WHY

Molecular evolution matters?

Information, graphics and texts mostly after: Dan Graur, Department of Zoology, Tel Aviv Univ Itai Yanai, Molecular Genetics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel Rose Hoberman, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

Molecular evolution

The evolution of

molecular entities

e.g., genes, proteins, introns, chromosomal arrangements

The evolution of

organisms and biological complexes

e.g., species, higher taxa, coevolutionary systems, ecological niches, and migratory patterns, by using molecular data

Molecular evolution

Assumption: Life is monophyletic

Molecular evolution descendant 1 descendant 2 The differences between 1 and 2 are the result of **changes** on the lineage leading to descendant 1 **+** those on the lineage leading to descendant 2.

Molecular evolution

Molecular evolution and Molecular evolution and Molecular evolution

K80 model (Kimura, 1980) or Kimura 2P Kimura's Two Parameter model (K2P) incorporates the observation that the rate of transitions per site (a) may differ from the rate of transversions (b), giving a total rate of substitiutions per site of (a + 2b)(there are three possible substitutions: one

transition and two transversions). The transition:transversion ratio a/b is often represented by the letter kappa (k).

In the K2P model the number of nucleotide substitutions per site is given by:

$$
d=\frac{1}{2}\ln\Biggl[\frac{1}{1-2P-Q}\Biggr]+\frac{1}{4}\ln\Biggl[\frac{1}{1-2Q}\Biggr]
$$

where:

AGC AAC ACC

> **P** the proportional differences between the two sequences due to transitions **Q** are the proportional differences between the two sequences due to transitions and transversions respectively.

K80 model (Kimura, 1980) or Kimura 2P AGC Sequences 1 and 2 differ one transition AAC $d=\frac{1}{2} \text{ln} \Bigg[\frac{1}{1-2(1/3)-0}\Bigg] + \frac{1}{4} \text{ln} \Bigg[\frac{1}{1-2 \cdot 0}\Bigg] = \frac{1}{2} \text{ln}\big[3\big] + \frac{1}{4} \text{ln}\big[1\big] = \frac{1}{2} \text{ln}\big[3\big] \approx 0.549$ AGC Sequences 1 and 3 differ one transversion **ACC** Sequences 2 and 3 differ one transversion $d = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1}{1 - 2 \cdot 0 - (1/3)} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \ln \left[\frac{1}{1 - 2(1/3)} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{3}{2} \right] + \frac{1}{4} \ln [3] = 0.477$ AAC ACC **1 2 3 1 - 2 0.549 - 3 0.477 0.549 -**

Molecular evolution

Gene sequences accumulate substitutions at a constant rate, therefore we can use genes sequences to time divergences.

This is referred to as a 'Molecular Clock'

Molecular evolution

Molecular divergence is

ROUGHLY correlated

with divergence of time

Molecular evolution

The idea of a molecular clock was initially suggested by **Zuckerkandl and Pauling in 1962**.

They noted that rates of amino acid replacements in animal haemoglobin were roughly proportional to real time, as judged against the fossil record.

The "constancy" of the molecular clock is particularly striking when compared to the obvious variation in the rates of morphological evolution (e.g. the existence of "living fossils").

Molecular evolution

A Hipótese do Relógio Molecular

- **A quantidade de diferenças genéticas entre sequências é função do tempo desde a separação.**
- **A taxa de mutação é (suficientemente) constante para estimar tempos de divergência**

Molecular evolution Calibrations

Cannot date fossils perfectly Fossils usually not direct ancestors branched off tree before (after?) splitting event. Impossible to pinpoint the age of last common ancestor of a group of living species

> **Mean Rate of Nucleotide Substitution in Mammalian Genomes**

1% / 106 years

Rate of molecular evolution can differ between nucleotide positions genes genomic regions genomes within species (nuclear vs organelle) species over time

Rate of molecular evolution can differ between nucleotide positions genes genomic regions genomes within species (nuclear vs organelle)

species over time

If not considered, introduces bias into time estimates

Rate Heterogeneity among lineages

How different regions of the genome may vary?

Evolution is a very slow process at the molecular level

Rates of Substitutions in Protein-Coding regions

Synonymous vs non-synonymous Functional vs non-functional

The rate of synonymous substitution is much larger than the **non-synonymous** rate.

Two different examples:

Apolipoproteins

Histones 3

Functional constraint =

Degree of intolerance towards mutations

The functional constraint defines the range of alternative residues that are acceptable at a site without affecting negatively the function or structure of the gene or the gene product.

Apolipoproteins

Transportadores de lípidos no sangue. Domínios constituídos por resíduos hidrofóbicos

Alterações entre aminoácidos hidrofóbicos (valina – leucina) permitidas em muitas posições.

Functional regions evolve slower than nonfunctional regions.

Important proteins evolve slower than unimportant ones.

Rates of Substitutions in Non-Coding regions

FACT: *S. ehrenberghi* **aAcrystallin lost its functional role**

Water-soluble structural protein found in the lens and the cornea of the eye accounting for the transparency of the structure

The main function of crystallins at least in the lens of the eye is probably to increase the refractive index while not obstructing light.

WHEN:

more than 25 MA ago

(when the mole rat became subterranean and presumably gradually lost use of its eyes)

FACT:

The aA-crystallin of *S. ehrenberghi* **evolves 20 times faster than the aA-crystallins in other rodents, such as rats, mice, hamsters, gerbils and squirrel.**

FACT: The aA-crystallin of *S. ehrenberghi* **possess all the prerequisites for normal function and expression, including the proper signals for alternative splicing.**

S. ehrenberghi **aA-crystallin lost its functional role but it could function...**

The functional role was lost a long time ago: over 25 MA

The gene evolves 20 times faster than the aA-crystallins in other rodents

The aA-crystallin of *S. ehrenberghi* **evolves slower than pseudogenes.**

The genes are functional for the vision?

Was the loss of vision more recent (than 25 MY)?

The gene has another function?

Explanation 1:

Are the genes functional?

Maybe not all function is lost …

(e.g.photoperiod perception)

Explanation 1:

Contradicting evidence

Photo-reception is lost.

The atrophied eye of *Spalax* **does NOT respond to light.**

Explanation 2:

Slow evolving gene may be due to a more recent (than 25 MY) loss of vision.

Rate of mutation is affected by the rate of mutation before loss of function and after nonfunctionalization. Therefore there is an underestimation of the time of loss.

Explanation 2:

Slow evolving gene may be due to a more recent (than 25 MY) loss of vision.

Explanation 2:

Contradicting evidence:

The aA-crystallin gene is intact as far as the essential molecular structures for its expression are concerned.

The phylogenies indicate 25MY as the probable timeframe for the mole vision impairment.

Explanation 3:

 The aA-crystallin-gene product serves a function unrelated to that of the eye (vision).

Facts:

1.aA crystallin has been found in other tissues.

2.aA crystallin functions as a chaperone that binds denaturing proteins and prevents their aggregation.

Facts:

1.aA crystallin has been found in other tissues.

2.aA crystallin functions as a chaperone that binds denaturing proteins and prevents their aggregation.

3.The regions within aA crystallin responsible for chaperone activity are conserved in the mole rat, therefore have a lower than expected substitution rate.