How spiders make their eyes: Systemic paralogy and function of retinal determination network homologs in arachnids

*Guilherme Gainett¹, *Jesús A. Ballesteros¹, Charlotte R. Kanzler¹, Jakob T. Zehms¹, John M. Zern¹, Shlomi Aharon², Efrat Gavish-Regev², Prashant P. Sharma¹

¹Department of Integrative Biology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA 53706

² National Natural History Collections, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

*Equal author contribution

Correspondence: guilherme.gainett@wisc.edu, ballesterosc@wisc.edu

Abstract

Arachnids are important components of cave ecosystems and display many examples of troglomorphisms, such as blindness, depigmentation, and elongate appendages. Little is known about how the eyes of arachnids are specified genetically, let alone the mechanisms for eye reduction and loss in troglomorphic arachnids. Additionally, paralogy of Retinal Determination Gene Network (RDGN) homologs in spiders has convoluted functional inferences extrapolated from single-copy homologs in pancrustacean models. Here, we investigated a sister species pair of Israeli cave whip spiders (Arachnopulmonata, Amblypygi, *Charinus*) of which one species has reduced eyes. We generated the first embryonic transcriptomes for Amblypygi, and discovered that several RDGN homologs exhibit duplications. We show that paralogy of RDGN homologs is systemic across arachnopulmonates (arachnid orders that bear book lungs), rather than being a spider-specific phenomenon. A differential gene expression (DGE) analysis comparing the expression of RDGN genes in field-collected embryos of both species identified candidate RDGN genes involved in the formation and reduction of eyes in whip spiders. To ground bioinformatic inference of expression patterns with functional experiments, we interrogated the function of three candidate RDGN genes identified from DGE in a spider, using RNAi in the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. We provide functional evidence that one of these paralogs, *sine oculis/Six1 A (soA)*, is necessary for the development of all arachnid eye types. Our results support the conservation of at least one RDGN component across Arthropoda and establish a framework for investigating the role of gene duplications in arachnid eye diversity.

Keywords: cave blindness | *sine oculis* | *Six1* | *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* | Amblypygi | RNAi

Introduction

Cave habitats offer apt systems for investigating the genetic basis of morphological convergence because communities of these habitats are similarly shaped by environmental pressures, such as absence of light and diminished primary productivity (Howarth, 1993; Juan, Guzik, Jaume, & Cooper, 2010). Troglobites, species exclusive to cave environments and adapted to life in the dark, exhibit a suite of characteristics common to cave systems around the world, such as reduction or complete loss of eyes, depigmentation, elongation of appendages and sensory structures, and decreased metabolic activity (Jemec, Škufca, Prevorčnik, Fišer, & Zidar, 2017; Protas & Jeffery, 2012; Riddle et al., 2018). Previous work has shown that troglomorphism can evolve over short time spans (<50 kyr) despite gene flow (Bradic, Teotónio, & Borowsky, 2013; Coghill, Darrin Hulsey, Chaves-Campos, García de Leon, & Johnson, 2014; Herman et al., 2018) and that parallel evolution of troglomorphic traits (e.g., depigmentation; eye loss) in independent populations can involve the same genetic locus (Protas et al., 2005; Protas, Trontelj, & Patel, 2011; Re et al., 2018).

Troglomorphism and troglobitic fauna have been analyzed across numerous taxonomic groups with respect to systematics and population genetics. However, one component of the troglobitic fauna that remains poorly understood is cave arachnids. Most orders of Arachnida are prone to nocturnal life history and some orders broadly exhibit troglomorphy; in fact, troglobitic species are known from all the extant terrestrial arachnid orders except Solifugae and Uropygi (Cruz-López, Proud, & Pérez-González, 2016; Esposito et al., 2015; Harvey, 2002; 2007; Hedin & Thomas, 2010; Mammola, Mazzuca, Pantini, Isaia, & Arnedo, 2017; Miranda, Aharon, Gavish-Regev, Giupponi, & Wizen, 2016; Santibáñez López, Francke, & Prendini, 2014; Smrž, Kováč, Mikeš, & Lukešová, 2013). In addition to eye and pigment loss, troglomorphism in arachnids manifests in the form of compensatory elongation of walking legs and palps, appendages which harbor sensory structures in this group (Derkarabetian, Steinmann, & Hedin, 2010; Mammola & Isaia, 2017; Mammola et al., 2018a; Mammola, Cardoso, Ribera, Pavlek, & Isaia, 2018b).

Thorough understanding of the developmental genetic basis for the evolution of troglomorphic traits has been largely spearheaded in two model systems: the Mexican cave fish *Astyanax mexicanus* (Bradic et al., 2013; Coghill et al., 2014; Herman et al., 2018; Porter, Dittmar, & Pérez-Losada, 2007; Protas et al., 2005; Protas & Jeffery, 2012) and the cave isopod *Asellus aquaticus* (Jemec et al., 2017; Re et al., 2018; Stahl et al., 2015). Both model systems have more than one hypogean population, can be maintained in laboratories,

and are amenable to approaches such as genetic crosses and quantitative trait locus mapping. The advent of short read sequencing technology in tandem with experimental approaches has transformed the potential to triangulate regulatory differences between hypogean (subterranean) and epigean (surface-dwelling) lineages (Protas et al., 2005; Re et al., 2018; Riddle et al., 2018; Stahl et al., 2015), and to study a broader range of cave taxa.

Among arthropods, work on the isopod *A. aquaticus* in particular has made significant advances in the identification of loci regulating pigmentation and size of arthropod eyes (Protas et al., 2011; Re et al., 2018), complementing forward and reverse genetic screening approaches in other pancrustacean models (e.g., *Drosophila melanogaster*, *Tribolium castaneum*, and *Gryllus bimaculatus*) (Cagan, 2009; Kumar, 2009; Takagi et al., 2012; ZarinKamar et al., 2011). However, developmental and genetic insights into the evolution of blindness illuminated by *A. aquaticus* and other pancrustacean models are not directly transferable to Arachnida for two reasons. First, the eyes of arachnids are structurally and functionally different from those of pancrustaceans. Typically, the main eyes of adult Pancrustacea (e.g., *A. aquaticus*) are a pair of faceted (or apposition) eyes, which are composed of many subunits of ommatidia. In addition, adult Pancrustacea have small median ocelli (typically three in holometabolous insects), often located medially and at the top of the head.

By contrast, extant arachnids lack ommatidia and typically have multiple pairs of eyes arranged along the frontal carapace. All arachnid eyes are simple-lens eyes or ocelli; each eye has a single cuticular lens, below which are a vitreous body and visual cells. The retina is composed of the visual cells and pigment cells. These eyes are divided in two types, namely the principal eyes and the secondary eyes (Foelix, 2011; Land, 1985). Principal and secondary eyes differ in the orientation of their retina (Homann, 1971): the principal eyes are of the everted type, with the visual cells lying distally, and lack a reflective layer; the secondary eyes are inverted, with the light-sensitive rhabdomeres pointing away from incoming light (analogous to vertebrate eyes). All secondary eyes possess a reflective layer of crystalline deposits called a tapetum, which is responsible for the “eye shine” of spiders. The principal eyes are the median eyes (ME, also known as anterior medium eyes). The secondary eyes comprise the anterior lateral eyes (ALE), posterior lateral eyes (PLE), and medium lateral eyes (MLE; also known as posterior medium eyes) (Fig. 1A) (Foelix, 2011; Land, 1985) (nomenclature used here follows Schomburg et al 2015). Certain orders and suborders of arachnids have lost one type of eye altogether, with the homology of eyes

clarified by the fossil record and embryology (Foelix, 2011; Garwood, Sharma, Dunlop, & Giribet, 2014; Morehouse, Buschbeck, Zurek, Steck, & Porter, 2017).

The second concern in extending the model derived from pancrustaceans is that a subset of Arachnida exhibits an ancient shared genome duplication, resulting in numerous paralogs of developmental patterning genes. Recent phylogenetic and comparative genomic works on Arachnida have shown that Arachnopulmonata (Ballesteros & Sharma, 2019; Ballesteros, Santibáñez López, Kováč, Gavish-Regev, & Sharma, 2019; Sharma, Kaluziak, Pérez-Porro, González, Hormiga, et al., 2014a), the clade of arachnids that bear book lungs (e.g., spiders, scorpions, whip spiders), retain duplicates of many key transcription factors, such as homeobox genes, often in conserved syntenic blocks (Leite et al., 2018; Schwager et al., 2017; Sharma, Santiago, González-Santillán, Monod, & Wheeler, 2015a; Sharma, Schwager, Extavour, & Wheeler, 2014b). Many of the ensuing paralogs exhibit non-overlapping expression patterns and a small number have been shown to have subdivided the ancestral gene function (subfunctionalization) or acquired new functions (neofunctionalization) (Leite et al., 2018; Paese, Leite, Schöner, McGregor, & Russell, 2018; Turetzek, Pechmann, Schomburg, Schneider, & Prpic, 2015).

While comparatively little is known about the genetics of arachnid eye development, gene expression surveys of insect retinal determination gene network (RDGN) homologs of two spiders (*Cupiennius salei* and *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*) have shown that this phenomenon extends to the formation of spider eyes as well (Samadi, Schmid, & Eriksson, 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015). Different paralog pairs (orthologs of *Pax6*, *Six1*, *Six3*, *eyes absent*, *atonal*, *dachshund* and *orthodenticle*) exhibit non-overlapping expression boundaries in the developing eye fields, resulting in different combinations of transcription factor expression in the eye pairs (Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015). While these expression patterns offer a potentially elegant solution to the differentiation of spider eye pairs, only a few studies with the spider *P. tepidariorum* have attempted to experimentally test the role of these genes in the formation of arachnid eyes. *Ptep-orthodenticle-1* maternal RNA interference (RNAi) knockdown results in a range of anterior defects, including complete loss of the head, which precluded assessment of a role in the formation of the eyes (Pechmann, McGregor, Schwager, Feitosa, & Damen, 2009). *Ptep-dac2* RNAi knockdown results in appendage segment defects, but no eye patterning defects were reported by the authors (Turetzek et al., 2015). More recently, a functional interrogation of *Ptep-Six3* paralogs, focused on labrum development, reported no discernible morphological phenotype, despite a lower hatching rate than controls and disruption of a downstream target with a labral expression domain

(Schacht, Schomburg, & Bucher, 2020). Thus, gene expression patterns of duplicated RDGN paralogs have never been linked to eye-related phenotypic outcomes in any arachnoplumonate model. Similarly, the functions of the single-copy orthologs of RDGN genes in groups like mites (Grbić et al., 2007; Telford & Thomas, 1998), ticks (Santos et al., 2013), and harvestmen (Garwood et al., 2014; Sharma, Schwager, Giribet, Jockusch, & Extavour, 2013; Sharma, Tarazona, Lopez, Schwager, Cohn, Wheeler, et al., 2015b) are entirely unexplored, in one case because an otherwise tractable arachnid species lacks eyes altogether (the mite *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Barnett & Thomas, 2012; 2013a; 2013b; Telford & Thomas, 1998).

Investigating the evolution of eye loss in arachnids thus has the potential to elucidate simultaneously (1) the morphogenesis of a poorly understood subset of metazoan eyes (Foelix, 2011; Morehouse et al., 2017), (2) developmental mechanisms underlying a convergent trait (i.e., eye loss in caves) in phylogenetically distant arthropod groups (Protas & Jeffery, 2012; Re et al., 2018), (3) shared programs in eye development common to Arthropoda (through comparisons with pancrustacean datasets) (Cagan, 2009; Stahl et al., 2015; Takagi et al., 2012; ZarinKamar et al., 2011), and (4) the role of ancient gene duplicates in establishing the diversity of eyes in arachnoplumonates (Leite et al., 2018; Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015).

As first steps toward these goals, we first developed transcriptomic resources for a sister species pair of cave-dwelling *Charinus* whip spiders, wherein one species exhibits typical eye morphology and the other highly reduced eyes (a troglobitic condition). We applied a differential gene expression (DGE) analysis to these datasets to investigate whether candidate RDGN genes with known expression patterns in model spider species (*C. salei*, *P. tepidariorum*) exhibit differential expression in non-spider arachnoplumonates, as a function of both eye condition and developmental stage. To link bioinformatic inference of expression patterns with functional outcomes, we interrogated the function of three candidate RDGN genes identified from DGE in a model arachnoplumonate, using RNAi in the spider *P. tepidariorum*, which exhibits the same number and types of eyes as whip spiders. We provide functional evidence that one of these candidates, *sine oculis/Six1*, is necessary for the development of all spider eye types.

Results

Charinus ioanniticus and *Charinus israelensis* embryonic transcriptomes

As an empirical case of closely related, non-spider arachnopulmonate sister species pair that constitutes one epigean and one troglobitic species, we selected the whip spider species *Charinus ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis* (Fig. 1 B–C). Whip spiders, arachnopulmonates of the order Amblypygi, are commonly found in cave habitats ranging from rain forests, savannahs and deserts (Weygoldt, 2000). The recently described troglobitic species *Charinus israelensis* (reduced-eyes) occurs in close proximity to its congener *Charinus ioanniticus* (normal-eyes) in caves in the Galilee, northern Israel (Miranda et al. 2016). Given that the formation of Levantine cave refuges is considerably recent, *C. israelensis* and *C. ioanniticus* are likely sister species with a small time of divergence, an inference supported by their similar morphology (Miranda et al 2016). We collected ovigerous females from both species in caves in Israel and extracted RNA from embryos (SI Appendix, Table S1). Embryos of whip-spiders (*Phrynos marginemaculatus*) achieve a deutembryo stage around 20–25 days after egg laying (dAEL), a stage where most external features of the embryo, such as tagmosis and appendages are fully formed, but not the eyes (Weygoldt, 1975). The deutembryo hatches from the egg membrane inside the broodsac carried by the mother, but remains in this stage relatively unchanged for around 70 days. The eyes begin to form around 50 dAEL, but the eye spots become externally visible and pigmented only close to hatching (90 dAEL) (Weygoldt, 1975).

For *de novo* assembly of the embryonic transcriptomes of *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis*, we extracted RNA from all embryonic deutembryo stages collected in the field (see Supplementary Information; table 1 for localities and sample explanations). Assemblies include two deutembryo stages before eyespot formation and one deutembryo stage bearing eyespots for *C. ioanniticus*; and two early deutembryo stages for *C. israelensis* (SI Appendix, Fig. S1).

The assembly of *C. ioanniticus* reads resulted in 219,797 transcripts composed of 143,282,365 bp with and N50 of 1122 bp (more than 50% of transcripts are 1122 bp or longer) (SI Appendix, Table S2). Universal single copy ortholog benchmarking with BUSCO v3.0 (Waterhouse et al., 2017) indicated 93.8% completeness, with 5.7% of BUSCO genes exhibiting duplication.

The assembly *C. israelensis* resulted in a higher number of transcripts: 663,281 transcripts composed of 230,044,656 bp and with N50 of 1045 bp. The BUSCO analysis shows 95.2% completeness, which is similar to the value for *C. ioanniticus* assembly.

RDGN gene duplication in *Charinus* whip spiders

Amblypygi is inferred to be nested stably in Arachnopolmonata, the clade of arachnids that bear book lungs (Ballesteros & Sharma, 2019; Giribet, 2018; Lozano-Fernandez et al., 2019; Rota-Stabelli et al., 2010; Sharma, Kaluziak, Pérez-Porro, González, Hormiga, et al., 2014a). Recent evidence suggests that the common ancestor of arachnopolmonates has undergone a whole- or partial-genome duplication affecting large gene families, such as homeobox genes (Leite et al., 2018; Schwager et al., 2017; Sharma, Santiago, González-Santillán, Monod, & Wheeler, 2015a). The stable phylogenetic position of Amblypygi in Arachnopolmonata predicts that genes in RDGN that are duplicated in spiders, should also be duplicated in *Charinus* whip spiders. To test this hypothesis, we performed phylogenetically-informed orthology searches on the newly assembled embryonic transcriptomes of both *Charinus* species, and conducted phylogenetic analysis with orthologs across selected arthropod species. We discovered that homologs of *atonal*, *Pax6*, *dachshund*, *sine oculis* (*Six1*), *Optix* (*Six3*), and *orthodenticle* are duplicated in *Charinus*, whereas *eyegone* and *eyes absent* occur as single-copy orthologs (these latter two also occurring single-copy in spiders) (Fig. 2).

atonal: The *atonal* gene tree showed poor resolution (SI Appendix, Fig. S2), hampering unambiguous assignment of the whip spider genes to *atonal* copies previously annotated in spiders (Samadi et al., 2015; Schwager et al., 2017). *D. melanogaster* copies of *atonal* and *amos* clustered together forming a clade with other pancrustacean and myriapod sequences, suggesting these paralogs are restricted to Mandibulata. The fruit fly *cousin of atonal* (*cato*) formed a clade including the *Cupiennius salei* sequence of *atonalB* whereas the second copy of *C. salei*, *atona1A*, is found in an independent clade with only arachnid sequences. It is in this later clade that the only sequences of *Charinus* related to *atonal* are found, in turn forming two separate clades with clear amino acid differences between these copies (SI Appendix, Dataset S1; *atonal* alignment). Herein, these copies are labeled *atona1A* (*atoA*) and *atona1B* (*atoB*). Note that the reference genomic sequences, annotated as “*atonal like homolog 8 like*” (Ptep XP 0159181091), is found orthologous to the gene *net* in *D. melanogaster*.

Pax6: In *D. melanogaster*, there are two paralogous copies of the vertebrate *Pax6*, *eyeless* and *twin of eyeless*. This duplication seems to be shared across all arthropods and both *Pax6* copies have been characterized in spiders (Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015). The gene tree of *Pax6* homologues clearly identified a clade for *toy* including chelicerate and

mandibulate copies, but no *Charinus* sequences are found in this clade (SI Appendix, Fig. S3). The sister clade (*eyeless*) consists only of pancrustacean sequences whereas the chelicerate copies, previously annotated as *eyeless* orthologs, are found in a separate clade. Among these, two distinct genes, herein dubbed *Pax6A* and *Pax6B*, are present in both *Charinus* species. Sequence similarity searches (blastp) of both *Pax6A* and *Pax6B* against the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster* points to *Dmel-toy* as the best hit, followed by *Dmel-ey*. Therefore, although the homology of these copies with *Dmel-ey/toy* is evident, it is not trivial to assign these to either of these genes or if these represent taxon-restricted duplicates of *eyeless*.

eyegone/twin of eyegone: These members of the Pax gene family are paralogous in *D. melanogaster* but occur as single copy in arachnids. Single copy orthologs of *eyg/toe* are present in the two target Amblypygi species (SI Appendix, Fig. S3).

dachshund: Spiders and scorpions have two paralogous copies of *dachshund* (Nolan, Santibáñez López, & Sharma, 2020; Turetzek et al., 2015). Two copies are present in the transcriptomes of both *Charinus* species and are here termed *dacA* and *dacB* (SI Appendix, Fig. S4). The *C. israelensis* *dacB* is assembled in two different gene fragments that overlap by three amino acids (SI Appendix, Fig. S4; see *dachshund* alignment in SI Appendix Dataset S1). The *C. ioanniticus* *dacA* copy is also assembled as two different gene fragments with little sequence overlap but being part of the *dacA* clade (SI Appendix, Fig. S4).

eyes absent: This single-copy orthologs are found in arthropods and arachnids alike and is represented in both *Charinus* species. The association of transcript to this gene is unambiguous for both amblypid species (SI Appendix, Fig. S5).

orthodenticle: As with spiders, there are two copies homologous to *Dmel-otd* in *Charinus*. The resolution of the gene tree is poor and does not allow uncontroversial association to spider orthologs (SI Appendix, Fig. S6). *Charinus* copies are termed *otdA* and *otdB*.

Optix: There are two very similar copies of *Optix* in *C. israelensis* and one in *C. ioanniticus* (SI Appendix, Fig. S7). The *C. ioanniticus* copy is termed *OptixA*. The two copies of *C. israelensis* show very conserved amino acid sequences but clear nucleotide differences. Although the gene tree with the reference genome shows them more closely allied to one of the spider paralogous copies of *Optix* (Ptep NP 00130752.1), a reduced analysis including *Cupiennius salei* and *P. tepidariorum* copies, suggests that the *Charinus* copies are independent duplications. Here the two whip spider copies are dubbed *OptixA* and *OptixB* but they should not be considered orthologous to the spider *OptixA/B*.

sine oculis: Two copies of *sine oculis* are found in *C. israelensis* and one in *C. ioanniticus*. Both copies are nested in a clade with *Ptep-soA* (SI Appendix, Fig. S8). These are herein dubbed as *soA* and *soB* given that orthology with either spider copy is unclear.

RDGN genes in whip spider eye formation: comparing early and late stages of *C. ioanniticus*

The expression of paralog pairs of *Pax6*, *sine oculis*, *Optix*, *eyes absent*, *atonal*, *dachshund* and *orthodenticle* in the developing eyes of the spiders (Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015), and the occurrence of the same paralogs in *Charinus* whip spiders, suggest that these genes may also be involved in the formation of eyes in whip spiders. We investigated this idea by comparing the expression levels of these RDGN genes in the stages before eye-spot formation versus a stage after eye-spot formation in the eye-bearing whip spider *Charinus ioanniticus* (henceforth “Comparison 1”; Fig. 3A).

We mapped reads of both treatments to the reference transcriptome of *C. ioanniticus* using the quasi-alignment software Salmon v. 1.1.0 (Patro, Duggal, Love, Irizarry, & Kingsford, 2017) and conducted a differential gene expression analysis of Comparison 1 using DESeq2 v 1.24.0 (Love, Huber, & Anders, 2014) (SI Appendix, Fig. S9). These comparisons showed that *Cioa-dacA*, *Cioa-otdA*, *Cioa-eya* and *Cioa-soA* are significantly over-expressed ($p_{adj} < 0.05$) in the eyespot stage in comparison with the stage before eyespot formation (Fig. 3A). While we cannot rule out that the differences in gene expression are due to other developmental differences between the two stages sequenced, these results highlighted these four RDGN genes as promising candidates involved in the formation of eyes in whip spiders.

RDGN genes in whip spider eye reduction: comparing *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis*

Blindness in adults of the model cave fish *Astyanax mexicanus* is a result of an embryonic process in which the rudimentary eye of the embryo is induced to degenerate by signals emitted from the lens tissue (Jeffery, 2009). Both early and late expression of RDGN genes, such as *Pax6*, are responsible for the reduction of eyes in fish from cave populations (Jeffery, 2009; Strickler, Yamamoto, & Jeffery, 2001). Likewise, in the isopod crustacean *Asellus aquaticus* cave blindness has a strong genetic component and mechanisms of eye reduction also act at embryonic stages (Mojaddidi, Fernandez, Erickson, & Protas, 2018; Protas et al., 2011). The embryonic development of the reduced-eyes whip spider *C.*

israelensis has not been explored to date, but we expect that reduction of eyes results from changes in embryonic gene expression during the deutembryo stage (Weygoldt, 1975). We investigated this possibility by quantifying the relative gene expression of RDGN genes in comparable embryonic stages of *C. israelensis* (reduced eyes) and *C. ioanniticus* (normal eyes) embryos before eye-spot formation (SI Appendix Table S1; Figure S1). Using the DGE approach from Comparison 1, we conducted a heterospecific analysis using as the reference either the *C. israelensis* transcriptome (henceforth “Comparison 2.1”) or the *C. ioanniticus* transcriptome (henceforth “Comparison 2.2”).

Both analyses are anchored on the premise that a hybrid mapping between the sister species is possible given the recent divergence between them. The mapping rate of the *C. ioanniticus* reads was similar regardless of the reference species, (96.74% and 96.59% respectively for *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis*). In the case of the reads from *C. israelensis* embryos, mapping rate to the conspecific (96.8%) transcriptome was higher than when mapping against *C. ioanniticus* (82.45%). The similar mapping rate of *C. ioanniticus* reads suggests that the two whip spiders are sufficiently closely related to generate interspecific comparisons of gene expression. Comparisons 2.1 and 2.2 yielded similar results with respect to the direction of differentially expressed RDGN genes (Fig. 3B–C). In comparison 2.1, *Pax6A*, *OptixA* and *OptixB* are significantly over-expressed in the normal-eyes species, with expression levels at least 4 times higher than in the reduced-eyes species ($\log_2FC > 2$; $p_{adj} < 0.05$) (Fig. 3B; SI Appendix, Fig. S10). In comparison 2.2, *Pax6A* and *OptixA* are also over-expressed in *C. ioanniticus* ($p_{adj} < 0.05$), and so is *eyes absent* ($p_{adj} < 0.05$; Fig. 3C). In comparison 2.2, *orthodenticle-B* appears under-expressed in the normal-eyes species ($p_{adj} < 0.05$ (Fig. 3C; SI Appendix, Fig. S11). We note that the magnitude of $\log_2FC$ and significance values differed considerably between analysis. Nonetheless, *Pax6A* and *OptixA* were consistently over expressed in the normal-eyes species, highlighting these two genes as promising candidates involved in the reduction of eyes in *Charinus israelensis*.

sine oculis is necessary for principal and secondary eye development in a model arachnopolmonate

Our bioinformatic analysis in the whip spider system suggested that *eyes absent* and paralogs of *sine oculis*, *orthodenticle*, and *dachshund* may be involved in the normal formation of eyes in *C. ioanniticus* (Comparison 1). We also found evidence that *Pax6* and a paralog of *Optix* may be involved in the reduction of eyes in the cave whip spider *C.*

israelensis. To link bioinformatic reconstructions of gene expression with functional outcomes, we interrogated the function of RDGN genes using parental RNA interference (RNAi) in the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. We selected *Ptep-soA* (*Ptep-so1 sensu* Schomburg et al. 2015), *Ptep-otdB* (*Ptep-otd2 sensu* Schomburg et al. 2015) and *Ptep-OptixB* (*Ptep Six3.2 sensu* Schomburg et al. 2015). In *P. tepidariorum*, these genes are known to be expressed in all eye types, in the median eyes only, and in the lateral eyes, respectively (Fig. 1D) (Schomburg et al., 2015).

Early expression of *Ptep-soA* is detected in lateral domains of the head lobes (stage 10) corresponding to the principal and secondary eyes, and continues until the pre-hatching stage 14 (Schomburg et al., 2015). Expression of *Ptep-soA* on wild type stage 14.1 embryos is bilaterally symmetrical on all eyes and uniformly strong (Fig. 4A–B). By stage 14.2, it remains strong on the principal eyes but it is stronger at the periphery of the secondary eye spots (Fig. 4A, C).

P. tepidariorum hatchlings, or postembryos, initially have no externally visible lenses and pigment. The red pigment and lenses of all eyes, and the reflective tapetum of the lateral eyes, become progressively recognizable in the 48 hours (at 26°C) until the animal molts into the first instar with fully formed eyes (SI Appendix, Video S1) (see also Mittmann & Wolff, 2012). We fixed embryos from *Ptep-soA* dsRNA-injected and dH₂O-injected treatments between 24h–48h, which encompasses stages where the eyes of postembryos are already recognizable until the first instar.

Negative control experiments (dH₂O-injected females) yielded postembryos with eye morphology indistinguishable from wild type animals: the median eyes (ME; principal eyes) have an inferior semi-lunar ring of red pigment and lack the tapetum; and all pairs of lateral eyes (secondary eyes) have the canoe-shaped tapetum type (Foelix, 2011; Land, 1985), which is split in the middle and surrounded by red pigment (Fig. 5A; panel 1). We observed misshaped tapeta on the lateral eyes of some postembryos on the earlier side of the developmental spectrum of fixed animals, but that was never observed on postembryos close to molting or first instars (SI Appendix, Fig. S12). It is unclear if this reflects a natural variation of early developing tapetum or an artifact of sample preparation.

Embryos from *Ptep-soA* dsRNA-injected females are also able to hatch into postembryos and continue molting to adulthood (SI Appendix, Video S2). However, a subset of the embryos of dsRNA-injected treatment (9.5%; n=195/2049) exhibits a spectrum of eye defects that was not observed on the controls (Fig. 5A–B; SI Appendix, Fig. S13). The defects occurred on all eyes, namely median eyes (ME), anterior lateral eyes (ALE), posterior lateral

eyes (PLE), and medium lateral eyes (MLE) (Fig. 5A). Affected medium eyes have reduced pigmentation or complete absence (Fig. 5A, panels 2–6), while lateral eyes also exhibited defects of the tapetum or complete absence of the eye (Fig. 5A, panels 4–6).

We selected a subset of the knockdown postembryos initially scored as having any eye defect (n=48) for quantifying the degree of effect per eye type, and the proportion of symmetrical and mosaic eye phenotypes in our sample. Medium eyes are affected in almost all cases (97%), whereas the three lateral eye types were similarly lowly affected (MLE: 14%; PLE: 8%; ALE: 10%) (Fig. 5C; SI Appendix, Fig. S12; detailed scoring criteria in Material and Methods). The majority of defective eyes are mosaics, meaning that a given eye pair is affected only on one side of the animal (Fig. 5C; SI Appendix, Fig. S12).

Parental RNAi against *Ptep-soA* did not completely abolish its expression, as detected by in situ hybridization (Fig. 4D; see Material and Methods). Nevertheless, we detected asymmetrical reduction of *Ptep-soA* expression on single eyes of a subset of stage 14 embryos (n=6/16; Fig. 4D), which closely correlates with the predominance of mosaic phenotypes observed in late postembryos (Fig. 5C).

Parental RNAi experiments using the same protocol targeting *Ptep-otdB* and *Ptep-OptixB* did not result in any detectable phenotypic effects on the eyes of embryos from dsRNA-injected treatment (two and six females injected, respectively; counts not shown). These results accord with a recent study that knocked down both *Optix* paralogs *P. tepidariorum* and did not recover eye defects (Schacht et al., 2020)

Discussion

Paralogy of RDGN members in arachnoplumonates

Amblypygi have a critical placement within arachnid phylogeny, as they are part of a trio of arachnid orders (collectively, the Pedipalpi, comprised of Amblypygi, Thelyphonida, and Schizomida), which in turn is the sister group to spiders. Whereas the eyes of spiders have greatly diversified in structure, function, and degree of visual acuity (particularly the eyes of hunting and jumping spiders), the arrangement and number of eyes in Amblypygi likely reflects the ancestral condition across Tetrapulmonata (= spiders + Pedipalpi), consisting of three pairs of simple lateral ocelli and a pair of median ocelli; a similar condition is observed in basally branching spider groups like Mesothelae and Mygalomorphae, as well as Thelyphonida (vinegaroons). However, while developmental genetic datasets and diverse

genomic resources are available for spiders and scorpions (Oda & Akiyama-Oda, 2020; Posnien et al., 2014; Schwager et al., 2017; Sharma, Schwager, Extavour, & Wheeler, 2014b), the developmental biology of the other three arachnopulmonate orders has been virtually unexplored in the past four decades beyond a single work describing the embryology of one North American amblypygid species (Weygoldt, 1975). To address this gap, we focused our investigation on a sister species pair of cave whip spiders and generated the first embryonic transcriptomes for this order. These datasets are immediately amenable to testing the incidence of RDGN duplicates previously known only from two spiders (Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015) and their putative effects in patterning eyes across Arachnopulmonata broadly.

The inference of a partial or whole genome duplication (WGD) in the most recent common ancestor of Arachnopulmonata is supported by the systemic duplications of transcription factors and synteny detected in the genomes of the scorpion *Centruroides sculpturatus*, and the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*, as well as homeobox gene duplications detected in the genome of the scorpion *Mesobuthus martensii* and transcriptome of the spider *Pholcus phalangioides* (Leite et al., 2018; Schwager et al., 2017). Additional evidence comes from shared expression patterns of leg gap gene paralogs in a spider and a scorpion (Nolan et al., 2020). Embryonic transcriptomes are particularly helpful in the absence of genomes, as several duplicated genes, such as some homeobox genes, are only expressed during early stages of development (Leite et al., 2018; Sharma, Santiago, González-Santillán, Monod, & Wheeler, 2015a; Sharma, Schwager, Extavour, & Wheeler, 2014b). Our analysis of *Charinus* embryonic transcriptomes shows that RDGN gene duplicates observed in spiders also occur in whip spiders, supporting the hypothesis that these paralogous copies originated from a shared WGD event in the common ancestor of Arachnopulmonata.

The conservation of some transcription factors patterning eyes is widespread in the Metazoan tree of life (Vopalensky & Kozmik, 2009). In the model fruit fly *D. melanogaster*, the homeobox Pax6 homolog, *eyeless*, was the first transcription factor identified as a “master gene”, necessary for compound eye formation and capable of inducing ectopic eye formation (Gehring & Ikeo, 1999; Kumar, 2009). The Pax6 protein is essential for eye formation across several metazoan taxa, which has fomented ample debate about the deep homology of gene regulatory networks in patterning structurally disparate eyes (Carroll, 2008; Shubin, Tabin, & Carroll, 2009; Vopalensky & Kozmik, 2009). In the case of *sine oculis* (Six1/2), orthologs are found across metazoans (Bebenek, Gates, Morris, Hartenstein, & Jacobs, 2004; Byrne et

al., 2017; Rivera et al., 2013). Evidence that *sine oculis* is required for the eye patterning in other bilaterians comes from expression pattern in the developing eyes of the annelid *Platynereis dumerilii* (Arendt, Tessmar, Medeiros de Campos-Baptista, Dorresteyn, & Wittbrodt, 2002), and functional experiments in the planarian *Girardia tigrina* (Pineda et al., 2000). Therefore, studies interrogating the genetic bases of eye formation in chelicerate models have the potential to clarify which components of the eye gene regulatory network of Arthropoda evolved in the MRCA of the phylum, and which reflect deep homologies with other metazoan genes.

A conserved role for a *sine oculis* homolog in patterning arachnopulmonate eyes

The eyes of arthropods are diverse in number, arrangement, structure and function (Paulus, 1979). Both types of eyes observed in Arthropoda, the faceted eyes (compound) and single-lens eyes (ocelli), achieve complexity and visual acuity in various ways. To mention two extremes, in Mandibulata the compound eyes of mantis shrimps (Stomatopoda) achieve a unique type of color vision and movements by using 12 different photoreceptive types and flexible eye-stalks (Daly, How, Partridge, & Roberts, 2018; Marshall, Cronin, & Kleinlogel, 2007; Thoen, How, Chiou, & Marshall, 2014). In Arachnida, the simple-lens median eyes of some jumping spiders (Salticidae) have exceptional visual acuity in relation to their eye size, achieve trichromatic vision through spectral filtering, and can move their retina using specialized muscles (Harland, Li, & Jackson, 2012; Land, 1985; Zurek et al., 2015). Comparative anatomy suggests that the common ancestor of Arthropoda had both lateral compound eyes and median ocelli that then became independently modified in the arthropod subphyla (Morehouse et al., 2017; Paulus, 1979). While in situ hybridization data for selected RDGN genes across arthropods generally support the hypotheses of eye homology, comparative developmental datasets remain phylogenetically sparse outside of Pancrustacea (Samadi et al., 2015; Schomburg et al., 2015)

We therefore applied a bioinformatic approach in a study system that lacked any genomic resources (Amblypygi) to assess whether RDGN homologs are transcriptionally active during the formation of eyes in the eye-bearing *C. ioanniticus* (Comparison 1), as well as those that may be putatively involved in eye loss in its troglobitic sister species (Comparison 2). As first steps toward understanding how arachnid eyes are patterned, our experiments demonstrated that *soA*, a *sine oculis* paralog identified as differentially expressed during the formation of eyes in *C. ioanniticus*, is necessary for patterning all eyes of a model arachnid system with

the same eye configuration (*Parasteatoda tepidariorum*). Thus, we provide the first functional evidence that part of the RDGN is evolutionarily conserved in the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of insects and arachnids, and by extension, across Arthropoda.

The advantage of such a bioinformatic approach is that it can potentially narrow the range of candidate genes for functional screens, due to the inherent challenges imposed by paralogy when assessing gene function. Eye reduction in the cave fish *Astyanax mexicanus* has been shown to involve differential expression of genes known to be involved in eye patterning in model organisms, such as *hedgehog* and *Pax6* (*eyeless/toy*) (Jeffery, 2009; Protas & Jeffery, 2012). In addition, other “non-traditional” candidates have been identified, such as *hsp90* (Jeffery, 2009). Likewise, evidence from quantitative trait loci mapping in cave populations of the troglobitic crustacean *Asellus aquaticus* shows that eye loss phenotype is correlated with loci that are not part of the RDGN (Protas et al., 2011; Protas & Jeffery, 2012). The results of the DGE analysis in whip spiders underscore the potential of a DGE approach to triangulate targets among candidate genes in non-model species more broadly. Future efforts in the *Charinus* system should focus on dissecting individual eye and limb primordia of embryos of both species, in order to identify candidate genes putatively involved in the reduction of each eye type, as well as compensatory elongation of the sensory legs of the troglobitic species, toward downstream functional investigation.

Do gene duplications play a role in the functional diversification of arachnoplumonate eyes?

A challenge in studying arachnoplumonate models to understand ancestral modes of eye patterning in Arthropoda is the occurrence of RDGN duplicates in this lineage. Our orthology searches and phylogenetic analysis showed that the evolutionary history of genes is not always resolved using standard phylogenetic methods, as short alignable regions and/or uncertainty of multiple sequence alignments can result in ambiguous gene trees. One way to circumvent this limitation is by analyzing expression patterns via in situ hybridization between paralogs in different arachnids in order to determine which patterns are plesiomorphic (Leite et al., 2018; Nolan et al., 2020; Turetzek et al., 2015). Nonetheless, the possibility of subfunctionalization and neofunctionalization may also complicate such inferences because discerning one process from the other is analytically challenging (Sandve, Rohlfs, & Hvidsten, 2018).

Genetic compensation of gene paralogs is another confounding variable, which can be accounted for by experimental advances in model organisms (e.g., Shull et al., 2020). We

note that the overall penetrance in this experiment is low (9.5%) when compared to some studies in *P. tepidariorum* (e.g., Khadjeh et al 2012; >59% in *Ptep-Antp* RNAi). Wide variance in penetrance has been reported by several research groups in this system, with phenotypic effects varying broadly even within individual experiments (e.g., Fig. 5 of Akiyama-Oda & Oda, 2006; Fig. S5 of Schwager, Pechmann, Feitosa, McGregor, & Damen, 2009). Furthermore, some genes have empirically proven intractable to misexpression by RNAi in *P. tepidariorum*, with one case suggesting functional redundancy of posterior Hox genes to be the cause (Khadjeh et al., 2012). Double knockdown experiments have been shown to exhibit poor penetrance (0-1.5%) in *P. tepidariorum* as well (Fig. S3 of Khadjeh et al. 2012; Fig. S1 of Setton et al., 2017), and to our knowledge, no triple knockdown has ever been achieved. While we cannot rule out functional redundancy with other RDGN paralogs in the present study, the low penetrance we observed may also be partly attributable to our conservative phenotyping strategy (see Material and Methods), which did not assess a possible delay in eye formation and emphasized dramatic defects in eye morphology for scoring.

The occurrence of RDGN gene duplications in Arachnoplumonata, in tandem with improving functional genetic toolkits in *P. tepidariorum* (e.g., Pechmann, 2016), offers a unique opportunity of studying the role of sub- and neofunctionalization in the development of their eyes, and a possible role of this process in the diversification of number, position and structure of the eyes in an ancient group of arthropods (Harland et al., 2012; Land, 1985; Morehouse et al., 2017; Paulus, 1979; Zurek et al., 2015). The genomes of mites, ticks, and harvestmen (Grbić et al., 2011; Hoy et al., 2016) (Gulia-Nuss et al., 2016) reveal that apulmonate arachnid orders have not undergone genome duplication events as seen in Arachnoplumonata (Schwager et al., 2017), or horseshoe crabs (Kenny et al., 2015; Nossa et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2020). Future comparative studies focused on understanding the ancestral role of chelicerate RDGN genes should additionally prioritize single-copy orthologs in emerging model systems independent of the arachnoplumonate gene expansion, such as the harvestman *Phalangium opilio* (Sharma et al., 2013; Sharma, Schwager, Extavour, & Giribet, 2012).

Materials and Methods

Animal collection

Three ovigerous females of the normal-eyes species, *Charinus ioanniticus* (ISR021-2; ISR021-3; ISR021-4), and two egg-carrying females of the reduced-eyes species, *Charinus israelensis* (ISR051-4; ISR051-6), were hand collected in caves in Israel in August 2018 (Supplementary Information; Table 1). Females were sacrificed and the brood sacs containing the embryos were dissected under phosphate saline buffer (PBS). For each female, a subset of the embryos (5 to 13 individuals) was fixed in RNAlater solution after poking a whole into the egg membrane with fine forceps, while the remaining embryos of the clutch were fixed in a 4% formaldehyde/PBS solution to serve as vouchers (SI Appendix, Table S1). Adult animals and embryos of *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* were obtained from the colony at UW-Madison, US.

Transcriptome assembly for *Charinus* whip spiders

RNAlater-fixed embryos were transferred to 1.5mL tubes filled with TRIZOL (Invitrogen) after two months, and subject to RNA extraction. Total RNA extracted from each sample of the embryos of *C. ioanniticus* (three samples) and *C. israelensis* (two samples) (SI Appendix, Table S1) was submitted for library preparation at the Biotechnology Center of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Each sample was sequenced in triplicate in an Illumina High-Seq platform using paired-end 100 bp-long read strategy at the same facility. Read quality was assessed with FastQC (Babraham Bioinformatics). Paired-end reads for *C. ioanniticus* (ISR021) and *C. israelensis* (ISR051) were compiled and *de novo* assembled using Trinity v.3.3 (Grabherr et al., 2011) enabling Trimmomatic v.0.36 to remove adapters and low-quality reads (Bolger, Lohse, & Usadel, 2014). Transcriptome quality was assessed with the Trinity package script ‘*TrinityStats.pl*’ and BUSCO v.3 (Waterhouse et al., 2017). For BUSCO, we used the ‘Arthropoda’ database and analyzed the transcriptomes filtered for the longest isoform per Trinity gene.

RNA sequencing for differential gene expression

The total RNA extraction of each sample of *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis* embryos was sequenced in triplicate in an Illumina High-Seq platform using a single-end 100 bp-long read strategy in the same facility as described above. For *C. ioanniticus* (normal-eyes), we sequenced two biological replicates of embryos at an early embryonic stage, before eye-spot formation (ISR021-2, ISR021-3), and one sample of late embryos, after eye-spot formation

(ISR021-4); For *C. israelensis* (reduced-eyes), we sequenced embryos at an early embryonic stage (ISR051-6; ISR051-4) comparable to the early stage in *C. ioanniticus* (ISR021-2, ISR021-3), as inferred by the elongated lateral profile of the body and marked furrows on the opisthosomal segments (SI Appendix, Fig. S1).

Differential gene expression analysis in *Charinus* and identification of eye gene orthologs

Orthologs of *Drosophila melanogaster* *eyeless* and *twin of eyeless* (*Pax6A*, *Pax6B*), *sine oculis* (*soA*, *soB*), *orthodenticle* (*otdA*, *otdB*), *Optix* (*Six3.1*, *Six3.2*), *dachshund* (*dacA*, *dacB*), and *eyes absent* (*eya*) had been previously isolated in *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* (Schomburg et al., 2015, and references therein). We used as reference sequences the complete predicted transcripts for these genes from *P. tepidariorum* genome (Schwager et al., 2017), *Cupiennius salei* (Samadi et al., 2015) (for *atonal* and *Pax6*), and *D. melanogaster*, including also *atonal* and *eyegone* from the latter species. The sequences were aligned with MAFFT (v7.407) (Katoh & Standley, 2013) and the resulting alignment used to build hidden Markov model profiles for each gene (hmmbuild, from the hmmer suite v.3.3) (Finn et al., 2015). Matches to these profiles were found using hmmsearch in the reference transcriptomes of *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis* as well as in the genomes of representative arthropods including *D. melanogaster* (GCA 000001215.4), *Tribolium castaneum* (GCA 000002335.3), *Daphnia magna* (GCA 003990815.1), *Strigamia maritima* (GCA 000239455.1), *Dinothrombium tinctorium* (GCA 003675995.1), *Ixodes scapularis* (GCA 002892825.2), *Tetranychus urticae* (GCA 000239435.1), *Limulus polyphemus* (GCA 000517525.1), *Tachyplesus tridentatus* (GCA 004210375.1), *Centruroides sculpturatus* (GCA 000671375.2), *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* (GCA 000365465.2) and *Trichonephila clavipes* (GCA 002102615.1). These species were selected from a pool relatively recent genome assembly resources and well curated reference genomes.

Homologous sequences (those with hmmer expectation value, $e < 10^{-10}$) to the genes of interest were then compiled into individual gene FASTA files, combined with the reference sequences used for the homology search, aligned (MAFFT), trimmed of gap rich regions (trimAL v.1.2, -gappyout) (Capella-Gutiérrez, Silla-Martínez, & Gabaldón, 2009) and used for maximum likelihood gene tree estimation (IQTREE v.1.6.8, -mset LG,WAG,JTT,DCMUT -bb 1000) (Nguyen, Schmidt, Haeseler, & Minh, 2015). The association of transcripts in the *Charinus* species with the genes of interest is based on the gene phylogeny and was followed by inspection of the coding sequences to distinguish

splicing variants from other gene copies. Alignments and the list of *Charinus* sequences is available in SI Appendix Dataset S1. These gene transcript association was then used for the transcript to gene map required for the DGE analysis.

Read mapping, transcript abundance quantification

For the *in-silico* analysis of gene expression, single-end raw reads were first trimmed using the software Trimmomatic v. 0.35 (Bolger et al., 2014). For the intra-specific analysis of early (before eyespot) and late (eyespot) embryos of *C. ioanniticus* (Comparison 1), the trimmed reads were quantified in the embryonic transcriptome of *C. ioanniticus*. For the intra-specific comparison of early embryos of *C. ioanniticus* and *C. israelensis*, two reciprocal analysis were conducted: reads from both species mapped onto *C. israelensis* transcriptome as the reference (Comparison 2.1); and reads from both species mapped onto *C. ioanniticus* transcriptome (Comparison 2.2).

Transcript abundance was quantified using the software Salmon v. 1.1.0 (Patro et al., 2017), enabling ‘*–validateMapping*’ flag. Analysis of differential gene expression was conducted with the software DESeq2 v 1.24.0 (Love et al., 2014) following a pipeline with the R package *tximport* v.1.12.3 (Soneson, Love, & Robinson, 2015). The exact procedures are documented in the custom R script (SI Appendix, Dataset S2)

Parental RNA interference, in situ hybridization, and imaging in *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*

Total RNA from a range of embryonic stages of *P. tepidariorum* was extracted with TRIZOL (Invitrogen), and cDNA was synthesized using SuperScriptIII (Invitrogen). Gene fragments for *Ptep-sine oculis A (soA)*, *orthodenticle B (otdB)* and *OptixB* were amplified from cDNA using gene specific primers designed with Primers3Web version 4.1.0 (Koressaar & Remm, 2007) and appended with T7 ends. Cloning amplicons were generated using the TOPO TA Cloning Kit with One Shot Top10 chemically competent *Escherichia coli* (Invitrogen). Amplicon identities and directionality were assessed with Sanger sequencing. Primer, amplicon sequences and fragment lengths are available in SI Appendix Dataset S3. Double-stranded RNA for *Ptep-soA*, *Ptep-otdB* and *Ptep-OptixB* was synthesized from amplicon on plasmids using MEGAScript T7 transcription kit (Thermo Fischer) with T7/T7T3 primers. Sense and antisense RNA probes for colorimetric in situ hybridization

were synthesized from plasmid templates with DIG RNA labeling mix (Roche) and T7/T3 RNA polymerase (New England Biolabs) using the manufacturer's instructions.

Parental RNA interference (RNAi) followed established protocols for double-stranded RNA (dsRNA) injection in virgin females of *P. tepidariorum* (Oda & Akiyama-Oda, 2020). Each female was injected four times with 2.5 μ L of dsRNA at a concentration of 2 μ g/ μ L, to a total of 20 μ g. For *Ptep-soA*, seven virgin females were injected with dsRNA of a 1048bp cloned fragment (SI Appendix, Fig. S13C) and 3 females were injected with the same volume of dH₂O as a procedural control. Two virgin females were injected with dsRNA for *Ptep-otdB*, and six females for *Ptep-OptixB*. All females were mated after the second injection, and were fed approximately every-other day after the last injection. Cocoons were collected until the sixth clutch, approximately one per week.

Hatchlings for all cocoons were fixed between 24–48 hours after hatching. Freshly hatched postembryos have almost no external signs of eye lenses and pigments. The selected fixation window encompasses a period in which postembryos have deposited eye pigments until the beginning of the first instar, where eyes are completely formed (SI Appendix, Video S1, S2). Hatchlings were immersed in 25% ethanol/PBST and stored at 4°C. For the *Ptep-soA* RNAi experiment, hatchlings were scored in four classes: (1) wild type, where all eyes were present and bilaterally symmetrical; (2) Eyes defective, where one or more eyes were reduced in size or completely absent; (3) dead/arrested; (4) Undetermined, where embryos were damaged or clearly freshly hatched. A subset of *Ptep-soA* dsRNA-injected embryos from four clutches (n=48) and of three control clutches (n=48) were further inspected in detail to assess the effects on individual eye types. Given that there is a spectrum on the intensity of pigment deposition in the medium eyes (ME), and small asymmetries on the shape of the early developing tapetum of the lateral eyes (LE) in control embryos, the following conservative criteria was adopted: ME were considered affected when asymmetry in pigmentation or lens size was detected. Both ME were only scored as affected when they were both completely missing, in order to rule out embryos were simply delayed in pigment deposition; LE were considered defective only when the tapetum was completely absent (SI Appendix, Fig. S12). Therefore, our coding does not allow detection of a phenotype consisting of delayed pigmentation.

For in situ hybridization, a subset of *Ptep-soA* dsRNA-injected embryos at stage 13/14 (Mittmann & Wolff, 2012) was fixed in a phase of heptane and 4% formaldehyde for 12–24 hours, washed in PBST, gradually dehydrated in methanol and stored at -20°C for at least 3

days before downstream procedures, after a modified protocol of Akiyama-Oda and Oda (2003). In situ hybridization followed the protocol of Akiyama-Oda and Oda (2003).

Embryos from in situ hybridization were stained with Hoechst nuclear staining and imaged in a Nikon SMZ25 fluorescence stereomicroscope mounted with a DS-Fi2 digital color camera (Nikon Elements software). For postembryos, the prosoma was dissected with fine forceps, gradually immersed in 70% Glycerol/PBS-T and mounted on glass slides. Postembryos were imaged using an Olympus DP70 color camera mounted on an Olympus BX60 epifluorescence compound microscope.

Acknowledgements

Microscopy was performed at the Newcomb Imaging Center, Department of Botany, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Sequencing was performed at the UW-Madison Biotechnology Center. Access to computing nodes for intensive tasks was provided by the Center for High Throughput Computing (CHTC) and the Bioinformatics Resource Center (BRC) of the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Specimens were collected under permit 2018/42037, issued by the Israel National Parks Authority to E.G.R. Fieldwork in Israel was supported by a National Geographic Society Expeditions Council grant no. NGS-271R-18 to J.A.B. This work was supported by National Science Foundation (grant no. IOS-1552610) to P.P.S.

References

- Akiyama-Oda, Y., & Oda, H. (2006). Axis specification in the spider embryo: *dpp* is required for radial-to-axial symmetry transformation and *sog* for ventral patterning. *Development*, 133(12), 2347–2357. <http://doi.org/10.1242/dev.02400>
- Arendt, D., Tessmar, K., Medeiros de Campos-Baptista, M. I., Dorresteyn, A., & Wittbrodt, J. (2002). Development of pigment-cup eyes in the polychaete *Platynereis dumerilii* and evolutionary conservation of larval eyes in bilateria. *Development*, 129(5), 1143–1154.
- Ballesteros, J. A., & Sharma, P. P. (2019). A Critical Appraisal of the Placement of Xiphosura (Chelicerata) with Account of Known Sources of Phylogenetic Error. *Systematic Biology*. <http://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syz011>
- Ballesteros, J. A., Santibáñez López, C. E., Kováč, Ľ., Gavish-Regev, E., & Sharma, P. P. (2019). Ordered phylogenomic subsampling enables diagnosis of systematic errors in the placement of the enigmatic arachnid order Palpigradi. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, 286(1917), 20192426. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2426>
- Barnett, A. A., & Thomas, R. H. (2012). The delineation of the fourth walking leg segment is temporally linked to posterior segmentation in the mite *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Acari: Oribatida, Trhypochthoniidae). *Evolution & Development*, 14(4), 383–392.

- 725 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2012.00556.x>
- 726 Barnett, A. A., & Thomas, R. H. (2013a). Posterior Hox gene reduction in an arthropod:
727 *Ultrabithorax* and *Abdominal-B* are expressed in a single segment in the mite
728 *Archegozetes longisetosus*. *EvoDevo*, 4(1), 23. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2041-9139-4-23>
- 729 Barnett, A. A., & Thomas, R. H. (2013b). The expression of limb gap genes in the mite
730 *Archegozetes longisetosus* reveals differential patterning mechanisms in chelicerates.
731 *Evolution & Development*, 15(4), 280–292. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12038>
- 732 Bebenek, I. G., Gates, R. D., Morris, J., Hartenstein, V., & Jacobs, D. K. (2004). *sine oculis*
733 in basal Metazoa. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 214(7), 342–351.
734 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-004-0407-3>
- 735 Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for
736 Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics*, 30(15), 2114–2120.
737 <http://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170>
- 738 Bradic, M., Teotónio, H., & Borowsky, R. L. (2013). The Population Genomics of Repeated
739 Evolution in the Blind Cavefish *Astyanax mexicanus*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,
740 30(11), 2383–2400. <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst136>
- 741 Byrne, M., Koop, D., Morris, V. B., Chui, J., Wray, G. A., & Cisternas, P. (2017). Expression
742 of genes and proteins of the Pax-Six-Eya-Dach network in the metamorphic sea urchin:
743 Insights into development of the enigmatic echinoderm body plan and sensory structures.
744 *Developmental Dynamics*, 247(1), 239–249. <http://doi.org/10.1002/dvdy.24584>
- 745 Cagan, R. (2009). Chapter 5 - Principles of *Drosophila* Eye Differentiation. In *Current*
746 *Topics in Developmental Biology* (Vol. 89, pp. 115–135). Elsevier.
747 [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0070-2153\(09\)89005-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0070-2153(09)89005-4)
- 748 Capella-Gutiérrez, S., Silla-Martínez, J. M., & Gabaldón, T. (2009). trimAl: a tool for
749 automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics*,
750 25(15), 1972–1973. <http://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348>
- 751 Carroll, S. B. (2008). Evo-Devo and an Expanding Evolutionary Synthesis: A Genetic
752 Theory of Morphological Evolution. *Cell*, 134(1), 25–36.
753 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.06.030>
- 754 Coghill, L. M., Darrin Hulsey, C., Chaves-Campos, J., García de Leon, F. J., & Johnson, S.
755 G. (2014). Next generation phylogeography of cave and surface *Astyanax mexicanus*.
756 *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 79, 368–374.
757 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.06.029>
- 758 Cruz-López, J. A., Proud, D. N., & Pérez-González, A. (2016). When troglomorphy dupes
759 taxonomists: morphology and molecules reveal the first pyramidopid harvestman
760 (Arachnida, Opiliones, Pyramidopidae) from the New World. *Zoological Journal of the*
761 *Linnean Society*, 177(3), 602–620. <http://doi.org/10.1111/zoj.12382>
- 762 Daly, I. M., How, M. J., Partridge, J. C., & Roberts, N. W. (2018). Complex gaze
763 stabilization in mantis shrimp. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
764 285(1878). <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0594>
- 765 Derkarabetian, S., Steinmann, D. B., & Hedin, M. (2010). Repeated and time-correlated
766 morphological convergence in cave-dwelling harvestmen (Opiliones, Laniatores) from
767 montane Western North America. *PLoS ONE*, 5(5), e10388.
768 <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010388>
- 769 Esposito, L. A., Bloom, T., Caicedo-Quiroga, L., Alicea-Serrano, A. M., Sánchez-Ruiz, J. A.,
770 May-Collado, L. J., et al. (2015). Islands within islands: Diversification of tailless whip
771 spiders (Amblypygi, *Phrynus*) in Caribbean caves. *Molecular Phylogenetics and*
772 *Evolution*, 93(C), 107–117. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2015.07.005>
- 773 Finn, R. D., Clements, J., Arndt, W., Miller, B. L., Wheeler, T. J., Schreiber, F., et al. (2015).
774 HMMER web server: 2015 update. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 43(W1), W30–8.

- 775 <http://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv397>
- 776 Foelix, R. (2011). *Biology of Spiders* (Third Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 777 Garwood, R. J., Sharma, P. P., Dunlop, J. A., & Giribet, G. (2014). A Paleozoic Stem Group
- 778 to Mite Harvestmen Revealed through Integration of Phylogenetics and Development.
- 779 *Current Biology*, 24(9), 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.03.039>
- 780 Gehring, W. J., & Ikeo, K. (1999). *Pax 6*: mastering eye morphogenesis and eye evolution.
- 781 *Trends in Genetics : TIG*, 15(9), 371–377. [http://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9525\(99\)01776-](http://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9525(99)01776-)
- 782 x
- 783 Giribet, G. (2018). Current views on chelicerate phylogeny—A tribute to Peter Weygoldt.
- 784 *Zoologischer Anzeiger - a Journal of Comparative Zoology*, 273, 7–13.
- 785 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2018.01.004>
- 786 Grabherr, M. G., Haas, B. J., Yassour, M., Levin, J. Z., Thompson, D. A., Amit, I., et al.
- 787 (2011). Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference
- 788 genome. *Nature Biotechnology*, 29(7), 644–652. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1883>
- 789 Grbić, M., Khila, A., Lee, K.-Z., Bjelica, A., Grbić, V., Whistlecraft, J., et al. (2007). Mity
- 790 model: *Tetranychus urticae*, a candidate for chelicerate model organism. *BioEssays*,
- 791 29(5), 489–496. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bies.20564>
- 792 Grbić, M., Van Leeuwen, T., Clark, R. M., Rombauts, S., Rouzé, P., Grbić, V., et al. (2011).
- 793 The genome of *Tetranychus urticae* reveals herbivorous pest adaptations. *Nature*,
- 794 479(7374), 487–492. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature10640>
- 795 Gulia-Nuss, M., Nuss, A. B., Meyer, J. M., Sonenshine, D. E., Roe, R. M., Waterhouse, R.
- 796 M., et al. (2016). Genomic insights into the *Ixodes scapularis* tick vector of Lyme
- 797 disease. *Nature Communications*, 7(1), 10507–13. <http://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10507>
- 798 Harland, D. P., Li, D., & Jackson, R. R. (2012). How jumping spiders see the world.
- 799 <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195334654.003.0010>
- 800 Harvey, M. S. (2002). The neglected cousins: What do we know about the smaller arachnid
- 801 orders? *Journal of Arachnology*, 30(2), 357–372. <http://doi.org/10.1636/0161->
- 802 8202(2002)030[0357:TNCWDW]2.0.CO;2
- 803 Harvey, M. S. (2007). The smaller arachnid orders: Diversity, descriptions and distributions
- 804 from Linnaeus to the present (1758 to 2007). *Zootaxa*, 1668(1668), 363–380.
- 805 <http://doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.1668.1.19>
- 806 Hedin, M., & Thomas, S. M. (2010). Molecular systematics of eastern North American
- 807 Phalangodidae (Arachnida: Opiliones: Laniatores), demonstrating convergent
- 808 morphological evolution in caves. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 54(1), 107–
- 809 121. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2009.08.020>
- 810 Herman, A., Brandvain, Y., Weagley, J., Jeffery, W. R., Keene, A. C., Kono, T. J. Y., et al.
- 811 (2018). The role of gene flow in rapid and repeated evolution of cave-related traits in
- 812 Mexican tetra, *Astyanax mexicanus*. *Molecular Ecology*, 27(22), 4397–4416.
- 813 <http://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14877>
- 814 Homann, H. (1971). Die Augen der Araneae. *Zeitschrift Für Morphologie Der Tiere*, 69(3),
- 815 201–272. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00277623>
- 816 Howarth, F. G. (1993). High-stress subterranean habitats and evolutionary change in cave-
- 817 inhabiting arthropods. *The American Naturalist*, 142 Suppl 1(Suppl.), S65–77.
- 818 <http://doi.org/10.1086/285523>
- 819 Hoy, M. A., Waterhouse, R. M., Wu, K., Estep, A. S., Ioannidis, P., Palmer, W. J., et al.
- 820 (2016). Genome Sequencing of the Phytoseiid Predatory Mite *Metaseiulus occidentalis*
- 821 Reveals Completely Atomized Hox Genes and Superdynamic Intron Evolution. *Genome*
- 822 *Biology and Evolution*, 8(6), 1762–1775. <http://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evw048>
- 823 Jeffery, W. R. (2009). Chapter 8. Evolution and development in the cavefish *Astyanax*.
- 824 *Current Topics in Developmental Biology*, 86, 191–221. <http://doi.org/10.1016/S0070->

- 2153(09)01008-4
- Jemec, A., Škufca, D., Prevorčnik, S., Fišer, Ž., & Zidar, P. (2017). Comparative study of acetylcholinesterase and glutathione S-transferase activities of closely related cave and surface *Asellus aquaticus* (Isopoda: Crustacea). *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), e0176746–14. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176746>
- Juan, C., Guzik, M. T., Jaume, D., & Cooper, S. J. B. (2010). Evolution in caves: Darwin's 'wrecks of ancient life' in the molecular era. *Molecular Ecology*, 19(18), 3865–3880. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04759.x>
- Katoh, K., & Standley, D. M. (2013). MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7: improvements in performance and usability. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 30(4), 772–780. <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst010>
- Kenny, N. J., Chan, K. W., Nong, W., Qu, Z., Maeso, I., Yip, H. Y., et al. (2015). Ancestral whole-genome duplication in the marine chelicerate horseshoe crabs. *Heredity*, 116(2), 190–199. <http://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2015.89>
- Khadjeh, S., Turetzek, N., Pechmann, M., Schwager, E. E., Wimmer, E. A., Damen, W. G. M., & Prpic, N. M. (2012). Divergent role of the Hox gene *Antennapedia* in spiders is responsible for the convergent evolution of abdominal limb repression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(13), 4921–4926. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1116421109>
- Koressaar, T., & Remm, M. (2007). Enhancements and modifications of primer design program Primer3. *Bioinformatics*, 23(10), 1289–1291. <http://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm091>
- Kumar, J. P. (2009). The molecular circuitry governing retinal determination. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Gene Regulatory Mechanisms*, 1789(4), 306–314. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagr.2008.10.001>
- Land, M. F. (1985). The Morphology and Optics of Spider Eyes. In *Neurobiology of Arachnids* (Vol. 189, pp. 53–78). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70348-5_4
- Leite, D. J., Baudouin-Gonzalez, L., Iwasaki-Yokozawa, S., Lozano-Fernandez, J., Turetzek, N., Akiyama-Oda, Y., et al. (2018). Homeobox Gene Duplication and Divergence in Arachnids. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 35(9), 2240–2253. <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msy125>
- Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology*, 15(12), 31–21. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8>
- Lozano-Fernandez, J., Tanner, A. R., Giacomelli, M., Carton, R., Vinther, J., Edgecombe, G. D., & Pisani, D. (2019). Increasing species sampling in chelicerate genomic-scale datasets provides support for monophyly of Acari and Arachnida. *Nature Communications*, 1–8. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10244-7>
- Mammola, S., & Isaia, M. (2017). Spiders in caves. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284(1853), 20170193–10. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0193>
- Mammola, S., Arnedo, M. A., Pantini, P., Piano, E., Chiappetta, N., & Isaia, M. (2018a). Ecological speciation in darkness? Spatial niche partitioning in sibling subterranean spiders (Araneae: Linyphiidae: Troglodyphantes). *Invertebrate Systematics*, 32(5), 1069–1082. <http://doi.org/10.1071/IS17090>
- Mammola, S., Cardoso, P., Ribera, C., Pavlek, M., & Isaia, M. (2018b). A synthesis on cave-dwelling spiders in Europe. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*, 56(3), 301–316. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jzs.12201>
- Mammola, S., Mazzuca, P., Pantini, P., Isaia, M., & Arnedo, M. A. (2017). Advances in the systematics of the spider genus *Troglodyphantes* (Araneae, Linyphiidae). *Systematics*

- 875 *and Biodiversity*, 15(4), 307–326. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14772000.2016.1254304>
- 876 Marshall, J., Cronin, T. W., & Kleinlogel, S. (2007). Stomatopod eye structure and function:
- 877 A review. *Arthropod Structure & Development*, 36(4), 420–448.
- 878 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.asd.2007.01.006>
- 879 Miranda, G. S., Aharon, S., Gavish-Regev, E., Giupponi, A. P. L., & Wizen, G. (2016). A
- 880 new species of *Charinus* Simon, 1892 (Arachnida: Amblypygi: Charinidae) from Israel
- 881 and new records of *C. ioanniticus* (Kritscher, 1959). *European Journal of Taxonomy*,
- 882 (234), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.5852/ejt.2016.234>
- 883 Mittmann, B., & Wolff, C. (2012). Embryonic development and staging of the cobweb spider
- 884 *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* C. L. Koch, 1841 (syn.: *Achaeearanea tepidariorum*;
- 885 *Araneomorphae*; Theridiidae). *Development Genes and Evolution*, 222(4), 189–216.
- 886 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-012-0401-0>
- 887 Mojaddidi, H., Fernandez, F. E., Erickson, P. A., & Protas, M. E. (2018). Embryonic origin
- 888 and genetic basis of cave associated phenotypes in the isopod crustacean *Asellus*
- 889 *aquaticus*. *Scientific Reports*, 1–12. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34405-8>
- 890 Morehouse, N. I., Buschbeck, E. K., Zurek, D. B., Steck, M., & Porter, M. L. (2017).
- 891 Molecular Evolution of Spider Vision: New Opportunities, Familiar Players. *Biol Bull*,
- 892 233(1), 21–38. <http://doi.org/10.1086/693977>
- 893 Nguyen, L.-T., Schmidt, H. A., Haeseler, von, A., & Minh, B. Q. (2015). IQ-TREE: a fast
- 894 and effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies.
- 895 *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 32(1), 268–274.
- 896 <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu300>
- 897 Nolan, E. D., Santibáñez López, C. E., & Sharma, P. P. (2020). Developmental gene
- 898 expression as a phylogenetic data class: support for the monophyly of
- 899 Arachnopolmonata. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 230(2), 137–153.
- 900 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-019-00644-6>
- 901 Nossa, C. W., Havlak, P., Yue, J.-X., Lv, J., Vincent, K. Y., Brockmann, H. J., & Putnam, N.
- 902 H. (2014). Joint assembly and genetic mapping of the Atlantic horseshoe crab genome
- 903 reveals ancient whole genome duplication. *GigaScience*, 3(1), 708–21.
- 904 <http://doi.org/10.1186/2047-217X-3-9>
- 905 Oda, H., & Akiyama-Oda, Y. (2020). The common house spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*.
- 906 *EvoDevo*, 1–7. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-020-00152-z>
- 907 Paese, C. L. B., Leite, D. J., Schöner, A., McGregor, A. P., & Russell, S. (2018).
- 908 Duplication and expression of Sox genes in spiders, 1–14. [http://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-](http://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-018-1337-4)
- 909 018-1337-4
- 910 Patro, R., Duggal, G., Love, M. I., Irizarry, R. A., & Kingsford, C. (2017). Salmon provides
- 911 fast and bias-aware quantification of transcript expression. *Nature Publishing Group*,
- 912 14(4), 417–419. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4197>
- 913 Paulus, H. F. (1979). Eye structure and the monophyly of the Arthropoda. In “Arthropod
- 914 Phylogeny”(A. PGupta, Ed.) pp. 299–383.
- 915 Pechmann, M. (2016). Formation of the germ-disc in spider embryos by a condensation-like
- 916 mechanism. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 13(1), 35. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-016-0166-9>
- 917 Pechmann, M., McGregor, A. P., Schwager, E. E., Feitosa, N. M., & Damen, W. G. M.
- 918 (2009). Dynamic gene expression is required for anterior regionalization in a spider.
- 919 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
- 920 106(5), 1468–1472. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0811150106>
- 921 Pineda, D., Gonzalez, J., Callaerts, P., Ikeo, K., Gehring, W. J., & Salo, E. (2000). Searching
- 922 for the prototypic eye genetic network: *Sine oculis* is essential for eye regeneration in
- 923 planarians. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(9), 4525–4529.
- 924 <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.97.9.4525>

- Porter, M. L., Dittmar, K., & Pérez-Losada, M. (2007). How long does evolution of the troglomorphic form take? Estimating divergence times in *Astyanax mexicanus*. *Acta Carsologica*, 36(1), 173–182. <http://doi.org/10.3986/ac.v36i1.219>
- Posnien, N., Zeng, V., Schwager, E. E., Pechmann, M., Hilbrant, M., Keefe, J. D., et al. (2014). A Comprehensive Reference Transcriptome Resource for the Common House Spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. *PLoS ONE*, 9(8), e104885–20. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0104885>
- Protas, M. E., Hersey, C., Kochanek, D., Zhou, Y., Wilkens, H., Jeffery, W. R., et al. (2005). Genetic analysis of cavefish reveals molecular convergence in the evolution of albinism. *Nature Genetics*, 38(1), 107–111. <http://doi.org/10.1038/ng1700>
- Protas, M. E., Trontelj, P., & Patel, N. H. (2011). Genetic basis of eye and pigment loss in the cave crustacean, *Asellus aquaticus*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108(14), 5702–5707. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1013850108>
- Protas, M., & Jeffery, W. R. (2012). Evolution and development in cave animals: from fish to crustaceans. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Developmental Biology*, 1(6), 823–845. <http://doi.org/10.1002/wdev.61>
- Re, C., Fišer, Ž., Perez, J., Tacdol, A., Trontelj, P., & Protas, M. E. (2018). Common Genetic Basis of Eye and Pigment Loss in Two Distinct Cave Populations of the Isopod Crustacean *Asellus aquaticus*. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 58(3), 421–430. <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icy028>
- Riddle, M. R., Aspiras, A. C., Gaudenz, K., Peuß, R., Sung, J. Y., Martineau, B., et al. (2018). Insulin resistance in cavefish as an adaptation to a nutrient-limited environment. *Nature*, 1–19. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature26136>
- Rivera, A., Winters, I., Rued, A., Ding, S., Posfai, D., Cieniewicz, B., et al. (2013). The evolution and function of the Pax/Six regulatory network in sponges. *Evolution & Development*, 15(3), 186–196. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12032>
- Rota-Stabelli, O., Campbell, L., Brinkmann, H., Edgecombe, G. D., Longhorn, S. J., Peterson, K. J., et al. (2010). A congruent solution to arthropod phylogeny: phylogenomics, microRNAs and morphology support monophyletic Mandibulata. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278(1703), 298–306. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.0590>
- Samadi, L., Schmid, A., & Eriksson, B. J. (2015). Differential expression of retinal determination genes in the principal and secondary eyes of *Cupiennius salei* Keyserling (1877). *EvoDevo*, 6(1), 16–17. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-015-0010-x>
- Sandve, S. R., Rohlf, R. V., & Hvidsten, T. R. (2018). Subfunctionalization versus neofunctionalization after whole-genome duplication. *Nature Publishing Group*, 50(7), 908–909. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0162-4>
- Santibáñez López, C. E., Francke, O. F., & Prendini, L. (2014). Shining a light into the world's deepest caves: phylogenetic systematics of the troglobiotic scorpion genus *Alacran* Francke, 1982 (Typhlochactidae:Alacraninae). *Invertebrate Systematics*, 28(6), 643–664. <http://doi.org/10.1071/IS14035>
- Santos, V. T., Ribeiro, L., Fraga, A., de Barros, C. M., Campos, E., Moraes, J., et al. (2013). The embryogenesis of the Tick *Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus*: The establishment of a new chelicerate model system. *Genesis*, 51(12), 803–818. <http://doi.org/10.1002/dvg.22717>
- Schacht, M. I., Schomburg, C., & Bucher, G. (2020). *six3* acts upstream of *foxQ2* in labrum and neural development in the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 230(2), 95–104. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00427-020-00654-9>
- Schomburg, C., Turetzek, N., Schacht, M. I., Schneider, J., Kirfel, P., Prpic, N.-M., &

975 Posnien, N. (2015). Molecular characterization and embryonic origin of the eyes in the
976 common house spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. *EvoDevo*, 6(1), 15.
977 <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13227-015-0011-9>

978 Schwager, E. E., Pechmann, M., Feitosa, N. M., McGregor, A. P., & Damen, W. G. M.
979 (2009). *hunchback* functions as a segmentation gene in the spider *Achaearanea*
980 *tepidariorum*. *Current Biology : CB*, 19(16), 1333–1340.
981 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.06.061>

982 Schwager, E. E., Sharma, P. P., Clarke, T., Leite, D. J., Wierschin, T., Pechmann, M., et al.
983 (2017). The house spider genome reveals an ancient whole-genome duplication during
984 arachnid evolution. *BMC Biology*, 15(1), 62. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-017-0399-x>

985 Setton, E. V. W., March, L. E., Nolan, E. D., Jones, T. E., Cho, H., Wheeler, W. C., et al.
986 (2017). Expression and function of *spineless* orthologs correlate with distal deutocerebral
987 appendage morphology across Arthropoda. *Developmental Biology*, 430(1), 224–236.
988 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2017.07.016>

989 Sharma, P. P., Kaluziak, S. T., Pérez-Porro, A. R., González, V. L., Hormiga, G., Wheeler,
990 W. C., & Giribet, G. (2014a). Phylogenomic interrogation of Arachnida reveals systemic
991 conflicts in phylogenetic signal. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 31(11), 2963–2984.
992 <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu235>

993 Sharma, P. P., Santiago, M. A., González-Santillán, E., Monod, L., & Wheeler, W. C.
994 (2015a). Evidence of duplicated Hox genes in the most recent common ancestor of extant
995 scorpions. *Evolution & Development*, 17(6), 347–355. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12166>

996 Sharma, P. P., Schwager, E. E., Extavour, C. G., & Giribet, G. (2012). Hox gene expression
997 in the harvestman *Phalangium opilio* reveals divergent patterning of the chelicerate
998 opisthosoma. *Evolution & Development*, 14(5), 450–463. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2012.00565.x>

1000 Sharma, P. P., Schwager, E. E., Extavour, C. G., & Wheeler, W. C. (2014b). Hox gene
1001 duplications correlate with posterior heteronomy in scorpions. *Proceedings. Biological*
1002 *Sciences*, 281(1792), 20140661–20140661. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.0661>

1003 Sharma, P. P., Schwager, E. E., Giribet, G., Jockusch, E. L., & Extavour, C. G. (2013).
1004 *Distal-less* and *dachshund* pattern both plesiomorphic and apomorphic structures in
1005 chelicerates: RNA interference in the harvestman *Phalangium opilio* (Opiliones).
1006 *Evolution & Development*, 15(4), 228–242. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12029>

1007 Sharma, P. P., Tarazona, O. A., Lopez, D. H., Schwager, E. E., Cohn, M. J., Wheeler, W. C.,
1008 & Extavour, C. G. (2015b). A conserved genetic mechanism specifies deutocerebral
1009 appendage identity in insects and arachnids. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
1010 *Biological Sciences*, 282(1808), 20150698–20150698.
1011 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0698>

1012 Shubin, N., Tabin, C., & Carroll, S. (2009). Deep homology and the origins of evolutionary
1013 novelty. *Nature*, 457(7231), 818–823. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature07891>

1014 Shull, L. C., Sen, R., Menzel, J., Goyama, S., Kurokawa, M., & Artinger, K. B. (2020). The
1015 conserved and divergent roles of Prdm3 and Prdm16 in zebrafish and mouse craniofacial
1016 development. *Developmental Biology*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2020.02.006>

1017 Smrž, J., Kováč, Ľ., Mikeš, J., & Lukešová, A. (2013). Microwhip Scorpions (Palpigradi)
1018 Feed on Heterotrophic Cyanobacteria in Slovak Caves - A Curiosity among Arachnida.
1019 *PLoS ONE*, 8(10), e75989. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0075989>

1020 Sonesson, C., Love, M. I., & Robinson, M. D. (2015). Differential analyses for RNA-seq:
1021 transcript-level estimates improve gene-level inferences. *F1000Research*, 4, 1521.
1022 <http://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.7563.1>

1023 Stahl, B. A., Gross, J. B., Speiser, D. I., Oakley, T. H., Patel, N. H., Gould, D. B., & Protas,
1024 M. E. (2015). A Transcriptomic Analysis of Cave, Surface, and Hybrid Isopod

- Crustaceans of the Species *Asellus aquaticus*. *PLoS ONE*, 10(10), e0140484–14.
<http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0140484>
- Strickler, A. G., Yamamoto, Y., & Jeffery, W. R. (2001). Early and late changes in *Pax6* expression accompany eye degeneration during cavefish development. *Development Genes and Evolution*, 211(3), 138–144. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s004270000123>
- Takagi, A., Kurita, K., Terasawa, T., Nakamura, T., Bando, T., Moriyama, Y., et al. (2012). Functional analysis of the role of *eyes absent* and *sine oculis* in the developing eye of the cricket *Gryllus bimaculatus*. *Development, Growth & Differentiation*, 54(2), 227–240. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-169X.2011.01325.x>
- Telford, M. J., & Thomas, R. H. (1998). Expression of homeobox genes shows chelicerate arthropods retain their deutocerebral segment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 95(18), 10671–10675. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.18.10671>
- Thoen, H. H., How, M. J., Chiou, T.-H., & Marshall, J. (2014). A different form of color vision in mantis shrimp. *Science*, 343(6169), 411–413. <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1245824>
- Turetzek, N., Pechmann, M., Schomburg, C., Schneider, J., & Prpic, N.-M. (2015). Neofunctionalization of a Duplicate *dachshund* Gene Underlies the Evolution of a Novel Leg Segment in Arachnids. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(1), 109–121. <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msv200>
- Vopalensky, P., & Kozmik, Z. (2009). Eye evolution: common use and independent recruitment of genetic components. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1531), 2819–2832. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0079>
- Waterhouse, R. M., Seppey, M., Simão, F. A., Manni, M., Ioannidis, P., Klioutchnikov, G., et al. (2017). BUSCO Applications from Quality Assessments to Gene Prediction and Phylogenomics. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 35(3), 543–548. <http://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msx319>
- Weygoldt, P. (1975). Untersuchungen zur Embryologie und Morphologie der Geißelspinne *Tarantula marginemaculata* C. L. Koch (Arachnida, Amblypygi, Tarantulidae). *Zoomorphologie*, 82, 137–199.
- Weygoldt, P. (2000). Whip Spiders (Chelicerata: Amblypygi). Their Biology, Morphology and Systematics. Apollo Books.
- ZarinKamar, N., Yang, X., Bao, R., Friedrich, F., Beutel, R., & Friedrich, M. (2011). The *Pax* gene *eyegone* facilitates repression of eye development in *Tribolium*. *EvoDevo*, 2(1), 8–15. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2041-9139-2-8>
- Zhou, Y., Liang, Y., Yan, Q., Zhang, L., Chen, D., Ruan, L., et al. (2020). The draft genome of horseshoe crab *Tachypleus tridentatus* reveals its evolutionary scenario and well-developed innate immunity. *BMC Genomics*, 21(1), 137–15. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-6488-1>
- Zurek, D. B., Cronin, T. W., Taylor, L. A., Byrne, K., Sullivan, M. L. G., & Morehouse, N. I. (2015). Spectral filtering enables trichromatic vision in colorful jumping spiders. *Current Biology*, 25(10), R403–R404. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.03.033>

Figure 1: Species used in this study and their eye arrangement. A: Schematic representation of the eyes of *Charinus* whip spiders (Amblypygi) (upper), and the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* (Araneae; lower). B: Live specimen of *C. ioanniticus* from Khirbet Haruba cave (Haruva cave). Inset: detail of the median eyes. C: Live specimen of *C. israelensis* from Mimlach cave. Inset: detail of the reduced median eyes. D: Live specimen of *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*, and schematic representation of the expression patterns of paralog pairs of *Ptep-sine oculis* (*soA/soB*), *Ptep-orthodenticle* (*otdA/otdB*), and *Ptep-Optix* (*OptixA/OptixB*) in the eyes. ME: median eyes; ALE: anterior lateral eyes; PLE: posterior lateral eyes; MLE: median lateral eyes; LE: lateral eyes.

Figure 2: Phylogenetic distribution of Retinal Determination Gene Network (RDGN) genes in an insect (*Drosophila melanogaster*), a non-arachnoplumonate arachnid group (Acariformes: *Dinothrombium tinctorium*; *Tetranychus urticae*) and Arachnoplumonata (spider: *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*; scorpion: *Centruroides sculpturatus*), including newly discovered orthologs in *Charinus* whip spiders (Amblypygi). Colored squares indicate number of gene copies for each RDGN gene. Dotted squares indicate missing data, not gene loss. For comprehensive list of duplicated genes in Arachnoplumonata see Schwager et al. (2017) and Leite et al. 2018. Gene trees and alignments for each gene are available in SI Appendix Dataset S1.

Figure 3: Differential gene expression analysis of Retinal Determination Gene Network (RDGN) genes in *Charinus* whip spider deutembryos. Bar graphs display log₂ fold change of selected RDGN genes. Direction of differential gene expression always follows sample to the left. A: Comparison 1; Comparison between reads of early (pre-eyespot) and late deutembryos (eyespot) of the eye-bearing species *C. ioanniticus* mapped onto *C. ioanniticus* transcriptome. B: Comparison 2.1; Comparison between reads of early deutembryo of *C. ioanniticus* and early deutembryo of *C. israelensis* mapped onto *C. israelensis* transcriptome. C: Comparison 2.2; Comparison between reads of early deutembryo of *C. ioanniticus* and early deutembryo of *C. israelensis* mapped onto *C. ioanniticus* transcriptome. *atoA/B*: *atonaA/atonaB*; *dacA/B*: *dachshundA/B*; *eya*: *eyes absent*; *eyg*: *eyegone*; *otdA/B*: *orthodenticleA/B*; *soA/B*: *sine oculisA/B*. Asterisks denote genes that were differentially expressed with a $p_{adj} > 0.05$. Log₂FC = 0 for *atoA*, *OptixB*, and *soB* for Comparison 1 and Comparison 2.2 are due to the absence of those paralogs in *C. ioanniticus* reference transcriptome.

Figure 4: In situ hybridization using DIG-labeled riboprobes for *Ptep-soA* in late embryos of the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. All embryos in frontal view. A–D: bright field images. A'–D': Same embryos, in Hoechst staining. A: Sense probe of a stage 14.2 embryo (no signal). B: Antisense probe on a wild type stage 14.1 embryo. C: Antisense probe on a wild type stage 14.2 embryo. D: Antisense probe on a stage 14.2 embryo from the *Ptep-soA* dsRNA-injected treatment. *soA*: *sine oculis A*. White arrowhead: median eye; Black arrow: anterior lateral eye; White arrow: median lateral eye; Double white arrow: Posterior lateral eye. Dotted arrowhead/arrow indicate asymmetrical expression and eye defect. Sample sizes are indicated above each treatment.

Figure 5: RNA interference against *Ptep-sine oculis A*. A: Bright field images of the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* postembryos resulting from control treatment (dH₂O-injected, panel 1) and double stranded RNA (dsRNA) injected treatment (panels 2–6), in frontal view. B: Frequencies of each phenotypic class per treatment from the combined clutches of all females. See SI Appendix Fig. S13 for counts per clutch. C: Frequencies of symmetrical, asymmetrical, and wild type eyes quantified from a subset of 48 individuals with eye reduction phenotype. See SI Appendix Fig. S12 for figures of all specimens and coding, and Material and Methods for the scoring criteria. ME: median eyes; ALE: anterior lateral eyes; PLE: posterior lateral eyes; MLE: median lateral eyes. Schematics for the different eye types follows the nomenclature in Figure 1.