosomes and Sex Disorders as Byproducts of Homologous Recombination

that Maintains Palindromes. Cell. 2009;138:855–69.

35. Goulding SE, Wolfe KH, Olmstead RG, Morden CW. Ebb and flow of the chloroplast

inverted repeat. Mol. Gen. Genet. 1996;252:195–206.

36. Palmer JD, Thompson WF. Chloroplast DNA rearrangements are more frequent when a large

inverted repeat sequence is lost. Cell. 1982;29:537–50.

37. Devos KM, Brown JKM, Bennetzen JL. Genome Size Reduction through Illegitimate

Recombination Counteracts Genome Expansion in Arabidopsis. Genome Res. 2002;12:1075–9.

38. Navarro-Costa P, Plancha CE, Gonçalves J. Genetic Dissection of the AZF Regions of the

Human Y Chromosome: Thriller or Filler for Male (In)fertility? J. Biomed. Biotechnol.

2010;2010:1–18.

39. Krausz C, Casamonti E. Spermatogenic failure and the Y chromosome. Hum. Genet.

2017;136:637–55.

40. Bellott DW, Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Brown LG, Pyntikova T, Cho T-J, et al. Mammalian Y

chromosomes retain widely expressed dosage-sensitive regulators. Nature. 2014;508:494–9.

41. Bellott DW, Skaletsky H, Cho T-J, Brown L, Locke D, Chen N, et al. Avian W and

mammalian Y chromosomes convergently retained dosage-sensitive regulators. Nat. Genet.

2017;49:387–94.

42. Ramírez-Carvajal G a, Morse AM, Davis JM. Transcript profiles of the cytokinin response

regulator gene family in *Populus*. New Phytol. 2008;177:77–89.

43. Bräutigam K, Soolanayakanahally R, Champigny M, Mansfield S, Douglas C, Campbell

MM, et al. Sexual epigenetics: gender-specific methylation of a gene in the sex determining

region of *Populus balsamifera*. Sci. Rep. 2017;7:45388.

44. Melnikova N V., Kudryavtseva A V., Borkhert E V., Pushkova EN, Fedorova MS,

Snezhkina A V., et al. Sex-specific polymorphism of MET1 and ARR17 genes in *Populus ×*

*sibirica*. Biochimie. 2019;162:26–32.

45. Chefdor F, Héricourt F, Koudounas K, Carqueijeiro I, Courdavault V, Mascagni F, et al.

Highlighting type A RRs as potential regulators of the dkHK1 multi-step phosphorelay pathway

in Populus. Plant Sci. 2018;277:68–78.

46. Wybouw B, De Rybel B. Cytokinin – A Developing Story. Trends Plant Sci. 2019;24:177–

85.

47. Akagi T, Henry IM, Ohtani H, Morimoto T, Beppu K, Kataoka I, et al. A Y-Encoded

Suppressor of Feminization Arose via Lineage-Specific Duplication of a Cytokinin Response

Regulator in Kiwifruit. Plant Cell. 2018;30:780–95.

48. Kieber JJ, Schaller GE. Cytokinin signaling in plant development. Development.

2018;145:dev149344.

49. Rong XF, Sang YL, Wang L, Meng WJ, Zou CH, Dong YX, et al. Type-B ARRs Control

Carpel Regeneration Through Mediating AGAMOUS Expression in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell

Physiol. 2018;59:761–9.

50. Reyes-Olalde JI, Zúñiga-Mayo VM, Serwatowska J, Chavez Montes RA, Lozano-Sotomayor

P, Herrera-Ubaldo H, et al. The bHLH transcription factor SPATULA enables cytokinin

signaling, and both activate auxin biosynthesis and transport genes at the medial domain of the

gynoecium. PLOS Genet. 2017;13:e1006726.

51. Renner SS. The relative and absolute frequencies of angiosperm sexual systems: dioecy,

monoecy, gynodioecy, and an updated online database. Am. J. Bot. 2014;101:1588–96.

52. Chin C-S, Peluso P, Sedlazeck FJ, Nattestad M, Concepcion GT, Clum A, et al. Phased

diploid genome assembly with single-molecule real-time sequencing. Nat. Methods.

2016;13:1050–4.

53. Chin C-S, Alexander DH, Marks P, Klammer AA, Drake J, Heiner C, et al. Nonhybrid,

finished microbial genome assemblies from long-read SMRT sequencing data. Nat. Methods.

2013;10:563–9.

54. McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, et al. The

Genome Analysis Toolkit: A MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA

sequencing data. Genome Res. 2010;20:1297–303.

55. Carlson CH, Gouker FE, Crowell CR, Evans L, DiFazio SP, Smart CD, et al. Joint linkage

and association mapping of complex traits in shrub willow (*Salix purpurea* L.). Ann. Bot. 2019;

doi: 10.1093/aob/mcz047.

56. Langmead B, Salzberg SL. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nat. Methods.

2012;9:357–9.

57. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence

Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;25:2078–9.

58. Catchen J, Hohenlohe PA, Bassham S, Amores A, Cresko WA. Stacks: an analysis tool set

for population genomics. Mol. Ecol. 2013;22:3124–40.

59. Margarido GR, Souza AP, Garcia AA. OneMap: software for genetic mapping in outcrossing

species. Hereditas. 2007;144:78–9.

60. Tang H, Zhang X, Miao C, Zhang J, Ming R, Schnable JC, et al. ALLMAPS: robust scaffold

ordering based on multiple maps. Genome Biol. 2015;16:3.

61. Wang Y, Tang H, DeBarry JD, Tan X, Li J, Wang X, et al. MCScanX: a toolkit for detection

and evolutionary analysis of gene synteny and collinearity. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012;40:e49.

62. Wilm A, Higgins DG, Valentin F, Blackshields G, McWilliam H, Wallace IM, et al. Clustal

W and Clustal X version 2.0. Bioinformatics. 2007;23:2947–8.

63. Gouker FE, DiFazio SP, Bubner B, Zander M, Smart LB. Genetic diversity and population

structure of native, naturalized, and cultivated *Salix purpurea*. Tree Genet. Genomes.

2019;15:47.

64. Kang HM, Sul JH, Service SK, Zaitlen NA, Kong SY, Freimer NB, et al. Variance

component model to account for sample structure in genome-wide association studies. Nat

Genet. 2010;42:348–54.

65. Tamura K, Peterson D, Stecher G, Peterson N, Kumar S, Nei M. MEGA5: Molecular

Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Using Maximum Likelihood, Evolutionary Distance, and

Maximum Parsimony Methods. Mol. Biol. Evol. 2011;28:2731–9.

66. Ellinghaus D, Kurtz S, Willhoeft U. LTRharvest, an efficient and flexible software for de

novo detection of LTR retrotransposons. BMC Bioinformatics. 2008;9:18.

67. Steinbiss S, Willhoeft U, Gremme G, Kurtz S. Fine-grained annotation and classification of

de novo predicted LTR retrotransposons. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;37:7002–13.

68. Patro R, Duggal G, Love MI, Irizarry RA, Kingsford C. Salmon provides fast and bias-aware

quantification of transcript expression. Nat. Methods. 2017;14:417–9.

69. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-

seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014;15:550.

**Figure 1.** Genomic content of Chr15W and composition of the sex determination region (SDR). a. A Manhattan plot of Chr15W, based on GWAS using SNPs derived from aligning to a reference genome lacking Chr15Z. The Y axis is the negative logarithm of p values, and the red line indicates the Bonferroni cut off. **b**. Count of LTR elements including Gypsy and Copia, as well as genes in 100 kb windows with a 50 kb step size. **c**. Distribution of female-biased sequence on Chr15W, along with a more detailed view of the SDR below. Each colored block shows the $\log_2$ of the ratio of female and male depth in 10 kb windows. Vertical gray lines below the figure show the boundaries of the contigs in the SDR. **d**. Each tick represents a gene in the SDR. Colors indicate putative origins of the genes based on blastp versus the rest of the genome.

**Figure 2.** Annotated genes in Chr15W and Chr15Z. Genes are grouped according to the best non-self-hit in the annotated genome. Twenty-nine genes from an unmapped Z, scaffold_844 are also included. Stippled areas indicate genes of groups identified as tandem duplicates.

**Figure 3.** Synonymous substitution rates (Ks) for genes in the SDR. a. Comparison of syntenic genes in the W-SDR and Z-SDR. **b**. Boxplot showing distributions of interspecific synonymous substitutions for 1,203 syntenic genes on Chr01 for the closely-related species *S. purpurea* and *S. suchowensis* and for 1,377 genes on Chr01 in *S. purpurea* and *Populus trichocarpa*, compared to the distribution of substitutions between syntenic genes in the *S. purpurea* SDR.

**Figure 4.** Palindromic repeats in the *S. purpurea* W chromsosme (a) and the *H. sapiens* Y chromosome (b). The dot plots were produced using LASTZ with identical settings. Note the different scales, indicated by the bar at the top right of each figure. *H. sapiens* palindromes are labeled following Skaletsky et al. [4].

**Figure 5.** Sequence comparisons for the two palindromes. a. Comparison of the four arms that are shared among the two palindromes. The black line represents the number of nucleotide differences in 100 bp windows, while the red line indicates gaps in the alignment on an inverted scale. b. Comparison of the portions of palindrome 2 that are not shared with palindrome 1. c. Phylogenetic trees of five multi-copy genes in the palindromic region.

**Figure 6. LTR retrotransposons, female specific genes, and palindromes**. **a**. Each vertical line with a wedge on top represents each of the 13 TEs identified in the palindromic region by LTRharvest. The height of each line indicates the number of estimated nucleotide substitutions in the two LTRs (transposons a-h), and an approximation of the insertion time based on the mutation rate in *P. tremula* (Ingvarsson 2008). **b**. Colored boxes represent putative chromosomal origins of genes in the palindrome. Dark red, Chr19, cyan, Chr17. Blue boxes represent genes with paralogs on the Z chromosome. **c**. The positions of 13 LTRs (shaded boxes). Hatched boxes represent incomplete duplications derived from *Ltr-p2-b3/b4*. **d**. Exon positions and orientations, represented by colored arrows. **e**. Schematic representation of female-specific palindromes. The box with a star represents a homologous region derived from part of one of the arms (preARM). Directions of arrows indicate the relative orientations of the four arms.

**Figure 7. Sequence variation in the palindrome arms. a**. Density of fixed differences between *S. purpurea* and *S. suchowensis* per 100 bp. **b**. Density of paralogous sequence variants (PSVs, differences among the 4 palindrome arms) in *S. purpurea* and *S. suchowensis*. **c**. Relative depth of Illumina sequence reads aligned to a reference sequence of one arm of the *S. purpurea* palindrome, where 2N represents the expected depth of read alignment across the whole genome. The grey shaded area represents a segment of the palindrome that is enriched for interspecific fixed variants, but depleted in PSVs, providing strong evidence for differential gene conversion in the two lineages.

**Figure 8.** Expression profile of genes from the W palindromes and autosomal paralogs. **a**. Normalized read counts of genes in different tissues from clone 94006 (female) and Fish Creek (male). **b**. Normalized read counts of selected genes in catkins from 10 females and 10 males from an $F_2$ family. Gene labels in bold font are from the palindromes. Asterisks indicates manually annotated genes.