Essay: On the close relationship between speciation, inbreeding and recessive mutations.

Etienne Joly, atnjoly@mac.com, Toulouse, September 2010

Foreword

This past year, 2009, was the Darwin year, celebrating the 200th anniversary of Charles Darwin's birth, and 150 years since the publication of his fabulous milestone book, 'The Origin of Species' (to which I will subsequently refer to as 'The Origin'). At the start of 2009, I was inhabited by a nagging ethical concern : how would humans deal with a situation where a group of individuals found themselves fertile among one another, but with limited fertility with the rest of the human race ? In other words, could speciation occur within the human race ? This concern sprouted from the idea that chromosomal rearrangements seemed to me like a very probable initial step of a speciation process, since systematic survey of the human populations have actually shown that such rearrangements are relatively frequent (frequency of the order of 1/1000, [1]). Furthermore, given the amazing success of the human race, having resulted in the huge numbers of human beings currently living on our planet, and given the amazing propensity of nature to generate new species, I felt that the chances must be quite high that speciation could occur within the human population.

Most scientist concerned with evolution and speciation would probably not share those concerns because the commonly held view is that speciation is most often allopatric, i.e. it occurs when populations of individuals evolve separately from one another for a sufficiently long time that they would no longer breed efficiently with one another when they are reunited, and the mobility of modern humans would be very effective at countering this type of phenomenon.

Contrarily to these views, I believe that, if reproductive barriers arise, they are basically equivalent to other characters, and must therefore have been selected for. In other words, there must be conditions where it becomes advantageous for groups of individuals to stop breeding with the ancestral population. The main conclusion that I reach by the reflections developed in this essay is that the process of speciation is primarily driven by advantageous recessive mutations, and that those will, in turn promote reproductive barriers, favouring inbreeding.

This past year has seen the publication of a plethora of review articles on the subject of evolution and speciation, which have allowed me to start catching up on these vast subjects, and to mature my reflections on the mechanisms involved in speciation. The reading of these reviews had also allowed me to confirm that those ideas I have developed are in disagreement with the generally held views, i.e. that allopatric speciation is the most common and probable route for the appearance of new species.

All the ideas developed in this essay are relatively simple, and most of them are related to many previously published works. So much work, however, has already been published on evolution and speciation that an autodidact newcomer such as myself could not hope to read, let alone understand and remember all the primary papers published previously on evolution and speciation. If I have failed to acknowledge previous works developing ideas related to those put forward here, the reader can be assured that this was not done maliciously but simply as a result of my relative naivety on the subject. I do, however, hold the firm conviction that, if some of the ideas developed in this essay prove to be correct and relatively novel, it was only possible because of this naivety.

Because, as a rule, I have adopted the principle of never citing a paper that I have not read, numerous times during the writing of this essay, I have found myself unable to decide what particular paper to cite as the appropriate original source of a particular concept or observation. Although I have tried to read as many primary papers as I could rather than reviews, I found that I simply could not read everything. In addition, most books, and also many papers were not available to me in our institute's library or freely online (As another rule, I refuse to pay for online access, because I firmly believe that all primary research papers should be freely available to all). In such situations when I had not managed to read the primary papers (for whatever reason), I have very often chosen to cite the very comprehensive et quite recent reference book "Speciation" by Coyne and Orr (2004), and to refer to it as 'C&O', with the indication of the appropriate chapter or page number.

The ideas presented here are relevant to many, if not most, subjects related to speciation and evolution. Another difficulty I have encountered in the writing of this essay is that of keeping the discussion focalised on the main subject of this essay, i.e. that new species do not arise by splitting in separate branches, but by "budding" away from the ancestral population as a result of inbreeding among a limited number of individuals. As a solution, for discussing several issues that seemed either too technical or rather peripheral to this main subject, I have chosen to treat those as separate short pieces which are provided either as footnotes, or as addenda at the end of this essay.

More complex subjects, such as evolvability, the origins of life and of sexual reproduction, group level selection and altruism would, however, each have warranted whole essays, and it was beyond my capacities to cover all those issues simultaneously. I have thus had to put back dealing with those other issues to later dates.

Abstract:

Whilst the principle of adaptive evolution is unanimously recognised as being caused by the process of natural selection favouring the survival and/or reproduction of individuals having acquired new advantageous traits, a consensus has proven much harder to find regarding the actual origin of species. Indeed, since speciation corresponds to the establishment of reproductive barriers, it is difficult to see how it could bring a selective advantage because it amounts to a restriction in the opportunities to breed with as many and/or as diverse partners as possible. In this regard, Darwin himself did not believe that reproductive barriers could be selected for, and today most evolutionary biologists still believe that speciation can only occur through a process of separation allowing two populations to diverge sufficiently to become infertile with one another. I do, however, take the view that, if so much speciation has occurred, and still occurs around us, it cannot be a consequence of passive drift but must result from a selection process, whereby it is advantageous for groups of individuals to reproduce preferentially with one another and reduce their breeding with the rest of the population.

In this essay, I propose a model whereby new species arise by "budding" from an ancestral stock, via a process of inbreeding among small numbers of individuals, driven by the occurrence of advantageous recessive mutations. Since the phenotypes associated to such mutations can only be retained in the context of inbreeding, it is the pressure of the ancestral stock which will promote additional reproductive barriers, and ultimately result in complete separation of a new species. I thus contend that the phenomenon of speciation would be driven by mutations resulting in the advantageous loss of certain functions, whilst adaptive evolution would correspond to gains of function that would, most of the time be dominant.

A very important further advantage of inbreeding is that it reduces the accumulation of recessive mutations in genomes. A consequence of the model proposed is that the existence of species would correspond to a metastable equilibrium between inbreeding and outbreeding, with excessive inbreeding promoting speciation, and excessive outbreeding resulting in irreversible accumulation of recessive mutations that could ultimately only lead to the species extinction.

Introduction:

Among the myriad of reviews and articles that have been written about "The Origin of Species" by Charles Darwin, a very large proportion underlines the fact that, despite the title of his book, what Darwin established was the mechanism of adaptive evolution by the process natural selection, but that he failed to provide answers to the many questions that surround the origin of species.

One of the important reasons for this failure was related to an issue to which he alluded to repeatedly in his book, which is that species are basically impossible to define. The main problem, which he acknowledged himself, and stays whole today, lies in the fuzzy limit between species and varieties: "*From these remarks it will be seen that I look at the term species, as one arbitrarily given for the sake of convenience to a set of individuals closely resembling each other, and that it does not essentially differ from the term variety, which is given to less distinct and more fluctuating forms. The term variety, again, in comparison with mere individual differences, is also applied arbitrarily, and for mere convenience sake.*" (The Origin, p. 52 mid Ch II).

One of the most important concepts that derives from the work of Darwin is that the process of life is one of constant evolution, which explains why so few of the life forms that occupied the earth 20 millions ago are still around today. The somewhat uncomfortable but inescapable conclusion from this is that the existence of every single one of the millions of species that surround us, including ours, must also be transitory, and this probably contributes to the difficulty that many humans have in accepting the theory of evolution, in addition to the fact that it also brings serious questions as to the existence of an almighty God. The processes of evolution and speciation are, however, very slow ones, and the 5000 years of human history[1] do not amount to even a tick on the clock of evolutionary times, and to our human eyes, the stability of the world thus appears as if it should stay the same for ever, and so with the species that occupy it. The fact that species are not stable entities, but in constant evolution is another factor that adds to the difficulty of defining them.

Initially, species were recognised and defined by naturalists and palaeontologists mostly in relation to their anatomical features, and it is on the basis of these features that Linnaeus opened the way to taxonomic classifications in the middle of the 18th century. Regarding taxonomic definitions of species, dogs are a particularly telling example of the fact that, when considering species based on morphological traits, certain organisms can differ greatly in their anatomy and still belong to the very same species.

It is some hundred years after Linnaeus, and well after Darwin and Wallace had laid down the principles of natural selection, that the biological species concept emerged, which introduced the notion of the importance of fertility, and of the capacity to hybridize in the definition of species. Today, the most popular definition of biological species is that proposed by Ernst Mayr in 1942, as "*groups of actually or potentially interbreeding natural populations, which are reproductively isolated from other such groups*".

---

[1] i.e. since humans first started scribbling cuneiform signs or hieroglyphs

The first thing to underline in this definition is that species are not defined as standalone entities, but always in relation to other species (which provides some rationale, albeit retroactive, to the fact that the singular of species is species and not specie, which refers to coined money). The second important point about the definition of biological species is about the difficulty of implementing it. Indeed, many closely related species still show some degree of fertility with one another. For example, many species that do not detectably hybridize in the wild can produce perfectly fit and fertile offspring under experimental conditions. Furthermore, even if one was to set a threshold value for the degree of hybridisation between two separate populations to consider them as separate species, the degree of mixing of populations can vary greatly depending on circumstances such as population densities, or environmental fluctuations such as clarity of waters for certain fish that use visual clues to recognise their own kin.

More recently, the amazingly fast progress in molecular biology has allowed geneticists to follow and quantify the occurrence of gene flow between divergent populations, and this is often taken into consideration when discussing whether two populations represent "good species" or not. On the subject of gene flow, one can, however, take the slightly provocative stance that gene flow can never reach the absolute zero, which is related to the fact that all organisms are based on the same genetic code. Indeed, there is more and more evidence accumulating about the prominence of horizontal gene transfer between all sorts of organisms, mediated by varied mechanisms that can involve viruses, and particularly retroviruses, or possibly by incorporation of whole organisms or just DNA. And transgenesis is another recent progress of technology which reinforces the notion that "zero gene flow" is only a theoretical limit towards which speciation can tend.

Considering the various difficulties one encounters in trying to define species, I will not engage in the somewhat sterile debate (excuse the bad pun) of what constitutes 'good species', or rather of when two groups of animals can be considered as separate species. And even less in the consideration of whether asexual organisms can be grouped into species. Rather, I will only engage in a reflection within the 'biological species concept', as initially defined by Ernst Mayr. Furthermore, in considering only groups of organisms that reproduce sexually, I will focus on the phenomenon of speciation. Indeed, although species are well nigh impossible to define, one cannot dispute that speciation occurs, i.e. the fact that, starting from an ancestral population, some groups of animals will start breeding more among one another than with the rest of the population, and will progressively acquire a range of characters that sets them apart from the original group. This, in fact, happens everywhere and all the time around us, in wild and domestic species and is the reason for the appearance of particular characters, or

traits, that lead to the definition of subtypes, morphotypes, races, varieties, subspecies, species .... One remarkable observation, however, is that inasmuch as legions of well documented examples exist where those types of varieties have been generated and/or documented, very few, if any, examples exist where truly significant reproductive isolation has been witnessed under domestication, or even produced experimentally. We will therefore have to ask ourselves what it is about natural conditions that differs so significantly from experimental conditions or domestication.

The most prevalent view about speciation today is that geographical separation is the most likely mechanism for the origin of species: independent adaptation to different environments will push the evolution of the two populations sufficiently apart that their offspring would be unfit because outbreeding between the two populations will result in the disruption of coadapted gene complexes. The term used to describe this type of speciation is allopatry, as opposed to sympatry, where ancestral and descendant species coexist in the same environment (or parapatry if they exist side by side, with a hybridisation zone in between). If two populations having evolved separately come back in contact later on, the intermediate phenotype of their offspring could make them unfit for either environment, and this would then provide the selective pressure for the selection of additional reproductive barriers, in a process called reinforcement, and often referred to as 'the Wallace effect'. Indeed, the earliest promoter of the view that reinforcement could occur under the pressure of natural selection was undoubtedly Alfred Wallace, who disagreed with Darwin's views that reproductive isolation could not possibly result from natural selection: "*The sterility of first crosses and of their hybrid progeny has not been acquired through natural selection*" (The Origin, Summary of Hybridism chapter). This point was a subject of written exchanges and arguments in private correspondence between the two around 1858, 10 years after their joint communication to the Linnean Society in July 1858, but Wallace formally published his views only in 1889, some twenty year later, in chapter VII of his book called Darwinism.

On the subject of allopatry versus sympatry, I do take a very divergent view to that adopted by a majority of evolutionary biologists to this day. Rather, I choose to follow Wallace's path against Darwin's in thinking that natural selection plays a major role in the reproductive isolation that defines species, and I shall actually venture some steps further than Wallace, and will advocate in the following pages that natural selection can act on the very first stages of reproductive isolation, and not just on reinforcement after divergence has taken place. Such views were also, but temporarily, those of Theodozius Dobzhansky early in his career [2], when he stated that " *...Occurence of hybridisation between races and species constitutes a*

challenge to which they may respond by <u>*developing*</u> *or strengthening isolating mechanisms that would make hybridisation difficult or impossible"*. In other words, I contend that, if there is so much speciation, i.e. genetic mechanisms causing reproductive isolation evolving everywhere, all the time, it must be because there can be basic, fundamental selective advantages for subgroups of individuals to breed preferentially among one another, and reduce their capacity to hybridize with the rest of the population. As will become clearer later on, I adopt the point of view that, if species arise as a result of selective pressures, then most events of speciation, even in their earliest steps, must take place as a result of the pressure of natural selection, and must therefore occur in settings of sympatry, or at least parapatry rather than allopatry since, under allopatric conditions, there can be no selective pressure to reduce breeding with individuals one seldom encounters.

But this is a very counter intuitive stance because saying that for a handful of individuals to breed preferentially among one another rather than with the rest of the population is basically equivalent to advocating that inbreeding can bring on a selective advantage. And it is common knowledge to almost everyone that inbreeding can be disastrously disadvantageous, and that hybrid vigour almost always brings your direct descendants a selective advantage.

I will, however, endeavour to demonstrate that inbreeding can have numerous advantages, particularly in the long run, and that the selective advantages brought about by inbreeding are the main driving force behind the phenomenon of speciation, whilst the short term advantages provided by outbreeding will result in an accumulation of recessive mutations that can represent a threat for the survival of species in the long run.

I) Potential advantages of inbreeding

We will hence start our reflection by asking ourselves what the advantages of inbreeding could be. If one carries out a simple literature search for the single keyword "inbreeding" on a server such as Google scholar, one can rapidly identify tens of thousands of citations. Upon rapid examination, it is actually striking to find that, in over 90% of those, the word inbreeding is systematically associated with either *depression*, *cost* or *avoidance*, compared to only a handful of papers where the potential benefits of inbreeding are actually being considered. There are, however, at least three ways that can indisputably bring an advantage to inbreeding, and a fourth one which is more contentious, but not necessarily less relevant to the phenomenon of speciation, or at least to the welfare, and hence survival, of species.

1) <u>Reducing the cost of sex</u>: The first and most undisputable advantage of inbreeding is that it reduces the cost of sex. Indeed, in sexual reproduction, each parent passes only half of its genome to each of its

offspring, which is directly related to the consideration that the cost of sex is two-fold [3], as compared to asexual reproduction, where each offspring inherits all of the parent's genome. But this factor of two is not quite a completely accurate measurement. Indeed, if we consider a hypothetical species with the most outbred population possible, each individual of that species will still be more genetically closely related to all the other individuals of the same species than to any other individual of a closely related species. In other words, all individuals of a given species share more common ancestors than they do with those of a closely related species. Hence when they breed within their own species, individuals do share some significant level of relatedness with their sexual partner compared with that of an individual of another species. So, even in a completely outbred population, the cost of sex is not quite as high as two. And the more closely related an individual is to it's partner, the less that cost will be, for both of them. Consequently, any evolutionary step that will favour inbreeding rather than producing offspring with more distantly related individuals, even of the same species, will thus reduce the cost of sex. Although the notion that "selfing" is potentially advantageous can be traced as far back as 1941 [4], and despite the broad interest in the very insightful "selfish gene" theory developed by Richard Dawkins [5], this intuitively obvious advantage of inbreeding actually seems to have received only very limited attention over the years (outside of the notable concept of optimal outbreeding developed by Bateson over 30 years ago [6]. For one of the more recent papers on the subject, see Kokko and Ots [7]).

2) <u>Inbreeding is necessary for the expression of advantageous recessive phenotypes.</u> Evolutionary "progress" is often perceived as the acquisition of new functions, relying on mutations causing the appearance of new genes that will, most of the time, be expressed as dominant, or co-dominant traits. There are many cases, however, where mutations resulting in the loss of certain functions can be advantageous for individuals. For example, losing certain patterns of colours can bring definite advantages, such as the stripes of the African ancestor of zebras and horses. Those stripes were presumably very advantageous for remaining inconspicuous to predators in the savannah, but probably had the reverse effect for the early equidae that colonised more northern and greener latitudes and would later evolve into horses. As could already be suspected from the observations reported by Darwin in the 'Analogous Variations' section of The Origin, and later elegantly recounted by Stephen Jay Gould [8], crosses between various species of equidae, and more specifically between zebras and horses, reveal that the stripy phenotype is the dominant one. For the ancestors of horses to loose their stripes, significant inbreeding must therefore have occurred to express that recessive stripe-less phenotype, and similar reasoning could be applied for the loss of any dominant character that may have been selected for in

ancestors, but was no longer beneficial, for whatever reason (climate modification, colonisation, sexual character that is no longer attractive …).

Outside of the visible external phenotypes such as those considered in the previous paragraph, the capacity to resist infections by pathogens is another type of recessive trait that I perceive as particularly likely to play a major role in the selection of relatively inbred sub-populations. Most pathogens, and in particular viruses, do show high degrees of specificity for their hosts. This is due to the fact that pathogens use particular receptors to penetrate the body and/or the cells of their hosts. Infections by harmful pathogens will therefore eliminate individuals expressing that receptor, and select for organisms able to resist invasion because they carry mutated receptors to which that pathogen can no longer bind. Such characters of natural resistance are, however, usually recessive because heterozygous individuals will still carry one gene for a functional receptor, which will suffice to render those individuals susceptible to invasion by that pathogen. One particularly relevant example of this is the case of humans carrying the CCR5-Δ32 mutation, which, when homozygous, provides complete resistance to HIV infection, and an increased survival of a couple of years when heterozygous [9]. This delayed sickness would, incidentally, favour the spreading of HIV rather than be beneficial to the population, and thus bring a further advantage to the homozygotes for the CCR5-Δ32 allele. The geographic distribution of the mutant CCR5-Δ32 allele does suggest that this mutation arose several hundred years ago in northern Europe, and it is hypothesized that it was probably selected for because it provided resistance to a pathogen different from HIV, because the HIV epidemic only arose much later, in Africa [9].

Although the pressure of a particular pathogen can provide a very definite advantage to those individuals that can resist infection by that pathogen, the fact that this resistance will only be found in homozygotes would be a major hindrance for the spreading of that resistant allelic form to a whole population, but would hugely favour particular subgroups where that allele would be homozygous, which could only occur through inbreeding. The presence of individuals with significant degrees of inbreeding within the population does not, however, necessarily need to pre-exist the infection by the pathogen, but could arise as a result of increased intensity of natural selection, such as an epidemic, resulting in sparse populations that would then have no option but to breed with their close kin. Of note, increased levels of inbreeding in the population can also arise as a consequence of colonisation [10]. Indeed, in times of affluence, sizes of populations may swell to large numbers, and inbreeding coefficients will then be minimal. Subsequent times of hardship will, however, inevitably follow, if only because high population densities are known to promote both the rise of predators, and the

outbreak and spread of virulent pathogens (accidental changes in environmental factors such as global modifications of climate conditions, meteorite impacts, or volcanic eruptions can also play important roles in reducing population numbers). Under such conditions of hardship, numbers will drop, and the surviving population will be very likely to become fractionated into small isolated groups, resulting in relatively high levels of inbreeding within each one of these groups. Under a scenario whereby an epidemic by a very virulent pathogen results in the decimation of a large population of mostly outbred individuals, the subsequent generations will hence be much more consanguineous, and this will provide the opportunity for phenotypes due to recessive mutations causing resistance to that pathogen to surface, and those would be endowed with a massive selective advantage. Furthermore, inbreeding among resistant homozygous individuals will be even more favoured over the next generations because out-crossing with less related susceptible individuals will result in all the offspring being susceptible to the decimating pathogen.

From this type of reasoning, we can thus see how, in addition to reducing the cost of sex, inbreeding can spontaneously promote the revelation of advantageous recessive characters. Increased inbreeding may not very often arise spontaneously, but will result from conditions that promote a reduction of the effective size of populations, such as colonisation or epidemics caused by very virulent pathogens, and the recessive nature of the characters that would be selected for under those conditions would then provide the grounds for reinforcing this inbreeding even further. Pushing this concept even further, Chris Grobbelaar actually proposed, over twenty years ago, the interesting idea that a mechanism of crisis inbreeding would be advantageous, whereby situations of stress would result in a shift from sexual preferences towards inbreeding [11].

3) Fighting Muller's ratchet: A third advantage of inbreeding is that, for diploid organisms, it is the only effective way to fight off the accumulation of recessive deleterious mutations in their genomes. The notion that mutations accumulate inexorably in genomes over the course of generations is commonly referred to as Muller's ratchet [12]. Muller advocated that a major reason for the prominence of sexual reproduction among all animal species was due to the need to eliminate these mutations through genomic recombination. Muller, in his early work on Drosophila, had documented himself that most new mutations tended to have recessive phenotypes. When it came to persistence of those in the genome over generations, however, he considered that all mutations were basically dominant, and that even the most recessive deleterious mutations must have some slight effect (2 to 5 %) on reproductive fitness [13]. Those weakly deleterious mutations would therefore be eliminated progressively over successive generations. Muller, however, carried out all of his work before the

discovery of the structure of DNA and of how genes worked. Although his arguments were clearly valid for weakly deleterious dominant mutations, we now know that new mutations will much more often result in the disabling of a gene or of a protein's particular function than in a change of function, and only very rarely in the generation of a new function. But for most genes, a single valid copy is usually largely sufficient to fulfil their function, and most mut/WT heterozygotes show very little, if any, reduction in fitness compared to WT homozygotes [14, 15]. Hence mutations will much more frequently give rise to completely recessive phenotypes, having absolutely no detectable effect on the fitness of heterozygotes, and only rarely to dominant, or co-dominant traits. Inbreeding, by promoting the conditions whereby recessive mutations can find themselves in a homozygous state, will hence allow the expression of those deleterious effects resulting from recessive mutations. As can be inferred from work on laboratory strains of knock-out animals such as drosophila or transgenic mice, at least a third, and maybe more than half of the mutations that result in the invalidation of genes, such as those interrupting an open reading frame, would actually be expected to be directly lethal, or to have such serious consequences that the homozygous bearer of such mutations would probably not go on to breed under natural conditions of selection.

The adjective "inbred" has clear derogatory connotations when referring to human beings and the commonly held perception about inbreeding is that it promotes degeneracy of the genome. Somewhat ironically, inbreeding actually results in "improving" the genome, and the fact that inbreeding results in elimination of recessive deleterious mutations from the population is actually well known, at least by animal or plant breeders and scientists : the extent of inbreeding depression decreases over successive generations of inbreedin [2][16]. Via this type of phenomenon, the

---

[2] I owe the notion that inbreeding is bad for your offspring, but good for their genomes, and hence for future generations, to a conversation I had several years ago with my former colleague Geoff Butcher regarding the criticisable habit of certain scientists of using outbred rodents for their experiments on the grounds that those are usually healthier and fitter than inbred ones. This practice indeed introduces genetic variability in the experimental samples, which can lead to results that are either too variable to be significant, or even sometimes plain artefactual. On this subject, Geoff Butcher expressed the extremely wise point of view that, if a scientist wants to work with very healthy rodents, he/she should be using F1 animals obtained from crossing two separate inbred strains. Those types of animals all have strictly the same genetic background, and are indeed extremely healthy because they benefit from full swing hybrid vigour, and carry basically no recessive or partially recessive deleterious mutations.

consequence of inbreeding will be that the allelic frequency of recessive mutations will be lower in the offspring than in their parents. For each mutation, the efficiency of the process is, however, remarkably low. Indeed, in the case of a heterozygous breeding pair, the allelic frequency for the mutated copy of the gene would only pass from 0.5 in the parents (each heterozygote for the deleterious allele), to 0.33 in the offspring (see box 1). But inbreeding is the only practical way for the members of a species with an obligatory diploid genome to cleanse their genomes off the recessive mutations that will otherwise inexorably accumulate over successive generations. The reason why I have used the word "practical" in the previous sentence is because of the bdelloid rotifers, the one undisputed example of asexual diploid organisms, that seem to have adopted an alternative strategy to sex to cleanse their diploid genomes from recessive mutations, but as discussed in addendum 1, it calls upon such extremes that it would be impractical for most other organisms. Haploid organisms such as prokaryotes do not have this problem of keeping their genome from accumulating deleterious mutations, because in haploids, all mutations are dominant, and deleterious ones will hence be eliminated very rapidly. Multiple cases exist in nature of the use of a haploid state by otherwise diploid eukaryotes, and in addendum 2, I have developed three such examples that I find particularly eloquent i.e. the cases of organisms that go through haploid stages, of the sexual chromosomes and of the endosymbiotic organelles.

Diploid genomes must have contributed greatly to the adaptive 'explosion' which took place among eukaryotes 1,5 billion years ago. The most important factor for this must have been the newfound tolerance of organisms to new mutations that would have been instantaneously deleterious in haploid organisms.

Conceivably, this may even have allowed the diploid organisms to "lower their guard", i.e. to reduce the fidelity of the replication of their DNA, and favour mechanisms of recombination [17], thereby favouring the appearance of novel adaptive mutations, helping them in particular to combat pathogens more efficiently, or to adapt to new environments. This view is supported by the fact that the vast majority of metazoans of today are obligatory diploids. The drawback of relying only on diploid genomes is that this also gives rise to the insidious type of Muller's ratchet I have just discussed, whereby recessive deleterious mutations can start accumulating silently in the genome of outbred individuals. Without sex, the benefits of a diploid genome would, thus, be very short lived, especially on the evolutionary time scale, and genomes would ultimately reach a mutational meltdown [18]. But sex without inbreeding is fraught with even more insidious, and thus far greater dangers that, as we will see, can ultimately lead to species extinction.

Box 1: **Comparing the effects of accumulation of recessive deleterious mutations in populations undergoing various degrees of inbreeding and with a theoretical completely outbred population.**

Panel A : Mendelian laws predict that when a crossing occurs between two individuals heterozygous for a recessive deleterious mutation, allelic frequency for that mutation drops from 0.5 to 0.33.

	WT	Recessive deleterious mutation
WT	WT/WT	WT/mut
Recessive deleterious mutation	WT/mut	🚫 mut/mut 🚫

Panel A : When breeding takes place between two individuals each carrying one copy of a defective essential gene, one quarter of their offspring will be either non viable, or very unfit because they will be homozygous for the deleterious mutation. If the mutation is truly recessive, the other three quarters will be perfectly viable, and two out of three among that viable offspring will be heterozygous for the mutation. The allelic frequency of that deleterious allele will hence pass from 0.5 in the parents to 0.33 in the offspring, and the mutation load from 1 to 0.66 mutations per individual.

As a rough estimate based on the simplistic case of a single gene, one could therefore say that a rate of spontaneous mutation of 0.17 per generation (0.5 – 0.33) will be compensated by a reduction of 0.25 in fertility. This value of 0.17 is rather compatible with the various estimates of the rate of spontaneous mutations, which are, for humans, between 0.1 and 3 new deleterious mutation per genome per generation [19]. Although I realise that those figures are probably inaccurate for the additive effect of multiple genes, it was beyond my limited mathematical capacities to perform more precise calculations. I am confident, however, that others will later find such calculations rather straightforward, and it will then be particularly interesting to evaluate what types of equilibriums are reached for various mutations loads, various rates of mutations, and various effective sizes of population (i.e. various degrees of inbreeding).

Panel B: Evaluation of the fertility as a function of mutation loads and inbreeding coefficients.

Legend:
- purely outbred
- 0,250
- 0,125
- 0,063
- 0,031
- 0,016
- 0,008
- 0,004
- 0,002
- 0,001

The theoretical fertility of breeding pairs in a population can be calculated as a function of M, the average number of recessive mutations per individual (i.e. the mutation load) and of I, the overall average inbreeding coefficient in that population (i.e. the probability that a locus taken at random in the genome will be homozygous by descent, corresponding to half the average degree of consanguinity of parents). The average fertility will then be $(1- I)^M$. The different coloured curves were calculated for the indicated inbreeding coefficients, and we can see that fertilities only start to be significantly affected for populations with inbreeding coefficients > 0.01, corresponding to parents with degrees of consanguinity of 0.02, i.e. roughly that of third or fourth cousins.

In parallel, one can also evaluate the fertility of breeding pairs in an infinitely large population, where there is effectively no inbreeding (in real populations, the average fertility would actually be a factor of the two). For mammals, if one estimates that roughly one third of genes are essential, this would amount to a total of approximately 10^4 essential genes. If the mutation load in the population is M, the probability of any locus being mutated will be $M/10^4$, and the probability of carrying two mutated alleles of any given gene will be $(M/10^4)^2 = M^2.10^{-8}$ and hence the effect on fertility would be $(1-M^2.10^{-8})^{10.000}$ overall since the threat applies for every single one of the 10.000 essential genes. This is represented as the thick red curve on panel B, and we can see that, whilst the chance of carrying two inactivated copies of the same gene remains extremely low for mutation loads below 20, it starts becoming quite significant for mutation loads over 30, and fertility will drop below 75% when genomes have accumulated, on average, over 50 recessive mutations. For populations harbouring levels of consanguinity superior to 0.02, the reduction in fertility is, as could be expected, much more sensitive to mutation load, and for a population with an inbreeding coefficient of 0.06, a drop of fertility to 75% will occur with a mutation load between 5 and 6, but this figure climbs to nearly 30 mutations for an inbreeding coefficient of 0.01.

We have seen in the previous paragraph that, based on calculations for a single gene, a drop of 0.25 in fertility would keep up with the rate of 0.17 new deleterious recessive mutation per genome every six generations. The figures would possibly be slightly different if one considered the additive effect of multiples recessive deleterious mutations affecting different genes, each with lower allelic frequencies, and clearly different with different mutation rates. The mutation rate of 0.17 per generation cannot, however, be very far from reality since the most extreme estimates go from 0.1 to 3, and a decrease in fertility of 0.25 does not seem a completely unrealistic figure to keep up with new recessive mutations occurring once every six generations. This does not, however, mean that one in four newborns would come to the world with mental retardation or grievous physical defects. Indeed, most recessive mutations that touch essential genes would be expected to cause spontaneous premature abortions at very early stages of pregnancy, and many even before they would be recognised as miscarriages. From this point of view, it is actually rather striking to note that, in modern humans, miscarriages occur at a rate of somewhere between 10 and 40 %. Whilst the occurrence of these miscarriages is clearly also related to other factors such as the age and the health of the mother, these figures suggest that it is not unreasonable to envisage that the price to pay to fight Muller's ratchet is that a fair proportion of the zygotes (say 20 to 30 %) will have to be lost to compensate for the occurrence of one new recessive mutation every six generations. And these figures also seem compatible with what one sees in mice. Indeed, although mice can have as many as 10 to 12 pups in a litter, inbred strains are much less prolific, with litters often limited to 4 to 6 pups. When I have had to sacrifice pregnant female mice for experiments on embryonic tissues, I have often been struck by the proportion of aborted foetuses one can find in the uterus of a gestating female mouse, which is often near 50%. Thus, even in inbred mice in which the inherited mutation load must be close to zero, the rate of abortions suggests that de novo recessive mutations occur at a rate that is probably superior to one in six zygotes, or one in six generations.

******** End of Box 1 ********

Indeed, DNA replication is far from being a perfectly faithful process, and the rate of appearance of mutations in the genomes of vertebrates is commonly recognised to be of the order of 2.10^{-8} per nucleotide for every generation, although the complete sequencing of the whole genomes of a family of four suggests it may be half as high [20]. For mammals, since their haploid genomes comprises roughly 3.10^9 base pairs, each diploid newborn will thus carry, on average, around 100 nucleotides that will differ from those it should have inherited from its parents if DNA replication were perfectly faithful, and DNA perfectly stable and completely resistant to damages by radiation and chemicals. Among those mutations, the vast majority will be silent, but some will modify or inactivate gene functions, and most of those will be deleterious, but recessive (somewhere between 3% and 1‰ of mutations, i.e. between 3 and 0.1 per individual per generation) [19]. Exceptionally, a mutation will lead to a different or new function, leading to a potentially adaptive character, and most of those will be dominant or co-dominant (somewhere between 10^{-4} and 10^{-5} for every new mutation, i.e. one in every one hundred to one thousand individuals).

In the long run, the phenomenon of evolution will be based mostly on the acquisition of new characters, corresponding to dominant mutations. But this can very easily be obscured by the much higher prevalence of recessive mutations. This can be ascertained by the repeated observations that the particular characters selected for in domestic species prove almost systematically to be recessive against the phenotype of the wild stock.[3]

Even if DNA replication could be selected to become completely faithful, this would not be a solution, because organisms have no choice but to evolve continuously in the face of natural selection, just like Lewis Carol's Red Queen, who needs to keep running just to stay in the same place, as famously underlined by Leigh van Valen [21]. But because evolution is blind, and occurs only by random mutations, in order to have a chance to see adaptive mutations arise, there will be no avoiding the hundred fold excess of deleterious mutations, which will need to be eliminated by natural selection. As alluded to earlier, most of those deleterious mutations will, however, be perfectly recessive, i.e. they will have no phenotype in heterozygotes. Hence, within a large out-breeding population, the chance that one individual will carry two copies of an inactivated gene will be very low. But those will consequently be transmitted to half of the offspring, and over successive generations, since such

mutations will keep accumulating, the mutation load will inexorably increase. Even at the lowest rate of the range envisaged above, i.e. one additional recessive mutation every ten generations, the mutation load will thus still increase rather rapidly until, as proposed by Muller [13], it reaches an equilibrium where as many mutations are eliminated at every generation than arise due to new spontaneous mutations. This process of elimination, which correlates directly with infertility, will, obviously, be greatly dependant on the inbreeding coefficient, i.e. on the effective size of the population. In box 1, I have tried to evaluate how the accumulation of recessive mutations in a population can affect the fertility of individuals as a function of the inbreeding coefficient in that population. From rather simplistic calculations, I conclude that, if the rate of accumulation of recessive mutations is of the order of one every six generations, this will be compensated by a drop in fertility of the order of 0.25. These figures, although rather speculative, seem to be compatible with the rates of spontaneous abortions one sees in human and mice, of which a fair proportion (I would guess between one and two thirds) are probably due to genetic causes. As already underlined by Muller 60 years ago [13], the proportion of miscarriages due to genetic defects necessary to keep the mutation load in a steady state will be principally dependent on the rate with which new mutations appear in the genome at every generation. The process of outbreeding will indeed reduce the initial frequency at which recessive mutations are found on both copies of a gene, but this advantage will only last for a while, until the mutation load has increased to levels where the decrease in fertility due to mutations once again compensates for the rate at which they appear. The advantage of outbreeding is thus very short lived on the evolutionary time scale. And, as mentioned earlier, I contend that it opens the door to a much greater threat. Indeed, if a large population undergoes extensive outbreeding for hundreds of generations, the equilibrium will only be reached when each individual carries, on average, several dozens of recessive mutations in its genome. If that population undergoes a sudden increase in selective pressures, for example because of a novel pathogen, of competition with another species, of a recrudescence in predators or of changes in the natural environment, the effective size of that population will shrink, and the inbreeding coefficient among the survivors will consequently become very significant[4]. If

---

[3] Since they did not know about Mendel's laws, the capacity of certain mutations in both pigeons and dogs to complement one another to restore a wild type phenotype after many generations of 'true' breeding did contribute greatly to confuse both Darwin and Wallace about the durability of acquired recessive traits.

[4] There is a rather counterintuitive possibility regarding a potential advantage for the fact that, in times of harshness, increased inbreeding coefficient causes individuals to become smaller. Indeed, smaller individuals require less nutrients for their survival, and size is also well known to be inversely proportional to population density. Hence, a rather intriguing possibility lies with the idea that, under conditions of increased natural selection, small sizes caused by inbreeding depression may actually bring on a selective advantage in the struggle for survival.

we imagine that the mutation load in such a large population had reached 40, and that the reduced numbers of individuals causes the inbreeding coefficient to raise to 0.03 in the remaining population, this will result in only 30 % of fit zygotes.. If we consider that this would happen under conditions where natural selection would be particularly harsh, the delayed cost of having avoided inbreeding for the short term benefits provided by outbreeding may well, in the long run, play a major role in the rapid extinction of that species, as well as reducing their capacity to colonise new environments (in the section 'convergence of character' of The Origin, Darwin himself stated '*When any species becomes very rare, close interbreeding will help to exterminate it*'). In cases where there is a relatively sudden shift in the pressures of natural selection, such as those caused by natural catastrophes, or by a global change in the earth's temperature, the resulting shrinkage in effective populations sizes would thus be expected to be less well tolerated by the more prominent populations, i.e. probably those having taken full advantage of extensive outbreeding. Incidentally, such a mechanism would provide an explanation for the phenomenon of punctuated equilibrium proposed by Gould and Eldredge [22, 23]. In the face of Muller's ratchet, as Muller himself very rightly stated 60 years ago, "*We cannot eat our cake today and have it tomorrow*" [13]p150.

4) <u>Inbreeding promotes population fragmentation, which can, in turn, promote collaborative or altruistic behaviour</u>:

From the point of view of the 'selfish gene' hypothesis [5], individuals should always favour their own interests, or at least those of closely related individuals [24, 25]. On the other hand, mathematical modelling has led certain population biologists to conclude that group level selection cannot work, and that for any behavioural trait to be selected, that trait must have a direct selective advantage for the individual. This type of reasoning is, however, based on the assumption that populations consist of large numbers of individuals breeding freely with the rest of the population. But natural populations are not like that. If we only look at the human population, although all individuals can theoretically breed with all those of the opposite sex with apparently equivalent efficiencies, we can see that the human race is structured in ethnies, races, types, families … and that certain characters are more prominent in certain groups of individuals than in the rest of the population.

In addition to the well recognised and very significant advantage of slowing down the spread of pathogens, population fragmentation has the other, much less direct and less obvious benefit of favouring the evolution of altruistic behaviours, by making group-level selection possible (see [26] for a recent review). On the subject of group selection, I chose to adopt the view that, in fragmented populations, each group effectively becomes equivalent to a multi-cellular organism (see [27] for recent views on organismality). In metazoans, the fact that all the cells share the very same genetic makeup makes it possible for the vast majority of cells to sacrifice themselves either directly by apoptosis, or by differentiating into somatic cells that have absolutely no hope of generating offspring, for the benefit of the very few that will be destined to the germ line. Similarly, if a population is comprised of many small groups of individuals that are more closely related to one another than to the rest of the population, I firmly believe that it then becomes possible for natural selection to favour the evolution of collaborative or altruistic behaviours, because, in the end, even if those behaviours do not directly benefit the individuals that undertake those altruistic behaviours, the members of that group, and hence, on average, all the genes of the gene pool of that group, will fare better than those of the "group next door" that may have stuck with strictly selfish behaviours. On this subject, in 1871, Darwin himself made the following statement in his book "The Descent of Man":

It must not be forgotten that although a high standard of morality gives but a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over the other men of the same tribe . . . an increase in the number of well-endowed men and an advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another.

Although, when one looks at natural populations, scores of examples can be found in all the kingdoms of life where altruistic, or at least collaborative behaviours have apparently been selected for, the questions linked to group level selection remain very contentious issues today. I know of no better example of cooperative altruistic behaviour than that of the lowly slime mould, Dictyostelium discoideum, and I contend that it is promoted by the ability of single cells to colonise new niches, resulting in fragmented populations. One of the reasons for which I find the example of Dictyostelium particularly telling is that it is not complicated by the intervention of sexual reproduction (see addendum 3 for more details).

In some cases, speciation could conceptually correspond to the need for populations having developed cooperative/altruistic strategies to fend off more selfish invaders. The issue of altruism is, however, really a side issue to the main focus of this essay. All I wish to say here is that, for group level selection to evolve, it must be selected for, and this selection can only occur in populations that are fragmented into small groups of genetically inter-related individuals, or in other words, by sub-groups undergoing more inbreeding than if the population was considered as a whole. The fact that inbreeding can have the additional characteristic of providing a selective advantage at the levels of populations simply reinforces the view that inbreeding can and will occur and will not always be avoided. This will result in structured populations, which will, in turn contribute to the phenomenon of speciation.

5) Disadvantages of inbreeding: For the sake of fairness of argument, it seems necessary to counterbalance our arguments here, and underline that inbreeding also has several very significant disadvantages. Indeed, when starting from an outbred population, inbreeding depression will result in a high proportion of completely unfit offspring, and in most of the offspring being less fit than those from outbred breeding pairs. Another consequence of excessive inbreeding is that, by reducing the gene pool available for generating varied combinations of genotypes, it will result in less diversity, and thus in a more limited adaptability of the populations. Hence populations that undergo excessive inbreeding will be less likely to develop new functions than large populations undergoing outbreeding, where new functions bringing selective advantages could rapidly spread to the whole population, and could further combine with other advantageous functions that will have arisen independently in other individuals. Inbreeding may thus result in a slower rate of evolution.

This last argument does, however, need to be balanced by two counter-arguments. First, as we have seen previously, advantageous traits are not necessarily dominant, and those that are recessive can only come to light under some level of inbreeding. Thus, although inbreeding will reduce the probability of dominant traits spreading to whole populations, it will increase the frequency at which recessive traits appear, and since the mutations causing such traits are much more frequent than those causing novel functions this may balance the effect of inbreeding on slowing evolution. Second, as has been recognised for a long time, the rate at which characters can become fixed in populations is inversely correlated to the size of those population [28]. By reducing the effective size of populations, the slower rate of evolution caused by inbreeding may thus also be compensated. As we will see later on, I actually contend that excessive inbreeding, leading to excessive speciation, will consequently result in the shorter lifespan of individual species.

Another potential disadvantage of excessive inbreeding is that it could result is reductions in the levels of polymorphism in a population, by provoking what would effectively amount to repetitive bottlenecks. For jawed vertebrates, which rely on polymorphism at the level of the MHC (Major Histocompatibility Complex) for fighting and eliminating infectious pathogens, this would be expected to have particularly nefarious consequences. As we will see later, however, comparing MHC polymorphism between related species reveals that inbreeding, and speciation, can apparently take place without losing healthy levels of polymorphism over the MHC region [29, 30], and presumably over most of the genome.

II) Focusing our reflections on what the ORIGIN of species could be. Or how can it sometimes be beneficial for a few individuals to breed preferentially among themselves rather than with the rest of the population, in others words with the ancestral stock?

We have thus underlined how inbreeding can have numerous advantages, and how systematic outbreeding is actually a strategy that is only advantageous in the short run, but that can lead to great drawbacks in the long run. I now propose to follow the path laid out by Darwin in the title of his book, and to focus on the very **origin** of species, i.e. to try to imagine what initial genetic event could eventually lead to the separation of a subgroup of individuals that breed preferentially among one another rather than with the rest of the population.

I have chosen to use the word 'saeptation' to describe a process based on a novel mutation that will promote the interbreeding between individuals carrying that mutation rather than with the rest of the population. In other words, saeptation will be the consequence of a mutation that will promote increased inbreeding within a group inheriting that mutation, and thus in a reduction of the gene flow between this new group and its immediate ancestral stock.

An alternative word would have been *isolation*, but I find that this somehow implies complete separation and is therefore too strong. Furthermore, isolation has been used very often in the past to refer to allopatric speciation after geographical isolation, and I am actually trying to demonstrate here that biological speciation probably occurs most often as a consequence of interactions between two groups of individuals, and not via a stage of physical isolation. The word *reinforcement* would have been another possible alternative, but it implies that some sort of divergence has already taken place, and I am actually trying to focus on the very first step, or steps, that will eventually lead to speciation, i.e. to the existence of inheritable reproductive barriers. In this essay, I will therefore use the word *saeptation* to describe genetically based processes that induce separation of a group of individuals from their immediate ancestors, and *reinforcement* to describe processes that decrease the gene flow between groups that have already been more or less separated by another mechanism, such as saeptation.

Lets us now envisage what type of mutation could eventually lead to saeptation. This supposed mutation will, one day, occur on one strand of DNA, and hence be present in one gamete, and go on to be present on one chromosome of all the cells of one individual.

1) One-step speciation:
In complete agreement with Darwin's views, in obligatory sexual species, it is very difficult to see how complete reproductive isolation could occur as a single step because the individual that would carry such a mutation would find itself immediately incapable of breeding with it's own kin, and would thus not stand a very good chance of passing on its genes. Conceptually, a very extreme case may lie with the remote possibility of a mosaic individual harbouring a mutation having

occurred in the precursor of its germ line, in which case several individuals in it's offspring could carry the same dominant mutation resulting in complete infertility with the members of the original population. The brothers and sisters carrying that mutation would then find themselves with no other potential partners than their sibs, and extreme inbreeding among those would potentially lead to a new species. The only figure case where this would not result in an extreme bottleneck would be if the chimerical founding adult (probably a male) could mate with multiple different partners (females), and thus generate a population of offspring with sufficient diversity. The odds of this type of scenario do, however, seem extremely low.

An alternative scenario for one-step speciation is the case of chromosomal speciation, which are mostly found in plants, where new species are formed either by autopolyploidy (both parents from the same species), or allopolyploidy (parents from closely related, but separate species), where non reduction during meiosis results in offspring that will be fit, and fertile with one another, but not with the parental species (C&O, p321). Such events of speciation, have, however, only been seen in the types of plants that regularly carry out either parthenogenesis, or self fertilisation, which amount to extreme inbreeding. The individuals of such species must therefore carry very low mutation loads. In addition, as pointed out by Coyne & Orr (p 344), this type of speciation would never be possible for dioecious organisms, i.e. those that have a strict separation between males and females, usually defined by sexual chromosomes.

2) <u>Saeptation scenarios caused by a recessive mutation</u>: For the vast majority of metazoans, successive steps of progressive separation thus appear as more likely scenarios to reach speciation, and I will now explain why I think the most likely scenario involves a recessive mutation as the very first step, i.e. the initial saeptation, which will end up promoting partial reproductive isolation of its bearers. The first reason for this is that, as already alluded to earlier, outside of silent mutations, new mutations will most frequently lead to loss of functions, and will usually be recessive, for the simple reason that it is easier to undo something that works than to create a new function from scratch. But, as we have seen in the previous section, a loss of function does not necessarily mean a selective disadvantage.

Let us go back to the example of the horse precursors, and how they could have lost the stripes carried by their zebra-like ancestors. In the first place, to reveal the non-striped recessive phenotype, some significant inbreeding must have taken place. That inbreeding could actually have been promoted by the very fact that the group for which the stripe-less phenotype was advantageous was in the process of colonising more northern latitudes. Colonising populations, having smaller effective sizes, have consequently higher inbreeding coefficients [10], and we will see later that this is particularly relevant for the situations of island colonisation. Another consequence of the small size of such a group is that it

will greatly facilitate the fixation of an advantageous recessive phenotype [28]. This isolation of a small relatively inbred group would hence result in reduction of the gene flow with the ancestral group because the adapted group would occupy a different territory. This would not, however, really represent a step of biological speciation, i.e. bona fide reproductive isolation, because if one individual of that adapted group ended up among individuals of the ancestral stock, it would probably breed with them very happily and efficiently, and the defining stripe-less phenotype would be diluted and only surface on very rare occasions[5]. But it would lay the grounds for the evolution of further isolating characters because, in the context of their isolated group, it would be very disadvantageous for individuals to breed with stripy partners from the ancestral pool since all off their offspring would then end up with the dreaded stripes on their back, and thus be much more susceptible to becoming eliminated by predators.

Consequently, if an additional mutation took place in a member of that adapted group that led to more effective reproduction with kin than with individuals not carrying that second mutation, the inherent disadvantage of such a mutation due to the reduction of fertility with the rest of the adapted group would be balanced by a very significant advantage to its bearers because it would help prevent that sub-group of individuals from being re-invaded by the dominant but disadvantageous trait. This preferential mating with kin would also amount to promoting further inbreeding. This may be further facilitated by the fact that, when populations have previously gone through stages of significant inbreeding, the cost of inbreeding depression is very much reduced because most recessive deleterious mutations will have already been cleansed from the genome. On the other hand, even in this context, inbreeding will retain its advantageous side of reducing the two-fold cost of sex. Hence, from the above reasoning, we see that, in the context of an outbred population, a mutation that simply results in promoting inbreeding will struggle to become established because it would have many disadvantages to weigh against the advantage of reducing the cost of sex. But in the context of a group having undergone significant inbreeding, the cost of further inbreeding would be much lower, and under the selective pressure of the persistent threat posed by invasion by the ancestral stock, the probability of additional steps of saeptation within that group would thus be much higher.

3) <u>Scenarios involving two mutations</u> (Dobzhansky-Muller model): To explain how mutations promoting reproductive isolation could ever appear in natural populations, Bateson (1909), Dobzhansky (1936) and Muller (1942) all came up with a similar hypothetical

---

[5] As we will see later on, this type of phenomenon actually happens in sticklebacks, which gain a selective advantage by losing their armour plates when they colonise freshwater environments.

model, which is nowadays unjustly referred to as the Dobzhansky-Muller model (see C&O, p 269). This model calls upon the existence of two completely separated groups (allopatry), where two separate mutations take place that would each have no effect on the reproductive fitness in the group in which they arise, but that would result in incompatibility between the groups if and when those two groups are brought back in contact with one another. Such models are, however, not in line with Darwin's views that each step along the very long path of an evolutionary process must carry its own selective advantage. In the context of a group carrying a recessive advantageous mutation, however, we can see how the pressure of the outside populations, carrying dominant but disadvantageous mutations, could promote the selection of a mutation favouring reproductive isolation from the ancestral stock. At the end of the previous paragraph, I have argued that this selective pressure may be sufficient to promote further steps of saeptation, i.e. isolation from the other members within the adapted group, because the disadvantages of this mutation promoting inbreeding would be overcome by the advantage of resisting invasion by the dominant disadvantageous phenotype. And this modified tilt of the balance would be further favoured by the reduced inbreeding depression resulting from the relatively high level of inbreeding already present within that group.

Another scenario is, however, possible, which is to a certain degree related to the Dobzhansky-Muller model in that it would involve multiple steps, but those would occur in sequence, and not independently: the secondary steps of isolation would target traits specific to the saeptated population which could quite possibly be the one having driven the saeptation, but not necessarily. Indeed, during the initial phases of saeptation, inbreeding among a limited number of individuals would result in a high proportion of other genes becoming homozygous, and could thus reveal additional recessive phenotypes only rarely encountered in the ancestral population. In addition, in other genes than the one having driven the saeptation, certain alleles would have become much more frequent, either because they were genetically linked to the advantageous mutation, or simply because the smaller size of the population had favoured their drift towards fixation. For these three types of genes (additional recessive phenotype, genetically linked to the advantageous recessive mutation, gene having reached fixation by chance), the allelic frequencies would therefore be very different in the saeptated inbred population than it the ancestral one. And those would then represent as many potential targets for the selection of isolating mechanisms that would prevent the individuals of the group from mating back with the ancestral group. Technically speaking, this would, however, not represent saeptation, but reinforcement, because the mechanism of isolation would specifically target the outsiders, and not the direct ancestral stock, i.e. the isolated group. This type of scenario would thus involve two or more steps like the Dobzhansky-Muller model, but the fundamental difference with that model is

that selective pressures would be driving the isolation, rather than rely on chance for the separate evolution of two traits that will, at a later stage, turn out to be incompatible. One of the predictions inferred from the Dobzhansky-Muller model is that the rate of accumulation of reproductive barriers should increase with time, the so called "snowball effect" [31-33]. But this prediction does not actually allow to discriminate with the sympatric scenario described above. Indeed, if the threat of hybridisation is maintained throughout the speciation process, one would expect a similar snowball effect: once some degree of reproductive isolation has started accumulating between the two populations, resulting in reduced inclusive fitness of the hybrids further than the simple initial loss of the recessive advantageous phenotype (for various reasons including reduced fertility, poor health or even lethality), the cost of mating and/or breeding with the ancestral stock will be further increased. Consequently, the pressure for selecting further mechanisms of reproductive isolation will also be increased, and one would thus expect the rate at which such traits are selected to go up, until such times when the two populations are sufficiently isolated that neither represents a significant threat for the other one.

4) <u>Scenarios involving a dominant mutation</u> : Lets us now consider whether a scenario can be envisaged whereby a dominant mutation would promote saeptation. The most obvious type of such a mutation would seem to be one that modifies the actual niche of the population, a phenomenon often referred to as ecological speciation. Indeed, if individuals carrying a novel mutation can start occupying new territories (geographical, seasonal, nutritional ...) they will, in this new territory, naturally find themselves in the presence of those other individuals carrying the same mutation, which will, by definition, be descended from the same ancestor, and will therefore be their close relatives (sibs or cousins). Since we are now talking about a dominant mutation, to allow the first individuals with the new mutation to find mates to reproduce, the initial separation between the adapted subgroup and the ancestral stock can, however, only be partial, and the possibility of hybridisation between the two groups must therefore be preserved. Although inbreeding among colonisers may carry an initial cost because of inbreeding depression, this could easily be offset by the advantage of the lack of competition in the new territory, and the inbreeding depression would only be transient, and recede after a few generations. Although, as we will see later, dominant mutations could play important roles in further steps of the speciation process, i.e. in reinforcement, it is thus hard to envisage how they could, on their own, promote the selection of reproductive barriers with the ancestral stock. In the case of a dominant mutation leading to the colonisation of a new niche, however, the increased inbreeding among the individuals carrying the mutation would, however, greatly increase the probability of revealing some additional recessive characters, of which some may turn

out to be adaptive to the newly colonised environment. And those recessive mutations could, in turn, provide the grounds for a selective advantage to stop breeding with the ancestral stock.

5) The special cases of

5a) Co-dominant and co-recessive characters.

When crossings occur between parents each carrying homozygous but different alleles of a gene, this will often result in the offspring harbouring intermediate phenotypes. Co-dominant characters will usually be due to a mutation that changes the function of a gene, and the heterozygous offspring will hence express both functions. Co-recessive mutations are due to mutations that inactivate a gene, but because of gene dosage effects, the offspring expresses less protein than the parent with the functional gene (this is, for example, often seen for pigments). If a mutation that changes the function of a gene that is also subject to gene dosage, the resulting phenotypes will be at the same time co-dominant and co-recessive. Within the frame of the analyses carried out in the previous paragraphs, co-recessive mutations would seem particularly prone to promoting speciation. Indeed, if such a mutation brings about an adaptive phenotype, such that the partial gain or the partial loss of a function makes it possible to colonise a new niche (warmer or colder climates, higher altitude, different food, different breeding time…), the heterozygotes of the first few generations would be closely related to one another, but would be expressing intermediate phenotypes that would not separate them too much from the ancestral stock, and hence allow for the generation of multiple individuals. Crossing of those semi-adapted individuals with one another would be favoured by the fact that they would occupy that new niche. This would result in a quarter of their offspring becoming homozygous for the adaptive trait, which they would hence express more strongly, and would possibly be restricted to occupying only the newly colonised niche, with little or no possibility of contact with the ancestral one. The intermediate phenotype of the heterozygotes could thus be likened to some sort of stepping stone for the assembly of an isolated, necessarily more inbred group of individuals homozygous for the adaptive trait. Once that group has been constituted, in addition to the fact that the cost of sex would be higher with the outside group than within the group, a further advantage would be that additional adaptations to the new niche would probably be selected for quite rapidly, and the phenotype of the offspring that would result from encounters with the ancestral stock would very possibly make them unfit for either environment. This would thus provide the grounds for the Wallace effect, i.e. for the selection of further mutations reinforcing the reproductive isolation between the two populations. We can thus see how co-recessive traits could conceptually promote reproductive isolation even more rapidly than completely recessive ones.

Importantly, whether the mutation driving the saeptation is completely recessive or co-recessive could have significant consequences on the size of founder populations. Indeed, in the case of completely recessive mutations, those could stay completely silent for long periods of time within a population, and hence surface when crossings occur between individuals that are not necessarily very closely related to one another. In the case of a co-dominant mutation, however, the new intermediate character will be expressed in half the offspring of the founding individual, and the founding population will thus necessarily be comprised mostly by brother-sister matings, or close cousins at best. We will come back later to considerations regarding the size of founder populations and preservation of heterogeneity in the population.

5b) Chromosomal translocations.

Chromosomes can be either circular, as in most bacteria and in endosymbiont organelles, or linear, as in all eukaryotes and a few bacteria. As far as I know, there are no known organisms with circular chromosomes that can carry out meiotic sexual reproduction, and all eukaryotes also have multiple chromosomes. Multiple linear chromosomes thus appear as a prerequisite to meiosis, with three chromosomes being the smallest number documented, in the fission yeast Schizosaccharomyces pombe (most species have several dozens, and up to several hundreds, or even over one thousand in certain ferns). One of the main reasons having driven the arrangement of the genetic information on such multiple and linear structures is almost certainly to promote one of the main purposes of sex, i.e. to achieve an efficient shuffling of the genes between individuals having evolved in parallel, via both inter- and intra-chromosomal recombination. Another commonly recognised advantage of this arrangement in metazoans (multi-cellular organisms) is that the maintenance of telomeres provides a certain level of safeguard against the rogue selfish multiplication of cells that will lead to cancer. Outside of these two obvious advantages, I perceive that the arrangement of genomes on multiple linear chromosomes is also likely to play a central role in the phenomenon of speciation. Indeed, in line with the observation that even closely related species almost always differ in their chromosomal architecture, the role of chromosomal rearrangements in speciation has long been hypothesized (see C&O p 256-267, citing White 1978). One hurdle to this hypothesis, however, is that a chromosomal rearrangement such as the textbook example of a whole arm reciprocal translocation pictured in fig. 1, will result in a significant decrease of the fertility of the individuals in which this translocation occurs in the first place, with half of the zygotes predicted to be non viable when mating occurs with individuals of the rest of the population, which would not carry this translocation. Once the translocation has become fixed within a group, complete fertility will be restored to all individuals of that group. But for this to happen, heterozygous individuals carrying the same

mutation will first have to mate with one another, and under such circumstances, the proportion of viable offspring is predicted to drop even a little bit more, from 1/2 to 3/8 (Fig. 1), and this is without accounting for the inbreeding depression that would necessarily occur since those individuals would, logically, have to be closely related to one another. Furthermore, the translocation would then become homozygous in only 1/6 of their viable offspring (corresponding to 1/16 of the zygotes).

Although other types of chromosomal remodelling, such as inversions or centromeric fusions, may not affect the proportion of viable offspring to the same extent as reciprocal translocations, some effect on the proportion of viable gametes would still be expected since such modifications are known to disturb the phenomenon of chromosomal pairing that takes place during meiosis [34].


Fig. 1 :
Legend: In an individual carrying a chromosomal translocation, only 50% of the offspring is viable (first line). If the cross takes place between two heterozygotes, the proportion of viable offspring drops to 6/16 (= 3/8). Once the translocation has become fixed in a population, crosses with the ancestral stock will generate a first generation (F1) that will be 100% viable, but those F1 individuals will be back to the situation of reduced fertility faced by the individuals who first carried the translocation, and this will be true whether they cross to individuals from the ancestral stock, or to individuals homozygous for the translocation.

Given the above considerations, it is difficult to see how chromosomal translocations could ever take hold in any population and reach fixation unless they were directly associated with a phenotype endowed with a very significant selective advantage. This is, however, not so difficult to envisage. The most direct way would be if one of the breakpoints involved in the remodelling resulted in the disruption of a gene, leading to a beneficial recessive mutation of the type discussed in the previous section. Alternatively, the effect could be less direct: it is now well known that, for many genes, the genomic context plays an important role in their regulation [35], and it thus does not seem unlikely that certain chromosomal alterations could have a direct dominant effect on one or more of the genes surrounding the breakpoints where the chromosomal alteration took place. This would be expected to potentially provoke significant phenotypic alterations, and those modified phenotypes may, sometimes, be advantageous, or adaptive to novel environments. Homeotic genes appear

as very likely candidates for the promotion of such events of speciation associated to chromosomal rearrangements. Indeed, their expression is known to be strongly influenced by their genomic environment, and since they are involved in regulating many embryonic and ontogenic processes, minor changes in their expression patterns could often have very significant effects on the shape and aspect of organisms. In the process of speciation, events of chromosomal remodelling could thus conceptually fulfil two roles simultaneously, i.e. a phenotypic alteration leading to some selective or adaptive advantage, coupled to a reduction of the fertility with the ancestral stock.

In addition to the argument that even very closely related species usually do show significant differences in their chromosomal architecture, the view that chromosomal remodelling plays a significant role in speciation is also supported by the relatively high frequency at which chromosomal rearrangements do occur, and could thus conceivably be sufficiently

frequent to occur even in small isolated groups undergoing saeptation. Indeed, systematic studies of human karyotypes have revealed that detectable neo-rearrangements occur at a frequency of approximately one in a thousand [36]. Whilst many of such rearrangements may result in spontaneous abortions (as many as 50 % of human reproductive failures could be due to chromosomal abnormalities), many others will be viable, as testified by the fact that as many as one in 625 phenotypically healthy human beings carries a reciprocal chromosomal translocation [37]. Because those translocations do provoke significantly reduced fertility, unless they are linked to an advantageous phenotype, they are expected to get progressively eliminated from large outbreeding populations over successive generations. But finding them at such a sizeable frequency vouches for the fact that individuals carrying chromosomal rearrangements will occur quite often in humans, and hence probably in all species.

In addendum 4, I discuss how chromosomal rearrangements could promote saeptation, leading to speciation, depending on whether they would be associated to dominant, recessive, or co-dominant/co-recessive advantageous traits, and I reach the conclusion that the most likely scenario would seem to be those involving co-dominant phenotypes. Although chromosomal rearrangements associated to strictly recessive advantageous phenotypes are also conceivable, and would lead to very rapid fixation of the rearrangements, this would seem an unlikely occurrence, and would provoke very tight bottlenecks for the founder populations.

Another possibility to consider is that chromosomal rearrangements could be selected for as secondary saeptation steps, i.e. simply because they would reduce fertility of a saeptated group when they breed with the ancestral group, even if it would initially also involve some reduced fertility with the rest of that founder group. Conceptually, this decrease in fertility may sometimes represent a sufficient advantage to be selected for its own sake, as suggested by the observation that chromosomal rearrangements are more frequent between sympatric than between allopatric species of drosophila [38]. The recessive beneficial advantage would then be one of maintaining optimised fertility, but the process would certainly be much more direct, and thus favoured if the chromosomal translocation was directly associated to a mutated gene leading to an advantageous phenotype.

5c) <u>The Wallace effect: Secondary steps towards speciation, i.e. reinforcement</u> .

Once a small group of individuals has 'sprouted' from the ancestral stock, if they have to keep expressing the recessive advantageous traits that drove the constitution of that group, breeding with the ancestral stock will represent a permanent threat for the welfare of their offspring, and the different sizes of the two groups will be a factor that greatly increases the weight of this threat. If the initial mutation was directly linked to a chromosomal rearrangement, this would limit the gene flow between the two groups, but would actually further increase the threat because the hybrid offspring would be viable, but less fertile.

After an initial step of saeptation, further steps of reproductive isolation from the ancestral stock would therefore be clearly advantageous for that new, but much smaller group. Within the saeptated group, any further mutation that would increase reproductive isolation from the ancestral stock would therefore be expected to carry a very significant advantage, and could thus rapidly spread to the whole group, which the small size of the saeptated group would further favour.

We can now ask ourselves what sort of mutations and/or traits could intervene in the progressive establishment of completely separated populations, i.e. undetectable gene flow, such as what one witnesses between closely related groups recognised as separate species, although living side by side in natural environments. Once a saeptated group has been constituted, in which individuals are all more closely related to one another than to the rest of the ancestral group, further steps of reproductive isolation will not necessarily have to rely on recessive mutations. In the previous paragraphs, I have argued that, in some circumstances, the selective pressure from the ancestral stock may be sufficient to promote further steps of saeptation within the isolated group, based on additional recessive mutations, which would be favoured by the increased inbreeding coefficient, and consequent low mutation load within that saeptated group. On the other hand, dominant traits would presumably spread to the group very rapidly, and would have the added advantage that it would not require the elimination of the rest of the group. In the long run, as long as hybridisation with the ancestral stock remains a threat, any additional trait that significantly reduces the chance of producing offspring with members of that ancestral population could bring on a sufficient advantage to be selected for. As such, mechanisms that prevent either mating or the formation of zygotes (and hence called prezygotic isolation) such as sexual preference, occupation of niches more remote from the ancestor, gamete incompatibility or even culturally acquired traits could all contribute to protecting the newly formed group from the threat of breeding with the ancestral population. This type of reasoning, which assumes an asymmetric relationship between a newly formed group and a more numerous ancestral stock, provides an explanation for the observation first underlined by Muller in 1942 that incompatibilities between closely related species are very often asymmetric (C&O, p274).

When prezygotic isolation is not complete, and closely related species can still mate and produce zygotes, those hybrids are often found to be either non-viable, or fit, but sterile. Scenarios for the development of this type of barrier between species, which is called postzygotic isolation, are slightly more difficult to envisage because one needs to explain how it can be more advantageous not to produce offspring at all than to produce hybrids.

For explaining this, however, I find one observation particularly useful: whilst problems of viability usually affect offspring of both sexes, problems of sterility usually follow Haldane's rule, and almost always affect only the heterogametic sex (C&O, p311-312). We can thus consider the problems of explaining hybrid lethality and hybrid sterility as completely separate.

Regarding hybrid lethality, I can see two obvious reasons whereby it would be better not to produce offspring at all than to produce hybrids. First, if there is a significant cost to one or both parents for the rearing of offspring that will ultimately be unfit, it will be advantageous to save those resources for the subsequent rearing of "purebred" offspring. And second, if the hybrid offspring occupies a niche that overlaps with that of the purebred offspring, those two types of offspring would then be competing with one another. Sometimes, a further threat for the more inbred offspring could lie with the fact that the hybrids would be particularly fierce competitors because they would benefit from hybrid vigour, and it would thus be best not to produce that hybrid offspring at all.

Regarding the phenomenon of hybrid sterility, I can see three ways whereby it can be promoted, which are not mutually exclusive.

1) The first one lies with chromosomal rearrangements. As already mentioned in the previous pages, chromosomal rearrangements are very often associated to phenomena of speciation, and even closely related species are often found to diverge by several chromosomal structural differences. Although hybrids carrying a single chromosomal translocation such as the one depicted on figure 1 will only see their fertility drop by 50 % when they mate with homozygous individuals of either type, this proportion will drop further for every additional chromosomal rearrangement and soon reach figures approaching zero. A factor further contributing to sterility is the observation that chromosome pairing has been found to be a necessary step for the proper completion of meiosis, at least in eutherian mammals (C&O p 262-264, citing Searle1993). As we have seen in the previous pages, the fixation of such rearrangements would be most likely to occur when they are directly linked to an advantageous phenotype. The observation that there are more differences in chromosomal architecture between drosophila species living in sympatry that in allopatry [38] does, however, suggest that the reduced fertility provided by such rearrangements may sometimes represent a sufficient advantage per se.

2) The second reason lies with the haploid nature of the sex chromosomes in the heterogametic sex (see addendum 2). As already discussed earlier (section II-3), following a process of saeptation, the allelic frequencies of many genes in the newly formed group would be expected to be significantly different from that in the ancestral population.

Similarly to what was discussed above, those genes, whether carried by autosomes or sexual chromosomes, would thus represent potential targets for the selection of new mutations carried by the sexual chromosomes: newly mutated genes would still function well with the genotypes frequently present in the isolated group, but would no longer work in combination with the genotypes prominent in the ancestral stock. This would be particularly likely for the heterogametic sex because any mutation carried by one or the other of the sex chromosomes, even those corresponding to a loss of function, would be immediately dominant, as already underlined by Muller in 1940, and formalised as the dominance theory put forward by Turelli and Orr [39]. Since sexual chromosomes are, necessarily, endowed with many genes related to sexual reproduction, a likely phenotype resulting from such a selective process would be one affecting the sexual capacities, and hence result in the sterility of the heterogametic sex. Alternatively, the genes involved in the reproductive isolation may be part of the large number of genes carried by the chromosomes which are diploid in half the individuals (X in mammals and flies or Z in certain insects, fish, reptiles and birds. For the sake of clarity and simplicity, I will use X as an example for the rest of this paragraph, but I could just as well have used Z). Lets us now envisage that a mutation takes place on a gene carried by the X chromosome, such that the gene product will still function well with the allelic form of some other gene found at high frequency in the saeptated group threatened by hybridisation, but will no longer function with the allelic form(s) found in the ancestral group. As long as the individuals of the group breed among one another, that mutation would have no detectable effect, and would thus not really have any reason to spread to the whole group. But if hybridisation with the ancestral stock took place, because this mutation corresponds to a loss of function, it will most of the time result in a recessive phenotype, and it would thus have the typical characteristics of X-linked deficiencies, i.e. be silent in diploid female offspring, and expressed in the hemizygous males. The X chromosome carries many genes involved in vital functions, and disabling of those would presumably result in lethal phenotypes. Under the threat of generating hybrid offspring with an outside group, the individuals carrying such mutations would then be endowed with a definite advantage that would explain how, although neutral within the saeptated population, such mutations could be driven to fixation in the group undergoing speciation. The above scenarios would thus explain why phenotypes of reproductive isolation are often asymmetric, why they are often stronger in situations of sympatry, and provide potential explanations for Haldane's rule, i.e. why, when inter-species crosses take place, if only one sex is

affected, it is usually the heterogametic one that is either non-viable [40], which I contend could often occur by recessive mutations of vital genes on the X chromosome, or sterile, by mutations of genes involved in sexual reproduction carried either by the Y or the X chromosome.

3) The third reason for which hybrid sterility may be selected for lies with the fact that sexual reproduction is usually much more costly for females than for males, with the latter having the capacity to produce virtually unlimited numbers of offspring. In the case where a population undergoing speciation competes with the ancestral stock for the occupation of a niche, I contend that the generation of hybrids where females are fit and fertile, but males are unfit can represent an extremely advantageous strategy. These aspects will be developed further in section IV.

III) There is probably seldom such a thing as truly allopatric speciation :

In the previous section, we have seen how advantageous recessive traits could promote the formation of small saeptated groups within large populations, and how the need to keep expressing those recessive phenotypes could subsequently drive reinforcement, i.e. further steps of reproductive isolation, based on a whole array of different mechanisms. The recurring theme of the reasoning developed in the previous pages is that reproductive isolation would not arise passively, but as a result of selection under the pressure of an outside group, most frequently the ancestral population. Even if today, the majority of evolutionary scientists believe that most events of speciation must have occurred in allopatry, I do actually believe that if truly allopatric speciation ever happens, i.e. for whole populations to drift apart sufficiently to become infertile with one another, it must be an extremely slow process, and consequently a very rare occurrence. Indeed, if populations of individuals are completely separated, there will be no selective pressure for evolving features that will further reduce gene flow between the two groups, because the gene flow will already be non extant. If the geographical barrier is later lifted, the features of the individuals in each group will almost certainly be quite different because they will have adapted to their respective environment. Some mechanisms of preference between similar phenotypes may favour reproduction among the individuals having co-evolved, but since there will have been no selective pressure, I contend that there would be no reason why the individuals from either group should have become infertile with those of the other group. This is in fact in complete agreement with what has been very recently described for Caribbean Anoles lizards. Those have evolved independently for millions of years on separate islands that only joined relatively recently to form the large island of Martinique, and more reproductive barriers appear to have been selected for between

populations that have evolved side by side to adapt to coastal or mountainous conditions than between those that have evolved on separate islands [41].

This is also exactly what happens with domesticated species. Under conditions of domestication, species can diverge to become very noticeably different, and reproduce for scores of generations under very divergent conditions of selection, yet they do not become infertile with one another. In this regard, I find the example of dog breeds particularly telling. Upon comparing the remains of a great Dane and of a Chihuahua, or of a Dachshund and a Saint-Bernard, no taxonomist in their right mind would ever place them as belonging to the same species. Yet, when my steps take me to public parks or other places where people go to let their four legged friends relieve their natural needs, I am often struck (and amused) to see how dogs of very different sizes and appearances can still recognise one another as potential sexual partners. And we do know that they do indeed belong to the same species. They all share exactly the same chromosomal architecture as wild wolves. In fact, if all these dogs of different sizes were placed in a giant enclosure and fed regularly, some sexual preferences between certain types may surface (see long citation of Wallace's book in section V), pregnancies between small females and large males may turn out to be fatal for the mothers, and the smaller males would probably not fare too well in fights with larger ones, but in the end, all those dogs would produce extremely fit offspring that would certainly be much more homogenous than the starting population, and would almost certainly contain genes inherited both from the Chihuahuas and the great Danes. I contend that, if domesticated species do not undergo speciation, it is because the process of selection is carried out by the breeders, and not by natural selection, where individuals, and groups of individuals, directly compete with one another for the production of offspring and the occupation of a niche, and loosing this competition means dying with no offspring.

In settings of domestication, even if most characters that are selected by the breeders are recessive, and could even be sometimes be associated to chromosomal rearrangements, there is never any direct pressure for individuals to stop breeding with the ancestral stock, and there can thus be no selection for either saeptation, or reinforcement. The fact that different domestic breeds, including dogs and pigeons, have now been maintained in complete separation from one another for hundreds of generations without any discernible sign of speciation ever being witnessed is, in my eyes, one of the stronger arguments against the possibility that passive speciation, resulting from drift, could play a significant role in the phenomena of speciation that are clearly taking place continuously in the natural world.

Another argument against the role of intrinsic genetic incompatibility resulting from a random process in the evolution of reproductive isolation can be found in comparing the estimations of lifetime of species, and of

the time it takes for such incompatibilities to develop. Indeed, for both mammals and birds, the fossil record tells us that the average time of existence of a species is around one million years [21], whereas the time it takes for the genomes of mammals to diverge sufficiently to become genetically incompatible is estimated to be around 2-4 million years [42], and well over 10 million years for birds [43]. Given those numbers, one would thus have to envisage that, if genome divergence by drift was the main factor responsible for speciation, most species would become extinct before they would have a chance of evolving into another species.

Detractors of the views expressed in this essay would not fail to point out that there are many documented examples of allopatric speciation, i.e. where groups of individuals that were geographically separated have become "good species", i.e. completely infertile with one another. But to counter this argument, we only need to think back to the ancestral species, the one which is presumed to have occupied the ancestral territory, and colonised the new one (or, as proposed by Darwin, become split in two by a rising mountain range). If the two modern species cannot breed with one another, then we can safely assume that at least one of the two would also have been infertile with the ancestral species. But, by definition, individuals of that ancestral species were initially present on the two territories, and that species cannot have disappeared before the appearance of a subgroup of individuals that were less fertile with the ancestral individuals, and would eventually lead to the modern species. The logical consequence of this point of view is that, when allopatric speciation appears to have occurred, it actually probably corresponds to several successive steps of 'sympatric' saeptation, with the new, better adapted group replacing the ancestral intermediate.

The most striking examples of speciation often occur on islands, and when Charles Darwin visited the Galapagos in the course of his voyage on the Beagle, the observation of all the very unusual specimen found on those remote islands would later on help him greatly to formulate his theory of evolution, as well as to consider the idea that geographic isolation could contribute to speciation because of the independent evolution of populations that would progressively become infertile with one another.

Let us now consider the phenomenon of island speciation from the point of view developed in the previous paragraphs, i.e. that speciation occurs mostly as a consequence of natural selection, in other words in a context where it is advantageous for subgroups of individuals to stop breeding with the ancestral stock. Colonisation of islands are, inherently, very rare events, and even more so for an obligatory sexual species because this implies that at least two individuals from opposite sexes find themselves on the same island at the same time, which could, quite often, be brothers and sisters descended from a single pregnant female. The initial population will, consequently, go through a very tight bottleneck, with extreme degrees of inbreeding. The resulting reduced fitness of the individuals may, however, be well tolerated because, in the newly colonised territories, those few individuals will have no competition from kin, and presumably very few predators and pathogens adapted to them. Because of this initial episode of inbreeding, however, the cost of subsequent inbreeding will be expected to become much reduced after just a few generations, and this population of colonisers would then presumably multiply quite rapidly to occupy its newfound niche. But the characters of the ancestral stock would probably not be best adapted to their new environment, and conditions would thus seem very favourable for the selection of new characters allowing them to adapt. As we have seen before, mutations leading to recessive characters are much more frequent than dominant ones. And these would be even more likely to come to light in the envisaged conditions, where inbreeding would be favoured both by the small size of the population, and by the fact that inbreeding depression would be minimal. Hence, if a recessive mutation occurred that brings on an adaptive advantage to the new environment of the colonised island, there would be a very significant advantage for the individuals carrying the adapted, recessive, phenotype, to reduce their breeding with the rest of the colonising group. Any mutation coming to reinforce that saeptation would thus be advantageous, and would not necessarily have to be recessive itself. Hence, mechanisms reinforcing the isolation of the adapted group from the rest of the population, such as traits of genetic or post-natally inherited sexual preference, gametic incompatibility, genomic incompatibility or chromosomal rearrangements could evolve within that group, whereas the initial selection of such traits is normally not favoured in larger, more outbred populations, where inbreeding depression is high.

The picture we get from the above scenario is one where, when a secluded niche, such as an island, is initially invaded by very few individuals, successive steps of saeptation and/or reinforcement among a few adapted individuals will be greatly favoured by the initial inbreeding episode. And at every step, the better-adapted descendants of that group would most probably wipe out the less-well adapted stock of their immediate ancestors. For every one of these steps, the reduction of gene flow with the immediate ancestors would not necessarily be very high but, although that ancestral stock would have long been eliminated from the island, each one of those steps reducing the fertility between the population of adapted individuals and their immediate ancestors, and consequently would be expected to have a cumulative effect on the fertility between the adapted population and the ancestral stock. Hence, if the population of individuals that have adapted to the island through successive steps of saeptation and/or reinforcement was ever brought back in contact with the more numerous, outbreeding population which stayed on the continent, individuals from those two groups would very probably be completely infertile with one another, even if the latter one had not evolved away much from the ancestral

stock. The speciation process so witnessed would, however, not really have occurred in allopatry, but as a succession of sympatric steps which can only occur under the selective pressure of the immediate ancestral stock. An argument that supports the validity of this type of reasoning is the recurrent observation that events of speciation seem especially prone to occur in the context of small populations, such as those promoted by small islands. The size of the niche itself (for example a small island, or a small lake) could indeed be the main factor contributing to the maintenance of a relatively high degree of inbreeding, and hence to the reduced level of inbreeding depression that can promote speciation. Thus, even in the context of islands that are not completely isolated from the regular invasion by individuals from the mainland (such as the Baleares, the Caribbean or the Canaries), or from other nearby islands (such as the Galapagos), small islands have been found to be particularly propitious to speciation in all sorts of genera (birds, lizards, mammals, insects…).

To conclude this section, I would say that, for most cases considered as undisputable examples of allopatric speciation, the times of separation are often much longer than the expected lifetime of the species considered. Also, since in most cases ancestor and speciating groups probably co-exist for much less time than the lifetime of species, it is not surprising that so few cases of speciation appear sympatric. But it is not because we do not see it happen that sympatric speciation does not happen. Thus, contrarily to the stance proposed by Coyne and Orr, I contend that allopatric speciation should not be considered as the default mode (C&O, p84). Rather, to prove that truly allopatric speciation has ever taken place, I advocate that one would have to demonstrate that no step of saeptation has taken place during the evolutionary process, whereby one sub-population would have become reproductively isolated from its immediate sympatric ancestor, and subsequently eliminated it.


Figure 2: Different modes of speciation

IV) What relationship can be expected between the different modes of speciation, the mechanisms of reproductive isolation that are being selected for, and the diversity of the newly separated population?[6]

Despite the arguments presented in the previous section, there is no denying that the conditions under which speciation occurs (sympatry, parapatry, allopatry) would be likely to play important roles on both what types of reproductive isolation mechanisms are being selected for, and on the size and diversity of the founding population that will ultimately result from the speciation process. In figure 2, I have drawn simplistic sketches that would correspond to scenarios of speciation occurring in those three conditions. In this drawing, the shapes represent the niche occupied by a population. I feel that an important point to underline regarding the nature of niches is that they are not solely linked to geographical constraints, but to many other factors such as the nature of the nutrients, the timing of the life cycle, the identity of other partner species such as pollinators for plants, or hosts for parasites, etc… All in all, I perceive that the defining point between parapatry and sympatry is whether the niches of two populations undergoing speciation are sufficiently non overlapping that neither could ever wipe out the other one. On the other hand, even if two groups have such different life styles or life cycles that they seldom breed with one another, but still compete for the very same food, or for the same territory, one could fully expect that one of the two protagonists will, sooner or later, inherit a new character allowing it to eliminate the other one completely. In short, when occupation of the niche equates to competition for survival, I will call this sympatry; if the two populations can exist side by side without one ever being wiped out by the other one, I will call this parapatry; and when the two populations have so few interactions that neither is a threat for the other one, I will call this allopatry.

In figure 2, within the niches, I have not represented populations as uniform entities, but as fragmented in subpopulations, where the less intense areas correspond to reduced densities of population, and hence higher degrees of inbreeding. Under conditions of parapatric speciation, the group undergoing speciation will colonise a different, adjacent niche (new territory, different nutrients, different breeding period …). For the reasons exposed in section II, speciation will be initiated if the character that allows this colonisation is recessive, and hybridisation between the two groups would thus represent a much bigger threat for the members of the newly formed and less numerous group than for the

---

[6] The views developed in this section are somewhat related to the considerations on founder effects developed as models of 'genetic revolution' by Mayr (1954) (see C&O p 387-393), 'founder-flush theory' by Carson (1975) and 'genetic transilience' by Templeton [44] , but contrarily to those, I do not believe that drift under conditions of true allopatry would suffice to promote the fixation of characters of reproductive isolation other than on extremely rare occasions.

ancestral stock. Under such conditions, one would thus expect reinforcement, or further saeptation, to be selected for essentially in the younger group.

Particularly interesting examples of parapatric speciation are those provided by ring species, whereby new species arise in successive steps around a circumventable geographic barrier such as a mountain (Greenish Warbler around the Himalaya), an ocean (Herring Gulls around the Atlantic Ocean) or a valley (Ensatina Salamanders around the central valley in California) [45]. In the end, although some gene flow persists between direct neighbours, i.e. between ancestral stock and new populations having colonised a new parapatric niche, the species that end up meeting at the opposite end of the ring are completely infertile with one another. The simplest explanation for this type of phenomenon seems to be that the additive effect of incomplete reproductive barriers will finally result in truly isolated species. With regard to the ideas proposed here, it will be particularly interesting to see if characters can be identified that have contributed to the progressive adaptation of the species along the barriers, and when those are due to recessive characters, whether this is accompanied by more significant reproductive isolation from the ancestral stock.

In a context of sympatric speciation, the younger group having undergone saeptation will have to compete directly with the individuals of the ancestral stock for the occupation of the niche. Whilst the speciating group would have the advantage of the newly acquired, but recessive, advantageous trait such as the resistance to a pathogen, the ancestral group would have the important advantage of a much more numerous starting population, presumably harbouring more diversity. The counterbalance of this would be, however, that this larger and older group would probably also carry a heavier mutation load than the speciating group. In the context of a competitive struggle between the two groups, population densities would presumably thin out for both groups, leading to increased inbreeding. Whilst this would not be a problem for the younger group, it would most probably result in a very significant drop in fertility for the older and more numerous ancestral stock because it would carry a heavier mutation load. In such circumstances, because of both the newly acquired selective advantage having driven the saeptation, and its lighter mutation load, the odds would thus seem very likely to tilt towards the younger population most of the times. At later stages, with the increased scale of its progressive elimination, the intensity of the threat would, however, bear more heavily on the ancestral stock, and it would thus be expected that mechanisms of isolation could be selected for in groups of animals derived from the ancestral stock. If those corresponded to recessive phenotypes, leading to saeptation, this may actually result in the selection of a separate isolated group (figured by a pink spot), which would then have to compete both with the first speciating group and with the ancestral stock. In the end, this could result in the

ancestral group having been replaced by two separate daughter species.

The lower part of figure 2 sketches the scenario of island colonisation developed in the previous section, whereby a handful of founding individuals give rise to a completely isolated population, and the high inbreeding conditions, resulting in low mutation load, favour successive steps of sympatric saeptation that will ultimately result in complete infertility between the population occupying the island and the ancestral stock.

The common point between the last two scenarios of speciation is that the newly formed groups have to compete with their direct ancestors for the occupation of the niche. In line with Darwin's views, the stakes in this struggle are 'the survival of the fittest', which implies the ultimate elimination of the other kind. Hence, for a population undergoing sympatric speciation, to paraphrase General Philip Sheridan, "the only good ancestor is a dead ancestor". For achieving this, I perceive that post zygotic mechanisms, which will often affect only the heterogametic sex, are particularly effective strategies which can have, as we will see, multiple types of advantages. Indeed, in the context of a newly formed group, even if the members of the group are somewhat fitter because of the advantageous recessive character they express, they may also be affected by more inbreeding depression, and the much smaller effectives of the newly founded population could easily be overwhelmed by the sheer number of the competitors. Lets us now envisage the consequences of generating hybrid offspring where one sex is fertile and the other one is either sterile or dead. For the next generation, this will result in a deficit in potential partners of the heterogametic sex, and that situation will have several consequences: i) it will free up some space in the niche that the purebred members of the saeptating group can then move into without competition. In a further elaboration, one could even envisage that there could be an advantage to the sterile hybrids being very fit because of hybrid vigour. They would thus occupy a large portion of the niche, but would eventually die with no offspring, and leave all that space vacant for the offspring of their fertile neighbours. ii) In mammals and flies, where the males are heterogametic, a further advantage would be conferred by the fact that the males can produce offspring with numerous partners at very little cost. In conditions where hybrid females remain fertile and hybrid males are sterile, the males from the saeptated group would thus find themselves with more potential partners. Subsequently, the offspring resulting from mating with those hybrid females would generate more fertile females, and, if the sterility was due to only one locus, presumably only 50 % of fertile males. Although this type of reasoning could also apply to species where the females are heterogametic (certain insects, fish, reptiles and birds), this effect of the process would be somehow restricted by the fact that females are, by nature, restricted in the number of eggs, and hence offspring that they can generate. This could however, be compensated for by monogamous

behaviours, because a sterile hybrid female would effectively neuter the sexual activity of her fertile male partner. In this regard, it is quite remarkable to note that, whilst 90% of bird species are monogamous, only an estimated 3% of mammals are[7]. iii) An important consequence of the process of 'sleeping with the enemy' will be that, among the offspring resulting from crosses between the purebred stock and the hybrid homogametic offspring, 50 % will become homozygous for the advantageous recessive trait, and could thus formally join the saeptated group. Through this type of process, the saeptated group, which may initially have been endowed with rather limited genetic diversity, may thus progressively incorporate a significant portion of the diversity present in the ancestral stock.

This last point brings us to consider the question of the evolution of genetic diversity through the process of speciation. In this regard, great insights can be gathered from comparing the diversity of the major histocompatibilty complex (MHC) between closely related species. The MHC, which is found in all jawed vertebrates, is the most polymorphic region of their genomes. The reason for this is that it is involved in many aspects of immunity, and thus under very strong selection, with the diversity of MHC molecules being used to fight off the amazing capacity of pathogens to adapt to their host. Comparisons of allelic diversity between closely related species such as human and chimpanzee [29], or mouse and rat [30], have revealed that certain polymorphisms of MHC molecules have survived all the successive steps of speciation that have separated each species from their common ancestor. Such observations thus strongly suggest that speciation, even if it involves inbreeding, does not necessarily have to occur via very tight bottlenecks, and thus tend to support the validity of the types of scenarios proposed at the end of the last paragraph.

In the case of human and chimps, the presumed last common ancestor is called Nakalipithecus, who lived some 10 million years ago. Since then, although the precise details of our ancestry are stilled hotly debated, it is clear that our family tree must have counted at least half a dozen successive species, first belonging to the gender Australopithecus (anamensis, afarensis, africanus …), and then to the gender Homo (habilis, erectus …). Over that time, 30 million sequence differences have accumulated between the human and chimp genomes, corresponding to 1% divergence, as well a 10

---

[7] On the subject of bird monogamy, in The Origin, Darwin himself underlines several times the fact that it has been possible to derive and keep so many different breeds of pigeons because those can be paired for life, and then kept in the same aviary. His report of the common observation of sudden reversion of certain phenotypes towards wild type phenotypes does, however, vouch for the fact that even among birds, some adultery still occurs regularly.

chromosomal modifications (9 inversions and 1 centromeric fusion), of which one can reasonably expect that about half must have taken place in the branch leading to humans. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the number of chromosomal rearrangements is roughly of the same order as the number of speciation steps on the presumed path between Nakalipithecus and the two modern species. This does not, however, prove in any way that each of those rearrangements was necessarily correlated to a phenomenon of speciation. Indeed, some of those chromosomal rearrangements could have become fixed in the population because they were directly linked to dominant beneficial characters.

When two separate human genomic sequences are compared, one allegedly finds around 0.2% divergence, which would amount to 6 million mutations per haploid genome. Our species has only been around for 250.000 years, and thus approximately 10.000 generations. As we have seen previously, new mutations accumulate at the rate of approximately 60 per haploid genome per generation. One would thus expect only 600.000 new mutations to have accumulated in each genome since the appearance of Homo Sapiens. The level of divergence seen between human genomic sequences thus provides additional support for the fact that events of speciation, even if they implicate a process of inbreeding, do allow for the conservation of high levels of genomic diversity[8].

If we consider the various scenarios envisaged in the previous pages, however, the levels of diversity would not be expected to be distributed evenly over the whole genome. Indeed, the genomic regions surrounding the loci having contributed to driving the speciation would be expected to have reached fixation very rapidly, and hence to show very limited diversity. Furthermore, the rate of fixation would be very different if they corresponded to recessive or to dominant characters. Indeed, if a recessive character leading to saeptation is being selected for, it will necessarily be fixed very rapidly in the saeptated population, and one would thus expect a few centimorgans of the genomic region surrounding the recessive allele to become fixed with it, and hence to harbour very limited diversity, and this would be even more true for co-recessive traits. Conversely, whilst the allelic frequency of an advantageous dominant character will rapidly increase to 70 or 80 % in a population, it will take a very long time to reach complete fixation, i.e. to eliminate all the non-advantageous recessive alleles. Somewhat ironically, it is actually inbreeding that would allow the elimination of the last ancestral, recessive and less advantageous alleles, via a mechanism equivalent to the one described in section I-3. Consequently, during all that time before complete fixation of the dominant allele, there will be many chances for crossing-overs to occur around the gene coding for the advantageous dominant trait, and the

size of the region of reduced diversity should therefore be much more limited than in the case of the selection for a recessive trait.

The prediction that follows this reasoning is that this may actually provide the means to identify the regions carrying the genes involved in events of speciation, and conceivably even the very genes having driven the speciation[9], as well as a reasonably accurate estimation of the dates at which it happened. Indeed, if one documented the levels of diversity of silent intergenic DNA over the whole genome for a good number of unrelated individuals belonging to the same species, this would not only provide the means to really evaluate the degree of inbreeding within a population, as well as the inbreeding coefficient for each individual, but one would also expect to be able to rapidly identify regions of limited diversity. Although the occurrence of chromosomal rearrangements may confuse the interpretation [34, 46], the gene responsible for driving the fixation would be expected to be at the centre of such regions, and the level of divergence of intergenic sequences within those regions would provide a relatively precise estimate of the time of fixation.

Finally, the slope with which the level of diversity decreases with genetic distance from the centre would provide an indication of whether the character that drove the fixation was recessive, and was hence probably involved in a phenomenon of saeptation, co-dominant, or dominant, and hence corresponded to adaptive evolution (including mechanisms of reinforcement). If such an exercise was carried out for tens of thousands of markers distributed over the whole genome in hundreds of unrelated individuals belonging to the same species, this could, I predict, provide a very informative picture of the successive steps of speciation in the evolutionary history of that species[10].

---

[8] The model of Transilience developed by Templeton [44] addresses similar issues from the point of view of population genetics.

---

[9] If the selective force driving the selection was a particularly nefarious pathogen, however, it may well be that it would have disappeared with it's host, and all that would be left would be an allelic form of a gene that was once used as a receptor for a now long vanished pathogen.

[10] In this regard, I would not be surprised if a locus having driven saeptation in the ancestors of the laboratory rat, Rattus Norvegicus, was one day found to lie near the MHC because the rat MHC has been found to have a much more restricted diversity of MHC haplotypes than those found in Mouse or Human. Alternatively, it may be that the ancestors of the rat population have gone through one or several tight bottlenecks, resulting in limited diversity of sequences through the whole genome.

Figure 3

V) The existence of species can only be transitory because it corresponds to a metastable equilibrium.

The field of Taxonomy was initiated by the swedish zoologist, Carolus Linnaeus, who, in his book *Systema Naturae* (first edition published in 1735, tenth and last in 1758), recorded some 9000 species of plants and animals. Today, this number has reached several millions, and it is estimated that around ten millions species of plants and animals of more than one millimetre inhabit our planet [47], and this number probably corresponds to less than 1% of the species that have existed since metazoan life started on earth 1.5 billion years ago, with an estimated average lifetime of a species around 4 million years [48, 49][11].

In this regard, the estimated number of 5000 extant mammal species represents only a tiny portion, and mammal species are particularly short lived, with an estimated average lifetime of just one million years, whilst reptiles, and species of higher plants and trees can last over 20 million years. All in all, it is pretty clear that very few of the species that we can find on earth today were there 20 million year ago. As already underlined in the introduction, the somewhat uncomfortable, but inescapable conclusion from this observation is that all the species that surround us, including our own, are bound for extinction.

---

[11] If we consider that sexually reproducing eukaryotes have existed for 1500 million years, and if the average lifetime of a species has been 4 million years since then, this amounts to an average number of approximately 400 steps of speciation separating the species of today from the first metazoan ancestors. If, along the way, every species had speciated into two descendants every 4 million years, this would give a number of species equal to 2^{400} which is so big that my desktop calculator refuses to calculate it, but which I make out to be something near 10^{120}, which is a number vastly superior to the number of

---

atoms on earth (ca. 10^{50}). From this type of calculation, we can see that the struggle for existence highlighted by Darwin and Wallace for individuals must also apply to species, and that the destiny of most species is either to disappear, or sometimes to yield one, and seldom more descendants.

The theory developed in the previous pages can actually lead us to suggest an explanation for this observed inherent tendency of species to disappear over time. Indeed, we have seen that the mutation load in a population is inversely related to the degree of inbreeding in this population, and the existence of species thus appears to rely on a fragile, metastable equilibrium, which I find very appropriate to represent in the context of the Yin Yang symbol to evoke the balance between degrees of inbreeding and outbreeding (Figure 3).

On the one hand, increased inbreeding will have the various advantages listed in section I : reducing the cost of sex, favouring the expression of recessive phenotypes, decreasing the mutation load, and promoting collaborative behaviours by population fragmentation. But, as we have seen, this increased inbreeding will at the same time favour the appearance of saeptated groups, for whom the way of existence will equate to the elimination of the ancestral stock, and hence the disappearance of the initial species.

On the other hand, extensive outbreeding will bring hybrid vigour, and delay the appearance of reduced fertility due to the accumulation of recessive deleterious mutations. This type of phenomenon may be particularly prominent for very successful species that end up effectively panmictic rather than being fractionated into smaller subpopulations. The evolution of individuals within such population would then favour the strongest, longest lived, largest individuals. In this regard, van Valen underlined that, for mammals, *"Occasionally, a small mammal becomes a large one, but a large mammal never becomes a small one"* [50] [12]. Regarding the fossil record on which van Valen based most of his work, it may in fact be worth to consider the possibility that it's composition may be biased towards species that, having adopted a panmictic strategy, would see the size of the populations swell very rapidly to very large numbers, but would at the same time rather rapidly reach a point of no return because, after only of few dozens of generations, the accumulation of recessive mutations would subsequently prevent any chance of any significant degree of inbreeding, and hence any possibility of a fresh start via an event of speciation. And, as we have seen, such populations would inescapably at some stage fall victims of their own success because they would be particularly prone to crises triggered by increased levels of selective pressures by outside factors such as pathogens, predators, competitors, or a shift of the climatic conditions.

Hence, one major difference between the outbreeding and inbreeding strategies is that the former leads to a

very high probability of ultimate extinction, whilst the latter would lead to an increased probability of formation of saeptating group(s) within the population, that will ultimately cause the elimination of the ancestral group by one or more descendant new species. The outbreeding strategy, however, is probably the one that takes place most frequently in natural populations because it brings on much more immediate advantages. Darwin and Wallace's theory of evolution, which is concerned with the acquisition of new adaptive traits, is in fact based on considering this type of strategy. And it is indeed by relying on the flexibility and variability of the genome taking place in parallel in the numerous individuals of a large population that one can hope to see surface the very rare events that will correspond to new adaptive functions. Since such new traits will, most of the time, be expressed in a dominant fashion, they will thus rapidly spread to the whole population.

On the other hand, there are many instances where it is advantageous to get rid of a character, and the susceptibility to pathogens seems to be particularly relevant here. But, as discussed at length in the previous pages, the loss of a function usually corresponds to a recessive trait, and the expression of recessive traits necessarily calls for some degree of inbreeding. And, although it is not endowed with the same immediately obvious advantage as outbreeding, inbreeding does reduces the cost of sex, and will keep the mutation load in check, although at the cost of reduced fertility. Given the less tangible and more delayed nature of those advantages, and despite the reasoning developed in the previous pages, I have actually found it very difficult to convince myself that the prolonged existence of species could rely on such a balance between outbreeding and inbreeding.

But the degree of inbreeding necessary to keep mutation loads in check is probably much less than that required to promote speciation, and if we consider the very divergent outcomes of the two strategies, and the timescales involved in evolutionary processes, we rapidly reach the conclusion that, in the long run, there is not really a choice between the two strategies in the struggle for survival because extensive outbreeding will inescapably lead to extinction. For example, this type of situation may well have applied to the Multituberculates, which were very common mammals during the paleocene, but underwent complete extinction during the Eocene [51], probably because of the competition of the newly arisen rodent competitors. If there are 10 million species on our planet, and the average lifetime of a species is 4 million years, then the turnover rate should be under three species per year. This may appear as a clear underestimate, especially in our modern era where ecological changes due to human activities have provoked the disappearance of thousands of species every year, but we should bear in mind that the extinction rates measured by paleontologists are those which correspond to the disappearance of organisms based on the anatomical features detectable in fossils,

---

[12] It is important to note that these rules do not seem to apply to island mammals that are larger than rabbit size, which tend to become smaller there, and mammals that are smaller than rabbit to become larger, which van Valen called the island rule.

and that species differentiated by colours, timing of life cycle or breeding habits would not be registered. Similarly, events of speciation corresponding to the loss of one or a few recessive traits would almost certainly not de detected by the fossil record. Based on the arguments raised above, I perceive that most events of extinction identified by paleontologists probably correspond to those of panmictic species having succumbed to increased selective pressures which initiated a process of irreversible decimation because of high inbreeding depression resulting from important mutation loads. From the above arguments, I conclude that, even if inbreeding is not immediately advantageous, it is an absolute requirement, an unavoidable price to pay, for long term survival of the descendants. This probably provides the ultimate example of group level selection because species that fall for the short sighted advantage of extensive outbreeding will relatively rapidly have to face the cost of unmanageable mutation loads, leading to unavoidable extinction.

If we now turn to the world around us, we will see that natural populations are, in fact, almost never panmictic. First, the world is so vast that most species are necessarily fragmented into myriads of small groups, with every event of colonisation providing an opportunity for episodes of increased inbreeding, resulting in a reduction of the mutation load. And there is also a natural tendency for individuals to associate with kin, as Wallace himself underlined in the following paragraph taken from his book, 'Darwinism', in Chapter VII's section entitled 'The Isolation of Varieties by Selective Association', (1889), which I do not resist the pleasure of sharing with you:

But there is also a very powerful cause of isolation in the mental nature—the likes and dislikes—of animals; and to this is probably due the fact of the comparative rarity of hybrids in a state of nature. The differently coloured herds of cattle in the Falkland Islands, each of which keeps separate, have been already mentioned; and it may be added, that the mouse-coloured variety seem to have already developed a physiological peculiarity in breeding a month earlier than the others. Similar facts occur, however, among our domestic animals and are well known to breeders. Professor Low, one of the greatest authorities on our domesticated animals, says: "The female of the dog, when not under restraint, makes selection of her mate, the mastiff selecting the mastiff, the terrier the terrier, and so on." And again: "The Merino sheep and Heath sheep of Scotland, if two flocks are mixed together, each will breed with its own variety." Mr. Darwin has collected many facts illustrating this point. One of the chief pigeon-fanciers in England informed him that, if free to choose, each breed would prefer pairing with its own kind. Among the wild horses in Paraguay those of the same colour and size associate together; while in Circassia there are three races of horses which have received special names, and which, when living a free life, almost always refuse to mingle

and cross, and will even attack one another. On one of the Faroe Islands, not more than half a mile in diameter, the half-wild native black sheep do not readily mix with imported white sheep. In the Forest of Dean, and in the New Forest, the dark and pale coloured herds of fallow deer have never been known to mingle; and even the curious Ancon sheep of quite modern origin have been observed to keep together, separating themselves from the rest of the flock when put into enclosures with other sheep. The same rule applies to birds, for Darwin was informed by the Rev. W.D. Fox that his flocks of white and Chinese geese kept distinct.

This constant preference of animals for their like, even in the case of slightly different varieties of the same species, is evidently a fact of great importance in considering the origin of species by natural selection, since it shows us that, so soon as a slight differentiation of form or colour has been effected, isolation will at once arise by the selective association of the animals themselves; and thus the great stumbling-block of "the swamping effects of intercrossing," which has been so prominently brought forward by many naturalists, will be completely obviated.

Such types of preference for closely related individuals may not need to be based on purely genetic factors, but could be culturally inherited, i.e. transmitted as memes [5], as has been documented many times with the phenomenon of imprinting in birds raised in nests of different species. In addition, there is probably also simply a natural tendency of individuals with similar phenotypes to breed more willingly and effectively with one another.

The concept that social structures and altruism are more likely to arise between genetically related individuals was initially developed by Hamilton [24, 25], and this was later coined as the *green beard altruism effect* by Richard Dawkins [5], to describe a hypothetical gene that would result in both a detectible trait and in altruistic behaviour among those bearing it. The occurrence of such a gene seems, however, rather unlikely, and there are, indeed, very few reported occurrences of such possible green beard genes. Moreover, the green beard hypothesis posits that the green beard would be a dominant character, i.e. a gain or a change of function, which, as underlined repeatedly in the previous pages, is far less likely to arise through mutations than a loss of function.

More recently, however, mathematical modelling of *beard chromodynamics* yielded the conclusion that the most stable arrangement for the maintenance of altruism was for a situation where beard colours are polymorphic, and the genes for altruism only loosely coupled to those for beard colours [52]. In other words, populations are most likely to get organised into groups of individuals that behave altruistically towards one another if the polymorphism of characters in the global population allows individuals to recognise those that are most likely to be genetically related to themselves, i.e. the ones that

look like them, and the social genes do not have to be the same as those used to evaluate kinship. In French, we have a proverb that says '*Ce qui se ressemble s'assemble*', and the existence of races and varieties in the natural world vouches for the spontaneous occurrence of structuration of natural populations which can only be the result of some preferential association, and reproduction, between individuals that are more closely related to one another than to the rest of the population. The recent finding that, even in the fungus Neurospora, some degree of reproductive isolation could be observed between stocks that had been grown for relatively short periods in different selective environments [53] indicates that a tendency for preferential mating with individuals bearing similar phenotypes can occur even in microscopic organisms.

For species that live exclusively on land, most niches would naturally have patchy distributions, providing an automatic enforcement of a fragmentation of populations. But for species that live in the sea, or that can take to the air such as birds or insects, there will be no enforced limitation to taking advantage of the short term benefits of extensive outbreeding. In this regard, it is actually remarkable to note that many species of birds, fish, or marine mammals not only show strong preference for kin characters, but also come back to breed to the very same place where they were born. I contend that these tendencies, which all must promote a significant degree of inbreeding, are the result of group selection, with the groups or species adopting more outbreeding strategies succumbing rapidly to unmanageable mutation loads. Individual examples of various mechanisms promoting inbreeding will be developed in the next section.

The picture we come to at the end of this section is indeed one of a Yin Yang equilibrium between outbreeding and inbreeding, in line with the notion of optimal outbreeding proposed by Bateson [54], whereby outbreeding is necessary for the acquisition of new characters favoured by the parallel evolution of the many individuals in whole populations, and inbreeding is necessary to eliminate not only the deleterious recessive mutations, but also to lose certain functions that have become undesirable, and in particular the susceptibility to pathogens. Like many things in biology, including life itself [55], the existence of species has all the characteristics of a metastable equilibrium because departing from it will promote a further departure from the equilibrium, either of outbreeding, destined for extinction, or inbreeding, which will favour speciation. The observation of the constant rates of extinction within genera reported by van Valen [21] does find an explanation in this model because the occurrence of events of destabilisation of the equilibrium would correspond to presumably rare stochastic events, as was concluded by a recent study [56].

V) Many classical examples of speciation appear to fit the model proposed.

For a scientist, one of the main problems in trying to understand the phenomenon of speciation is that it is basically impossible to perform experiments that will lead to bona fide speciation, i.e. complete reproductive isolation between two groups of individuals. The first reason has been dubbed a 'methodological contradiction' by Lewontin in 1974. Indeed, studying the genetics of speciation involves experiments that cannot be done, i.e. cross species that are, by definition infertile with one another.

The second reason is one of the time scale, and/or of the size of the samples required. Indeed, because the mutations that lead to evolution and/or speciation occur purely by chance, they will only ever occur very rarely. In the previous sections of this essay, I have argued that speciation is promoted by inbreeding, i.e. by the small size of breeding groups. But the probability of a new mutation occurring in the very few individuals of that breeding group is consequently infinitely small, and if one started from just one such breeding group, one would probably have to wait for thousands of generations for saeptation to occur. This is probably similar to what happens on isolated islands, where the time scales estimated to reach speciation are of the order of tens of thousands of years (and no one would ever get funding for an experiment on this time scale ;-). Of note, in the Park Grass Experiment performed in East Anglia, adjacent plots of meadow have been continuously subjected to different fertilizer treatments since 1858, and some signs of reproductive isolation, with reinforcement via different flowering times, have been identified between populations derived from one type of grass [57]. I could, however, find no reported data regarding the reciprocity of this reproductive isolation, or about the character which may have been selected for (and hence even less about its dominant or recessive nature).

Another approach to test the validity of a model of speciation is to make predictions regarding the type of results that could be expected from the model proposed, and then to check whether those predictions hold up when the genetic source of reproductive isolation is dissected between closely related species. Many such predictions can thus be made from the model(s) developed here, with the main ones being that i) When speciation occurs, i.e. when a new group gets reproductively isolated from an ancestral population, this should be due to one or more recessive advantageous mutation(s) occurring in the new group. ii) Genera that undergo a lot of speciation should be those that carry the lowest mutation loads, correlating to lifestyles favouring inbreeding such as frequent self fertilisation, or very fragmented populations.

In the following paragraphs, we will look at several extensively documented cases of speciation that have been reported in the literature, and find that most of those examples do seem to fit the model proposed[13].

Fish

The first ancestral vertebrate was a fish that lived in the ocean over 500 million years ago, and today more than 30,000 species of fish occupy our planet's waters, having adapted to the many diverse habitats found in oceans, seas, rivers, lakes… Since all these different species of fish occupy niches of very different sizes and architectures, one would not expect the same inbreeding/outbreeding strategies to have been selected in all fish, for example those breeding in the open ocean and to those living in lakes or in small streams.

Among fishes, the most often cited and discussed case of speciation is that of the haplochromine cichlids found in the African lakes, which are hosts to hundreds of closely related species. Cihlids actually represent a very large family of over 3000 species which are widely distributed over the lakes and rivers of Africa and South America (some of their best know representatives are the Tilapia, which are used extensively for aquaculture, and the Angelfish, of Amazonian origin, which is commonly found in domestic tropical aquaria). For many years, speciation of cichlids has been the subject of various heated controversies. The first one over whether the speciation see in African lakes really occurred in sympatry or allopatry, and a very strong argument for the fact that sympatric speciation was possible for cichlids recently came from work on cichlids found in a very small crater lake of central America [58].

Another contentious issue has been whether some of the sympatric populations found in the African lakes represent varieties or 'good species'. This latter question is particular relevant for the diverse groups of Lake Victoria which were initially behaving as completely isolated groups, because of assortative mating mostly based on colour patterns. In recent years, as a result of human activity, the waters of the lake have become progressively more and more turbid, and the various

vibrant colours which characterised the males of the various types of cichlids one hundred years ago disappeared progressively because the members of the various 'species' hybridised with one another, to result in a much more homogenous and duller population [59]. The first point to make from this observation is that, once again, it underlines the difficulty of defining species, since it shows that effectively good species can later on become varieties when their living conditions change, even in the wild. From the point of view of the ideas developed in this essay, the observation that hybridisation resulted in the disappearance of the vibrant colours is very reminiscent of the colours of Darwin's pigeons, and does thus strongly suggest that the expression of many of these vibrant colours corresponds to recessive mutations, and that the expression of these must therefore require inbreeding. Conversely, another bright phenotype know as orange blotch is a dominant trait expressed only in females, to whom it brings a selective advantage [60]. This phenotype is encountered in certain individuals of several species of the lakes Malawi and Victoria, but has not led to speciation. Thus, as predicted by the model, bright colours associated to recessive mutations lead to reproductively isolated groups, whilst those associated to dominant mutations do not.

We will now turn to the reason why cichlids may have such a tendency to undergo explosive speciation, and I contend that an explanation can be found in another recent study, based on *Pelvicachromis taeniatus*, a river-inhabiting African cichlid. In this report, Thünken and collaborators look at the mating preferences of this cichlid fish, and find a strong preference for kin over non-kin, and, importantly, no sign of inbreeding depression in the offspring resulting from sib mating [61]. These observations strongly suggest that, in cichlids, there can be an inherent tendency to prefer mating with very closely related individuals. In rivers, where the context is presumably easily disruptive for population structures, this preference for kin may be important for the maintenance of low mutation loads, and for the expression of recessive phenotypes. When cichlids with extensive inbreeding habits colonise lakes, however, the disrupting of groups of closely related animals would no longer occur, and this could promote frequent saeptation and result in the explosive speciation that is witnessed in African lakes. The existence of those species will, however, be particularly fragile, because of the segmentation of the whole population into a myriad of very small groups, that will be reproductively isolated from one another, and will thus not benefit from sharing their gene pool with a very large number of individuals. And the high probability of saeptation of some subgroup will, in addition, represent another permanent threat for the occupation of the niche. The situation of cichlids thus represents an inherently unstable situation, with an excessive tendency for speciation. Ultimately, a more stable equilibrium would presumably be reached if some

---

[13] In this regard, my relative naivety on the subject of speciation, to which I have already alluded to in the foreword of this essay, has proven to be a great advantage. Indeed, it not only contributed to my capacity to have ideas that seem to diverge quite significantly from the currently accepted dogmas, but once I had formally developed these ideas, it allowed me to gather data which already existed in the literature, but of which I was not aware, to test the validity of the model. In this respect, I think it is worth underlining that my writing of all the previous sections preceded the writing of this section, which coincided with my acquisition of the knowledge about the precise details corresponding to the various models of speciation. I consider this to be a very significant advantage because the model therefore has the added strength of having proven to be predictive rather than being adapted to explain the evidence.

sub-population lost its inherent preference for kin, and started adopting a more outbreeding strategy.

Although visual clues clearly play a pivotal role in the preferences of cichlids for kin, another important component could possibly involve the MHC since, in other fish genera, MHC discrimination has been shown to be involved in inbreeding avoidance. In this regard, the case of salmon provides a particularly interesting example of equilibrium whereby the MHC is used both by the mating adults for promoting MHC diversity (but not for inbreeding avoidance) [62], but conversely, fertilisation is apparently favoured when eggs and sperm share MHC similarity [63]. Since, under normal conditions, salmon copulation is usually polyandrous, and thus provides the grounds for sperm competition and/or sperm selection by the ovum, the choice of mates would seem to play a relatively minor role, especially since, as alluded to earlier, the tendency of salmon to return to the very same place where they were born must further enhance their tendency for inbreeding. In the study by Landry et al., however, a relatively small number of males (41) and females (35) were placed in an arm of the same river that is not usually occupied by salmon because of impassable waterfalls. Under such conditions of unfamiliar grounds and low populations numbers, the results obtained by typing offspring for the MHC class II β chain suggested that matings had occurred to favour offspring that was heterozygous. In arctic charr, which is closely related to salmon, Olsen et al. found that ancestry, whereby sibs were preferred to non-sibs, had a more important influence than MHC preference [64]. The fact that these two latter studies looked at the MHC class II locus whilst the study of Yeates et al. looked at MHC class I may be of some importance because, in teleost fish, the regions for class I and class II are not linked [65], and cues conveyed by one class of MHC molecules could have different consequences to those of the other class, which may have contributed to the apparent discrepancy of some of those results.

Sticklebacks are another type of fish which are found both in the sea and in fresh waters and have been very useful for the study of speciation. Sticklebacks, which are also known as tiddlers in English, are very efficient colonisers, and are widespread in the northern hemisphere, over much of Europe, Asia, and America. Regarding the role of the MHC in mating preference, an intriguing observation is that sticklebacks appear to favour mating with individuals of intermediate MHC divergence, to yield offspring with an optimal number of 5 to 6 MHC class II β alleles [66], which they apparently achieve by smelling the peptides that can bind to MHC molecules [67]. In another study, however, Frommen and Bakker found some signs of inbreeding avoidance in groups of fish raised separately, but with no data on the correlation to MHC similarity [68]. From the point of view of the ideas developed in this essay, the data from salmon and sticklebacks contribute to the drawing of a picture whereby clues from the MHC allow fish to mate preferentially with individuals with which they share some genetic similarity, but not too much, which is entirely compatible with the idea of a balance between inbreeding and outbreeding.

Another fascinating observation made on sticklebacks is the phenomenon of parallel speciation. Indeed, when populations of sticklebacks colonise freshwater environments, and lakes in particular, they have a strong tendency to evolve into adapted forms that lack certain features that characterise the anadromous (sea dwelling) sticklebacks:

- In shallow lakes, one finds mostly a form called benthic, which is larger, with smaller eyes, and feeds mostly on invertebrates found on the lake's bed. The benthic form has a great reduction in the number of armour plates and of pelvic structures.
- In deep lakes with steep sides, the favoured adaptation tends to be a form called limnetic, which corresponds to a smaller fish which feeds mostly on plankton at the lake's surface, and is, overall, less different to the ancestral marine fish.

In at least 6 lakes of British Columbia, Canada, evolution has repeatedly driven the apparition of both benthic and limnetic forms from the same ancestral stocks. Those benthic and limnetic forms, although capable of producing perfectly fertile offspring when given no choice of partner, cohabit in those lakes in apparent complete reproductive isolation from one another. For those various sympatric pairs, size and colour were shown to be the two main phenotypes that contribute most to the reproductive isolation [69]. A truly remarkable finding was the observation that, for all these populations, benthic individuals from one lake mated preferentially with benthic partners from other lakes than with limnetic ones from any lake and the converse was true for limnetic fish [70]. As underlined by the authors, the observation that, under similar conditions, evolution can lead to the parallel selection of similar sympatric reproductively isolated populations is a very strong argument in favour of the idea that natural selection is involved in the speciation process. This was in fact further supported by their observation that reproductive isolation between benthic and limnetic individuals seemed even more pronounced between fish from the same lakes than between fish obtained from different lakes, despite being more closely related to fish from the same lake. It thus suggested that reproductive barriers could be selectively raised against the population that represented the most direct threat, i.e. the fish of the same lake, but of the other morph.

Further work, orchestrated by the group of David Kingsley, has led to the dissection of the genetic mechanisms responsible for the loss of armour plates or of pelvic structures which are both particularly prominent in benthic sticklebacks. As predicted by the model proposed in this essay, both phenotypes were found to be due to mostly recessive mutations. The loss of armour plates was mapped to the ectodysplasin gene (EDA) which, in mammals, is known to be involved in many ectoderm features such as teeth and hair [71].

28/09/10

29

Remarkably, the same allele of the EDA gene, which carries just four amino acid differences compared to that found in fully plated fish, was identified in all the low plated morphs obtained from Europe, and from both the American coasts. That same allele was also identified in fully plated fish caught in river estuaries, albeit at low frequencies (3.8% in California and 0.2% in British Columbia). Another allele was, however, found in Japanese stocks, which shows no changes from the wild type in the protein coding sequence, but falls in the same complementation group as the other low-plate phenotypes. These results suggest that the allele responsible for plate loss in sticklebacks has been around for several million years, and has spread widely over the northern hemisphere, probably because it is associated to a very significant advantage in freshwater populations, where it would thus get amplified, and then fed back into the marine population by episodes of hybridisation. Because it is essentially recessive, this allele can remain 'hidden' at low frequency in the marine populations. When marine stocks colonise freshwater niches, however, this must favour some degree of inbreeding, which would rapidly reveal the recessive phenotype, and the selective advantage would then rapidly increase the allelic frequency in the isolated population. In conditions where the threat of the fully-plated allele persists, this will provide the grounds for selection of reinforcement via mechanisms such as reproductive isolation, which could ultimately result in proper speciation.

The loss of pelvic structures was also very recently shown to be due to recessive mutations corresponding to deletions in the promoter regions of the Pitx1 gene [72]. Remarkably, characterisation of the promoter regions of this gene in nine different populations of benthic sticklebacks revealed that the same 488-bp segment was missing in all nine populations, but this was due to nine different events of deletion. This observation thus testifies that the advantageous phenotype of losing pelvic structures arose repeatedly and independently in all those completely separate benthic populations as a result of selective pressures, and, contrarily to the previous example, was not 'hidden' as a recessive trait in the ancestral marine population, which would only surface under conditions of inbreeding. The other point that can be made from this observation is that, under the right conditions of selection, recessive mutations due to loss of existing genetics materials are sufficiently common that they can be repeatedly obtained in completely independent populations. Another remarkable observation contained in that article is that, as predicted at the end of section IV, there is a considerable reduction in the heterogeneity of sequences focused on the region surrounding the Pitx1 gene [72]. Amazingly, this reduction only spreads over a few kilobases, which suggests that events of DNA recombination such as crossing-overs must occur very frequently over the region carrying this gene. As discussed in section IV, the tightness of the region of reduced polymorphism may actually be related to the fact that a sizeable proportion of the Pitx1 mutations have a completely recessive

phenotype, which would increase the delay with which the genomic regions carrying the mutation would become fixed, and thus provide plenty of opportunities for crossing-overs to occur in the close vicinity of that region.

Altogether, the picture that shapes itself regarding speciation in sticklebacks adapted to lake environments is one where either hidden recessive phenotypes, or relatively probable inactivating mutations initially result in recessive advantageous phenotypes, promoting successive steps of saeptation from the ancestral marine fish. Subsequently, once separate groups have been formed, reinforcement based on sexual preferences will then follow, driven either by the ancestral stock or by the other morph, based on a variety of phenotypes, among which size and colour are particularly prominent.

So far, in this section, we have only considered fish species that are naturally structured and/or have been recognised as prone to undergo speciation (both factors actually going hand in hand if we accept the proposed model). In the oceans there are, however, many other types of fish populations that are extremely numerous, and hence probably much more prone to panmictic reproductive strategies. Those that spring to mind are, for example, mackerels, sardines, anchovies or cods, and for all of those, great fluctuations of effectives have been witnessed over the years, with recovery rates that often prove difficult to predict. This is particularly true for the cod populations, which are proving very slow to recover from the overfishing that has taken place over the past decades. In line with the model proposed in this essay, I contend that, for fish populations that are sufficiently numerous to adopt a panmictic strategy, the variations in numbers, and in particular their episodic slow recovery after population shrinkage, could partly be due to reduced fertility caused by high mutation loads in the context of increased inbreeding coefficients caused by population shrinkage.

To conclude about fish, the currently available data suggest that, in species that tend to have a certain structure imposed by the niche they occupy and/or their breeding habits, mechanisms exist that would ensure a balance between inbreeding and outbreeding by favouring mating between individuals of relative relatedness. When circumstances change, however, such as when cichlids or sticklebacks find themselves in the more stable and secluded environment of a lake rather than in streams or the ocean, this will tilt the balance towards inbreeding, and favour speciation.

Birds

For birds, the capacity to take to the air potentially opens an almost limitless capacity for dissemination. Many bird species are, however, rather sedentary, with a strong tendency for territoriality. And for those that are migratory, similarly to fish, there is a very strong

tendency to return to the very place of their birth when they reach sexual maturity.

Contrarily to fish, however, there is no clear sign that the MHC plays a strong role in regulating the relatedness of mating partners, probably because the sense of smell is less developed in birds than in fish. Rather, visual and auditory clues are used extensively in the establishment of the usually monogamous breeding pairs. Remarkably, rather than being innate, sexual preferences of birds are actually mostly cultural, i.e. mainly acquired via a mechanism called imprinting, which takes place during the first few weeks of life. One must, however, underline that there must also be some level of innate capacity of certain birds to recognise kin. Otherwise, how would the cuckoo ever recognise it's mate? During the imprinting period, birds learn to identify various characters such as the song of their parents, as well as the size, shape and colours of their parents' or siblings' anatomical features such as beaks or plumage. Imprinting has been demonstrated in too many bird species to cite them all here, with varying degrees of importance put on song or anatomical features depending on each species. The most picturesque and best know example is certainly that of the experiments performed with geese by Konrad Lorenz where he showed that the goslings became imprinted on him (or more precisely on his gumboots) during the first few hours after their hatching. When it comes to choosing a mate, those preferences would hence promote pairing between closely related individuals. Working with Japanese quails, Bateson actually demonstrated that cousins were the preferred partners, i.e. individuals that differed a little bit from the parental picture, but not too much [73]. Based on his observations, Bateson proposed the notion of 'optimal outbreeding'[54], which could not possibly be more in line with the ideas put forward in this essay.

Since one could not possibly evoke the subject of speciation in birds without mentioning the most emblematic case of Darwin's finches, I will briefly discuss those as a final example. Those famous finches were collected by Darwin (or more precisely shot and preserved by his servant, Syms Covington) on the Galapagos islands during the second voyage of the Beagle, and only identified later by the ornithologist John Gould as a new group of twelve separate species of finches which seemed most related to ground finches found on the south American continent. Today, Darwin's finches are classified into fourteen different species that have different distributions on the different islands of the archipelago, and for which the most telling anatomical difference lies in the size and shape of the beaks, which are variously adapted to feed on different nutriments (different size of seeds, different parts of cactuses, or various other sources such as insects or larvae). Molecular characterisation of those different species has led to the conclusion that all those species derive from a common ancestral stock which probably comprised at least 30 founders (C&O, p 403). There is clear reproductive isolation between the various species, with imprinting documented to occur both on songs and on beak shape (incidentally, the shape of the beak has by itself a strong influence on the song). The main factors that control the shape of the beak have actually been indentified as bmp4 (depth and width) [74] and Calmodulin (length) [75]. Both factors act independently from one another, and in a dose-dependent manner. The various beak phenotypes are thus expected to behave as co-dominant traits (or rather co-recessive, since hybrids would thus express intermediate, less suitable phenotypes).

Since some hybridisation (of the order of a few %) between certain species can still occur [76], a dogmatic evolutionist could argue that those populations thus do not represent true species. For the purpose of the ideas developed in this essay, Darwin's finches simply provide a very telling example of a population of individuals founded by a very limited effective. In the restrained context of those small islands, inbreeding coefficient were thus necessarily increased, and, given the natural propensity of birds to prefer mating with close kin, and the co-recessive nature of the traits selected, this situation has led to one of the most impressive examples of adaptive radiation documented to date.

Mammals:

Contrarily to fish and birds, most mammals are restricted in their dispersion (the technical term for this is limited vagility), and most populations of mammals are thus naturally fragmented, and this is particularly true for those that live in relatively small groups, such as horses or certain primates, or are active colonisers, such as murine rodents (rats and mice)[14]. When the natural tendency of a species is for a small number of individuals to find themselves repeatedly isolated into separate colonies, thus imposing high inbreeding coefficients, it is expected that the natural instincts should evolve to compensate for this, and thus favour outbreeding whenever possible rather than further inbreeding.

Such behaviours have indeed been documented in many mammalian species, and in particular in the house mouse, *Mus Musculus domesticus*. For many years, experimental evidence has been accumulated showing that there was indeed inbreeding avoidance between mice from different inbred strains, and documented that the MHC was playing a pivotal role in this phenomenon. More recently, however, the group of Jane Hurst used wild mice rather than inbred strains to document the mating behaviours of mice, and identified that major

---

[14] The fact that it has been possible to generate consanguineous lines of rats and mice has proven extremely useful for scientific research. For other species such as rabbits, hamsters or guinea pigs, this has, however proven much more difficult. I contend that this could in part be explained by the natural tendency of muridaes to colonise new environments, which must have kept their mutation loads very low, and also shaped their genomes to cope with repeated episodes of extreme inbreeding.

urinary proteins (MUPs) had a much more potent influence on kin recognition, and inbreeding avoidance, than did the MHC [77]. The discrepancy between those results and those obtained previously by other groups finds an explanation with the fact that the process of deriving inbred mice has yielded strains with very limited inter-strain variability of the MUPs [78]. Furthermore, in an extremely recent paper, the group of Jane Hurst actually characterises Darcin, an invariant urinary protein found in the urine of male mice, which behaves as a pheromone by inducing contact-dependent imprinting of females to prefer the males harbouring the other smells found in that urine [79].The observation that diverse MUP complexes undergo parallel evolution in different species suggests that polymorphic MUPs, as well as other polymorphic factors [80], may play an important role in regulating the mating behaviour in many species [81], which may call for revisiting some of the results obtained regarding the pivotal role of the MHC in regulating the degree of inbreeding between individuals in vertebrate species, including fish.

The precise mechanism(s) driving inbreeding avoidance is, however, of little relevance to the ideas discussed here. Rather, we can find multiple arguments that provide strong support for the ideas proposed here in the study published by Bush et al. more than 30 years ago [82].

Firstly, they underline that the effective size of mammal populations (which is inversely correlated to the average inbreeding coefficient) appears to be inversely correlated to the rate of speciation: Whilst speciation is very rapid in horses and primates, which have very structured populations, it is much slower in marsupials and carnivores, which have much more diffusive breeding strategies, and slowest in bats and whales, probably because of their high vagility. The various altruistic behaviours frequently witnessed in certain colonies of bats is, however, often viewed as being due to high levels of relatedness between the individuals comprising those colonies. One could thus envisage that the longevity of bat species may relate to the stability of the equilibrium between outbreeding (due to their high vagility) and inbreeding (due to the structure of their colonies, promoted by the importance of cooperative behaviours for their survival [83]).

Second, the rate of speciation is also shown to be strongly correlated to the rate of chromosomal evolution, and horses, primates and rodents are indeed genera where many instances of chromosomal rearrangements have been documented between closely related species, which can sometimes produce hybrids that are either infertile (as for the equine species) or of limited fertility, as for the chromosomal species of alpine mice [84, 85].

Third, the authors also underline that the organisation of populations into clan or harems, where a single dominant male sires most of the females is another mechanism which reduces the effective size of populations, and thus increases the average inbreeding coefficient. There are a few notable exceptions where it is actually the female that gives rise to most of the

offspring of a colony. One of them is the African wild dog, which lives in pack of 20 to 40 animals, and inbreeding avoidance is obtained by males and non-reproducing females emigrating away from the population. Another one is the eusocial naked mole rat, which is found in east Africa and is actually more closely related to porcupines than to rats. Those live exclusively underground, in colonies of 50-100 individuals where all the offspring descends from one single 'queen'. Although inbreeding coefficients have been found to be extremely high in those animals, this must be a consequence of their lifestyle rather than by choice since outbreeding was found to be preferred when available [86].

Inbreeding is, however, not avoided to the same degree in all mammal species, and there are also numerous examples of kin preference in mammals, which are often the result of imprinting, in other words a cultural rather than a genetic heritage. On the whole, one finds that mammals in which inbreeding avoidance is the most prominent are those for which their natural lifestyle would most often provoke the isolation of small groups. Yet, they should presumably be those carrying the smallest mutation loads. Hence, they should be the ones for which inbreeding is the less costly. For mammals as for fish and birds, the overall picture therefore seems to match a model of balance between inbreeding and outbreeding, in line with Bateson's optimal outbreeding model [54] rather than outright and systematic inbreeding avoidance. One study carried out in wild American Pikas (which are related to rabbits and hares) actually found that, much like Bateson's Japanese quails, the preferred partners were those of intermediate relatedness [87].

Insects

With more than one million species identified, the class of the insects is, by far, the most numerous one of the whole kingdom of eukaryotic life, and basically comprises half of the metazoan species recorded to date. Insects are thus clearly very prone to speciation. Although insect populations are often very large, they are also very frequently fragmented into very restricted and diverse niches, which often exist only transitorily, and which must thus be repeatedly colonised by a handful of individuals. To my knowledge, no behavioural inbreeding avoidance has ever been described in insects, and it is only very recently that some level of outbreeding preference has been reported, in polyandrous female field crickets, via a process of preferential sperm-storage [88], and this despite similar success of mating with sibs or non-sibs [89]. Conversely, numerous instances have been documented whereby insects show kin preference, based on a whole range of processes which include preferred mating protocols, acoustic and visuals clues and pheromone detection. Repeated episodes of colonisation, and the absence of inbreeding avoidance must contribute to keeping the mutation loads down, and thus promote the phenomenon of speciation in

insects. As developed in addendum 2, the haplodiploid mode of reproduction of insects such as the hymenoptera (ants, bees, wasps …) corresponds to a very effective way of eliminating recessive mutations, and it is quite remarkable that the hymenoptera represent more than 30% of all insect species. Another factor which may contribute significantly to the tendency of insects to undergo speciation is that the selective pressures due to predation are particularly significant for insects, and traits that can reduce detection by predators are quite often recessive.

Among all insects, Drosophila has proven a particularly useful tool for many aspects of biology, and particularly for genetics and the study of speciation. So much data has been published on speciation in Drosophila that it would be unrealistic to attempt to summarise it here (there are more than 50 sections discussing Drosophila in the book *Speciation* by Coyne and Orr (2004), many of them several pages long). I will therefore restrict myself to outlining a few points that seem to be most relevant to the ideas developed in this essay.

Regarding genetic loads in fragmented populations, as early as 1964, Dobzhansky was underlining the observations made by several groups that "*the heaviest genetic loads are found in common and ecologically most versatile species of Drosophila, and the lightest ones in rare and specialized species and in marginal colonies of common ones*" [90].

Reproductive isolation between different species of Drosophila relies mainly on two mechanisms: choosiness of females for the males of their own species, and hybrid sterility.

- When crossings occur between different species, mating preferences almost systematically disappear in F1 females (C&O, chapter 6), which testifies for the recessive nature of those phenotypes. If we follow the type of reasoning developed in the previous pages, this would suggest that such characters leading to behavioural isolation must have arisen in the context of saeptation, which could have been either primary, or secondary to the constitution of two populations. The repeated observation that stronger assortative mating is found between populations of flies that are in close contact in the wild (C&O, p 357-365) brings very strong support to the idea that reproductive isolation is a phenotype that is selected for, and not just the result of drift between populations that are not in contact with one another.

- Regarding hybrid sterility, it follows Haldane's rule since it is almost always the males that are sterile. A large body of evidence from various studies suggests that this sterility is often asymmetric (ie concerns the males obtained through only one of the two types of crossings), and results from the accumulation of multiple small effects mapping to various genes rather than to the large effect of major genes (see C&O, p299-319). This is in complete agreement with the scenarios proposed in section III and sketched in figure 2, whereby

reproductive isolation arises as a succession of small steps, each selected for under the threat of another population : either the ancestral population expressing a dominant but deleterious trait, or a newly arisen group which threatens the ancestral population by progressively taking over the niche.

- Multiple studies, of which many come from the group of Mohamed Noor, underline the implication of chromosomal rearrangements in the reproductive isolation seen between closely related species of drosophila. When they have been mapped, the genes for female preference and hybrid male sterility were found to be associated with chromosomal rearrangements [38, 91], and furthermore, such rearrangements are much more prominent between sympatric species than between allopatric ones ([38] C&0, p309). The explanation most commonly offered for these observations, in line with the Dobzhanski-Muller model, is that the chromosomal rearrangements prevent recombinations between multiple genes having co-evolved. As proposed in section II 5c, if reproductive isolation evolves as a response to the threat of hybridisation with a neighbouring distinct population, chromosomal rearrangements could also have two additional effects contributing to the isolating phenotypes: first induce some level of infertility in hybrids, and second be endowed with an intrinsic phenotype, either by the inactivation of a gene leading to an advantageous recessive phenotype, or by modifying the genomic context of the genes surrounding the rearrangement.

Altogether, the masses of data accumulated with various species of drosophila seem to be in perfect agreement with the model proposed, whereby the flies' lifestyle, which involves repeated colonising of isolated habitats by a few individuals, results in very fragmented populations, with high inbreeding coefficients and consequently low mutation loads. This must increase the probability of both the appearance of advantageous recessive phenotypes, and fixation of chromosomal rearrangements. Whilst the resulting groups would not initially be strongly infertile with the ancestral population, hybridisation will be detrimental to the fitness of the offspring, which would promote reinforcement mostly in the more threatened, less numerous newly arisen group, thus explaining the asymmetry of the isolation phenotypes often observed between drosophila populations.

Another fly species which is an old favourite for the study of speciation is the maggot fly, *Rhagoletis pomonella*, which one finds in North America and which adapted very rapidly from its native hawthorn host to cultivated apples after those were introduced in north America in the 1800's, and the first report of this speciation can be traced back to Walsh in 1867, less than 70 years after apples were introduced, and very soon after Darwin's publication of The Origin. Although some gene flow can still occur, there is very significant reproductive isolation between the two species, based on

a combination of factors which include the fact that larvae have different timings for their emergence from their diapause (i.e. the larval life), leading to adults having reduced overlapping periods for hybridisation, and also that Rhagoletis mate on or near the fruit of their host plant. The data on Rhagoletis fits the proposed model very well: Firstly, preferential responses to specific fruit odours are recessive since they have been shown to disappear in F1 hybrids [92]. Second, multiple loci related to diapause have actually been mapped to regions of chromosomal rearrangements which have been shown to have introgressed from an isolated population of Mexican Rhagoletis. The overall picture is thus one where recessive odour-based fruit preference would drive saeptation, and chromosomal rearrangements associated to different diapause phenotypes would reinforce the isolation both by favouring intra-group synchrony, and presumably also by reducing inter-group fertility.

Chromosomal rearrangements are found in closely related species, or sub-species in many other types of insects, and the best documented example is probably in the Australian wingless grasshoppers, which were studied by White, and which led him to propose the model of stasipatric speciation [93](C&O, p16), and more recently that of chains of chromosomal changes [94], whereby sequential chromosomal rearrangements progressively reinforce the genetic isolation of a population from the ancestral one, in conjunction with other mechanisms of reinforcement such as hybrid sterility [93].

If we now turn to butterflies, we can find two examples that underline the correlation between the recessivity of phenotypes and the phenomenon of speciation. The first example is that of the peppered moth, *Biston betularia*, which was first reported by J.W. Tutt in 1896, and has since become an emblematic example of adaptive evolution. Originally, the populations of those moths were light colored (peppered), which provided very good camouflage against the barks of trees. During the industrial revolution, however, many lichen died, and the average color of tree trunks turned much darker because of soot deposits. This made the light colored peppered moths much more conspicuous for their bird predators, and led to the selection of a darker phenotype, the black-bodied moth, which initially represented less than 2 % of individuals, but raised to around 95% over the five decades between the middle and the end of the 19th century. With the color of tree trunks progressively returning to a more natural light color, the frequency of dark moths has since been decreasing slowly. The rapidity of the initial selection process is explained by the fact that the darker phenotype is due to a dominant mutation. In fitting with the model, this did not, however, lead to any detectable process of reproductive isolation.

Conversely, in another butterfly, a recent report describes that a recessive phenotype is associated with the type of mating preference expected to correspond to

the early steps of speciation [95]. In western Ecuador, one finds *Heliconius cydno alithea*, which is a mimetic butterfly which follows the models of other Heliconius butterflies, *H. sapho* (white) and *H. eleuchia* (yellow). Those two latter species produce toxic chemicals that protect them against predation. Within the population of *H. cydno alithea*, depending on the region, one finds white and yellow butterflies in various proportions, which correlate with the relative abundance of the respective white and yellow models in that same region. Whilst white and yellow *H. cydno alithea* are not reproductively isolated, Chamberlain and colleagues found that the yellow males showed a marked preference for yellow females, whilst white males were indiscriminate. Crosses between yellow and white butterflies also revealed that white is the dominant phenotype. Remarkably, male preference was found to segregate with the K locus coding for wing colour, which may be explained by the fact that the same pigments dictating wing colour are also used as filtering pigments in insect eyes.

Thus, in butterflies as in cichlids, selection of advantageous recessive colour patterns can lead to some degree of reproductive isolation, whilst dominant ones do not.

Flowering Plants

With close to 300.000 species recorded, flowering plants compete with arthropods for the second place for the phylum with the most species [47, 96]. Among those, the rate of speciation appears to be particularly prominent in plants capable of self-fertilisation. This is in part related to the phenomenon of speciation by polyploidy, which is actually relatively rare, and occurs over just one or very few generations, and is thus not really relevant to the mechanisms we are trying to dissect in this essay (see C&O, chapter 9). As first proposed by Baker in 1953, the higher number of species among selfing plants is often interpreted as related to their higher capacity to colonise new environments (see[97]), and this does indeed fit the para- and/or allopatric scenarios proposed in section III.

An additional factor may, however, be that the capacity to self fertilise, which is the ultimate form of inbreeding, would be very effective at reducing the mutation load, which would, in turn, favour speciation. In a more recent report Heilbuth concluded that it was not so much the capacity to self-fertilise that increased speciation, but dioecy (i.e. the complete separation of the population between males and females) that was associated with lower number of species [98], which is in complete agreement with the observation that dioecious plants only comprise 6% of all flowering plants, among which one finds Holy, Willow, Ash, Juniper and Gingko biloba (one of the longest lived species know to date, C&O, p425). To reach this conclusion, Heilbuth compared multiple plant families for species richness among three types of plants : those capable of selfing, those where selfing could be possible but is prevented via various self-incompatibility mechanisms, and dioecious plants,

and found comparatively low numbers of species only in the latter. This puzzling observation can, however, find explanations in the light of the model proposed here. Indeed, the prediction from the model is that, under conditions of excessive inbreeding, populations will undergo very frequent speciation, but the durability of these species will, consequently, be much reduced because most new species will tend to eliminate their immediate ancestor. The incapacity to self fertilise may thus reduce the rate of speciation, but would increase the lifetime of the species, with a net result of equivalent numbers of species. Furthermore, the diversity of mechanisms used for self-incompatibility in various plant species suggests that those have been repeatedly and independently selected for, probably because they represented a selective advantage in populations that had an excessive tendency to undergo rampant speciation.

In addition to underlining the correlation between the selfing capacity of plants and their propensity to colonise remote grounds, Baker was also among the first to propose that sex could have evolved as a mean to reduce inbreeding [99]. Multiple arguments exist to suggest that dioecy is a much more efficient guard against inbreeding than mechanisms of self incompatibility such as gametophyte incompatibility (see [98]), and switches between dieocious and selfing modes of reproduction must also be much less likely than between self-incompatible and -compatible ones, such as recently described for the annual plant Capsella [100]. Given this, it is thus not surprising that dioecious species should be guarded against inbreeding via higher mutations loads, and thus have a much lower tendency towards speciation, and thus be much less numerous than those with complete or partial hermaphrodism. One should not, however, make the mistake of equating speciation with adaptive evolution. Evolution is related to the acquisition of new characters, which is much favoured by the exchange of genetic material among numerous individuals in large and long established populations. Speciation, according to our model, is mainly due to the loss of some undesirable trait(s), which can only occur via inbreeding between a necessarily restricted number of individuals, which will almost always result in some loss of diversity, and thus reduce further adaptability.

To conclude on plants, we will turn towards a couple of examples of plants which are common favourites of speciation specialists.

The first case is that of two closely related species of monkeyflowers, *Mimulus lewisii* and *cardinalis*. Those are found in the hills and mountains of California, with the pink M. lewisii occupying higher altitudes, and the bright red M. cardinalis occupying the valleys. Although the ranges of the two species overlap between 1500 and 2000 meters, and despite the fact that they are capable of producing viable and fertile offspring in the greenhouse, hybrids are almost never found in the wild, which is highly related to the fact that the red *M. cardinalis* is pollinated mostly by hummingbirds, whilst the paler *M. lewisii* is pollinated almost exclusively by bumble bees.

Phylogenetic comparisons have established that the ancestral phenotype was the paler colour of *M. lewisii*, and the bright colour of *M. cardinalis* is actually a recessive phenotype due to a mutation in the YUP gene, which prevents carotenoid deposition in the petals [101]. By deriving near-isogenic lines of *Mimulus* for various characters, Bradshaw and Schemske managed to demonstrate that, although the two species have diverged by many other detectable traits that segregated diversely, the preference of either hummingbirds or bumblebees was primarily controlled by this single locus. Hence, we have here an example where a recessive mutation has led to what I consider a clear case of parapatric speciation by provoking a switch to a different pollinator, which presumably allowed *M. cardinalis* to colonise the lower ranges and valleys where hummingbirds are found.

The last plant example I have chosen to discuss is that of oaks (*Quercus*), for their extraordinary capacity to resist speciation, since complete reproductive isolation still has not been reached between many of the approximately 400 'species' of oaks recorded to date. Those correspond to very different types which are distributed over very spread and diverse habitats of the northern hemisphere, but many of those 'species', and particularly the group of white oaks which are most prominent in north America, can still intercross and yield perfectly fit offspring, with clear signs of hybridisation and gene flow having been documented in wild populations [102-104]. Whilst these observations have led to numerous and lengthy debates on the appropriateness of such or such definition of species, and left evolution biologists puzzled for many years, the very limited tendency of oaks to undergo speciation may also find an explanation in the model proposed here. Firstly, although oaks are monoecious, gametophytic self-incompatibilty has been found in many types of oaks. Second, oaks have a very significant capacity to spread both via pollen and via acorns that can be transported over rather short distances by animals such as squirrels, but also over much longer distances by floating down streams, or conceivably even across sea waters (Darwin spends several pages of The Origin discussing the resistance of various seeds to seawater). This capacity to diffuse must greatly favour hybridisation, and thus the spread of dominant advantageous traits. At the same time, oaks have a clear tendency to congregate in forests that are comprised mostly of oaks, and this must surely provide the grounds for a certain degree of inbreeding, which must result in the mutation load remaining reasonably low. Another factor that must favour the selection of very vigorous hybrids lies with the number of acorns that an oak produces. Indeed, during its very long lifetime, a single oak produces hundreds of thousands of acorns, which will give several thousands of seedlings, and maybe a few dozen young trees, but of which only a handful (two, statistically) will go on to produce progeny themselves. This tremendous level of selective pressure probably contributes significantly to preventing the survival of those suffering from any

significant degree of inbreeding depression. Altogether, I would surmise that the situation of oaks probably hovers near the equilibrium between the yin of inbreeding and the yang of outbreeding, with a mutation load sufficiently low to prevent degeneration, but sufficient outcrossing to share dominant advantageous phenotypes, and at the same time maintaining a mutation load sufficiently high to prevent the degree of close inbreeding that promotes the successive steps of saeptation leading to speciation.

White Sand lizards: an experiment in progress:

In the first paragraphs of this section, I underlined why it was so difficult to carry out experiments related to speciation. The example I have chosen to conclude this section is one where nature may actually have provided us with such an experiment, including the indispensible internal control. In White Sands, New Mexico, USA, dunes of white gypsum formed less than 6000 years ago. In those dunes, one finds several types of lizards harbouring very light colours, which are each descended from their darker relatives found in the nearby Chihuahuan desert. Amazingly, in three separate species, the group of Erica Rosenblum has recently mapped the cause of this albinism to different mutations of the very same gene : the melanocortin-1 receptor (which is, incidentally, also associated to red hair in human). Even more remarkably, in one species, the mutation is dominant, whereas it is recessive in another one. Although the mating preferences between white and brown lizards have not yet been documented for those two species, those experiments are being scheduled (E. Rosenblum, personal communication). The prediction from the model is that, if there is asymmetry in the mating preferences, those should be stronger in the morphs with the recessive form (white or brown), and most prominent in Aspidoscelis inormata, for whom the white phenotype is recessive, and the threat of breeding with the more numerous ancestral stock of brown lizards thus much more significant.

VI) And what about *Homo sapiens* ?

"Dans un oeuf, y'a du blanc et du jaune. Eh bien quand on mélange, il n'y a que du jaune". Coluche, Les Vacances (1979)

In the paragraph discussing mammals, I purposefully avoided the difficult subject of the situation of the human race. As we will see in the following paragraphs, there are many aspects whereby what we know of past and current structures of human populations, as well as human instincts appears to fit the model, if only too well for comfort. Indeed, the subjects of our mutation loads and of our species preservation give rise to such grave questions, especially with the spectres of eugenics and Nazism still looming in our not so distant past, that I felt it was best to discuss the data and the situation of *Homo Sapiens* separately.

Today, the human population comprises well over 6 billion people, and this number is predicted to reach 9 billion in about forty years, despite serious uncertainties about the capacity of our planet to sustainably feed that many people. Although it is universally admitted that we all belong to the same species, humans are split into many ethnies and races. If one looks at the situation in places where those ethnies come into close contact with one another, such as in big cities, one does, however, witness a very significant level of intra-racial preferential pairing. Furthermore, offspring of interracial couples, whilst benefitting from high physical fitness, often suffer from reduced social fitness because they find themselves struggling to integrate into either of the groups that their parents came from. In this sense, to highlight once again the difficulty of defining species, if one adopted the same criteria as are often applied to animal or plant species in the wild, one could conclude that speciation has already started occurring in humans. In support of this rather provocative stance, the most distinctive phenotypes to distinguish between ethnies are the colours of skin, hair and eyes, which have progressively gone from dark in our African ancestors to the very pale skin, blond hair and blue eyes seen in Northern European populations. And it is completely fitting with the model that secondary mechanisms of isolation such as xenophobia or racism, should often be asymmetrical, and strongest on the side that expresses the recessive traits. For example, we know that all the "arian" traits that were the basis of the selection criteria of the Nazi doctrine do not actually correspond to real improvements by a gain of a new function, but all correspond to mutations causing losses of function in various pigment genes, which are all either recessive, or co-recessive. Another even darker aspect of the human practices matches certain points discussed in section IV: War is very similar to a sympatric struggle, i.e. a conflict for the occupation of the niche between separate populations. In times of conflict, sexual violence and systematic rape have been used for centuries as a weapon of war (see http://www.unicef.org/sowc96pk/sexviol.htm). Indeed, in the context of a sympatric struggle, the practice of systematic rape is a very effective strategy to neutralise the reproductive force of the opposing population, and imposes a burden that can last for many years by producing children that are often rejected by both camps. Thankfully, since 1998, the United Nations as decided to consider this abominable practice as genocide, and as a crime against humanity.

The recent discovery of a few percents of Neanderthal sequences in the genome of Eurasian populations and not in those of sub-Saharan African descent [105] is also in perfect agreement with this type of scenario: the ancestral population of Homo sapiens, having formed in Africa, came in prolonged contact with Neanderthal populations when it started colonising more northern latitudes, and the two most probably competed for territory occupation. Under such conditions, it would not be surprising if Haldane's rule applied between Homo sapiens and Neanderthal, with interspecies mating

28/09/10   36

resulting in hybrid progeny comprised of sterile males and fertile females, for whom further mating with Homo sapiens males would be the most effective way to produce offspring. Over successive generations, genomic DNA from those females would thus have entered the gene pool of the Homo sapiens population during its out of Africa colonising migration , which could actually have proven to be a very effective strategy to acquire sets of genes that were better adapted to the colder and greener territories being colonised, and which the Neanderthal populations had inhabited, and thus adapted to for hundreds of thousands of years.

To date, despite this hybridisation with Neanderthal, and despite the fractionation of Homo sapiens into separate races for tens of centuries, Homo sapiens is still clearly a single species because no population has been described that would be less fertile with another, or that would differ in its overall genetic constitution, for example a fixated chromosomal rearrangement.

Regarding the occurrence of inbreeding in humans, there has been a considerable evolution over the past few decades. For many centuries, the structures of human populations were probably quite similar to those seen in great apes today, being split into groups of a few dozens, with some individuals, most often females, passing from one group to another. Over the centuries, the advent of civilisation resulted in the progressive increase in the size of those groups, driven by a whole range of reasons, among which the most significant were probably i) the conflicts with adjacent groups (with the smaller groups being eliminated) ii) the advent of agriculture, which imposed sedentarity and allowed the sustenance of denser populations iii) the specialisation of individuals into classes of farmers, craftsmen, soldiers, carers … resulting in an increase in the groups' critical mass, i.e. the number of people necessary for having sufficient numbers of the various kinds in each group.

Until the middle ages, the size of most human communities remained small, and average inbreeding coefficients in human populations must thus have been quite significant. In this regard, the recent sequencing of the genome from the hair of a 4000 year old Eskimo gave results consistent with an inbreeding coefficient of 0,06 [106], equivalent to that of the offspring of parents with 0.12 of consanguinity corresponding to the degree shared by first cousins.

Later on, recognising the existence of infectious microbes, leading to the concept of hygiene, did considerably favour the increase in size of cities by decreasing the incidence of epidemics (when visiting the tower of London a few years ago, I learnt from the guide that, if London was the largest city in the world for many years, it was thought to be related to the English's love of tea. Indeed, boiling the water greatly reduced the spreading of water-born pathogens such a typhus, dysentery or cholera). The concept of aseptia also greatly reduced the numbers of deaths during childbirth. Later on, progress in medicine such as vaccination, antibiotics, surgery would increase the survival of individuals,

resulting in further swelling of the populations and of the sizes of towns and cities.

Today, nearly 50% of the world population lives in major town and cities [107]. For western populations, one can thus consider that the situation has become progressively panmictic in just a few generations, as testified by the study of regions of extended homozygosity in samples of the North American population, which found that average inbreeding coefficients were above 1% in people born in 1900, but nearing zero in those born around 2000 [108]. These changes in population structures are widely perceived as beneficial because they should result in reduced incidence in the occurrence of rare genetic diseases due to recessive mutations [107, 109]. But, as has been discussed at length in this essay, this could to be a very short sighted perspective because it equates to, as Muller once put it, "eating all of our cake today" by allowing the recessive mutation load to increase progressively to higher levels, until the rate of elimination by genetic defects once again balances the rate of their accumulation [13].

Incest, the union of individuals related in direct line, and thus sharing at least 0.25 of their genome, is avoided and condemned as taboo in virtually all societies, and this situation probably evolved to counter our natural instincts attracting us to our closest kin, of which the famous Oedipus complex is probably the most striking example. Historically, consanguineous unions have been particularly prominent in rural populations as well as in the upper classes (for example among Egyptians pharaohs or European royalty and aristocracy), whilst stern avoidance of consanguinity is mostly a trait typical of more urban middle classes. Today, the attitudes of various societies and cultures towards consanguinity diverge greatly. Indeed, although first cousin marriage are widely perceived as undesirable in the most developed nations, and are even illegal in 31 or the 50 states of the USA, as well as in China, this is not the case in many other parts of the world such as the middle east or Asia, where weddings between uncles and nieces (degree of consanguinity F=0,25, resulting in offspring with an inbreeding coefficient I=0.125) or between first cousins (F=0.125, I=0.06) are common, and even sometimes actively encouraged [109, 110]. Today, despite the phenomenal increase of the proportion of the human population living in urban environments, more than 10% of the world's unions are still consanguineous, and this is sometimes transiently reinforced in the communities of recent urban immigrants [109, 110].

Although consanguineous marriages do result in a detectable cost in the fitness and viability of the offspring, this is balanced by various factors such as more stable marriages, better relationships between the members of the extended family, a stronger sense of community, enhanced female autonomy, and, importantly, the economic benefits of keeping the family land and belongings together [110]. Fifteen years ago, Bittles and Neel used a meta-analysis of 23 different

studies to compare the fate of the offspring from unions between first cousins with those from non-consanguineous parents, and estimated that first cousin marriages resulted approximately in an additional 4% of the offspring dying in the interval between 6 months gestation and ten years of age [15][111]. More recently, a study based on the complete birth records of the Icelandic population over the past 200 years not only confirmed that an evolution towards less consanguinity was also taking place in Iceland, but also showed that couples that were consanguineous at the level of third or fourth cousins produced more grandchildren than those that were either more or less related [112]. The couples that were more closely related had produced at least as many children, but a higher proportion of those had died earlier and/or never reproduced, most probably as a consequence of deleterious recessive mutations.

Today, the situation of human populations is clearly not in a state of equilibrium, but in the process of evolving rapidly. On the one hand, the populations of well developed countries combine low fertility rates with panmictic reproductive strategies that will result in significant increases in mutation loads for the future generations, as well as promoting more and more selfish behaviours. On the other hand, the world's most prolific populations are also the poorest (fertility rates are highest in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East), and in many of those, the common occurrence of consanguineous unions should maintain the mutation load to low levels, but this will presumably promote further separation between the various populations of the world in the long run. Indeed, although consanguinity rarely results in very high degrees of inbreeding in humans, I contend that it is only a question of time before a significant chromosomal rearrangement finds itself associated to an advantageous recessive mutation. If such a mutation were to become fixed in an certain portion of the population, which would then have reduced fertility with the rest of the population, the questions of one or more species within the human race would become very real, and lead to extremely serious ethical concerns.

Although circumstances such as wars, water rises due to global warming and food shortages due to overpopulation represent much more pressing threats today than those based on genetic events, the same may not be true for the evolution of the balance between various populations over the next coming decades. Given

the differences in fertility rates between the wealthy and poor populations, even if the progress of molecular biology will probably be able to help control genetic loads by pre-natal screening, one does not need to be called Thomas Malthus to see that the situation does indeed look poised for a progressive replacement of the populations descended from those living today in more developed countries by those coming from less developed countries. This may be even amplified further by the well know fact that, when the standards of living first increase in poor populations, this causes the fertility rates first to increase even more for one or two generations, before decreasing dramatically.

The challenge for future generations will be to find a model of society which, at the same time would provide sufficient levels of quality of life to all human beings to curb their fertility, so that economies can be built on sustainable resources, and also promote the right balance between inbreeding and outbreeding: i) enough consanguinity to maintain mutation loads in check, and to nurture the perpetuation of traditions and cultures, as well as cooperative behaviours iii) enough outbreeding to allow the shuffling of races, ideas and cultures. Indeed, for ideas and for genes alike, exchanging and mixing is the most effective way to promote the new encounters, the new combinations that result in truly significant innovations and progress, i.e. true evolution. It is, at the same time, also the best way to prevent the phenomenon of speciation. For, even if it results in the awesome natural diversity that surrounds us today, I contend that the phenomenon of speciation first and foremost corresponds to a loss in opportunities for exchange of genetics materials between organisms, which is a direct consequence of the fact that, most of the time, it is initiated by the loss of a pre-existing function rather than by the gain of a new one.

Concluding remarks:

The ideas developed in this essay are mostly based on rather basic, not to say simplistic, concepts. One of the reasons that kept me from writing up those ideas for several years was the reasoning that, if this model was even partially correct, then one of the many geneticists that have pondered about speciation for the past 150 years should have developed similar ideas before me. Today, I contend that, if similar ideas have not been developed before, it is mostly because speciation has been considered as a phenomenon that should be explained by population genetics. Most of the grounds for population genetics were, however, laid during the first half of the twentieth century, initially by Fisher, Haldane, and Wright with highly mathematical papers, and later by others such as Dobzhansky, Mayr and Muller, to reach the global concept of what is known as "The modern synthesis". All this groundwork by very intelligent and gifted people took place before the structure of DNA, the genetic code, the digital nature of genetic information and the structure of genes were

---

[15] Based on the figure of an increase of 4% in the incidence of deaths between 6 months of gestation and 10 years of age in the offspring of first cousins, Beetles & Neel concluded that the average mutation load must be 0.7 lethal equivalent per gamete, and hence 1.4 per zygote. Considering that a large proportion of recessive mutations would probably provoke undetected early abortions, we can presume that the average total load in recessive deleterious mutations was at least twice that figure, and quite possibly somewhere between 5 and 10.

discovered, which all happened after WW2. But because they did not have access to this molecular knowledge, pre-war geneticists, and Muller in particular [13], considered all mutations as essentially dominant in their calculations. We now know that dominant mutations are usually due to a gain of function, recessive ones to a loss of function, and co-dominant ones to either a change of function or to the effect of gene dosage. And we now also know that most recessive mutations are indeed truly recessive : having just one functional copy of a particular gene is usually sufficient, and heterozygotes with one wild type and one mutated copy of a particular gene have absolutely no detectable phenotype, and a perfect capacity to reproduce (contrarily to the pre-war assumption of an average effect of 2-5% effect on fitness [13, 113]). As long as one does not recognise that many mutations are truly recessive, one simply cannot venture towards the idea that deleterious ones are driving the absolute requirement for inbreeding, and advantageous ones the initial steps of speciation.

Another factor that could have contributed to certain geneticists not following the paths I followed in these pages may have been related to the darkness, the political 'incorrectness' of the conclusions that these paths lead to regarding our future, and particularly that of our westernised populations. As Winston Churchill said: *Once in a while you will stumble upon the truth but most of us manage to pick ourselves up and hurry along as if nothing had happened.*

But, as a geneticist, one should not lose sight of the fact that nature, and particularly the process of natural selection, is not politically correct. Indeed, when one thinks of the survival of the fittest, one often fails to consider the darker side of natural selection and that the counter-balance of the "survival of the fittest" is the "death (or disappearance) of the less fit". As considered at length by both Darwin and Wallace in their respective works, most reproducing organisms in natural populations produce many more than two offspring, and of those, most will not go on to breed and their genes will hence disappear forever. I thus contend that the concept of "mildly deleterious mutations" is a very anthropocentric concept that derives from a very well fed, wealthy, healthy and secure self centred perspective. For the vast majority of living organisms, including most human beings on this planet today, there is no such thing as mild natural selection. Under natural conditions, the struggle for existence, as outlined by Darwin himself, is a very tough one in natural populations where only one in ten, hundred or even thousand of conceived zygotes will become mature organisms that go on to produce offspring. A very recent paper looking at wild population of field crickets reported the very unexpected observation that only one in ten of sexually active adults actually yielded offspring the following year, and this was true for both males and females [114] If it were not the case, we would not see so much variation, so many new characters being selected for in the first place, and

selected against later on, and consequently so many species around us.

Addendum one : Bdelloid Rotifers: A scandal about a ratchet, or a ratchet about a presumed scandal ?

Bdelloid Rotifers, which have been dubbed an "evolutionary scandal" by John Maynard Smith, are the only known example of multi-cellular organisms for which there is absolutely no doubt that they reproduce strictly asexually. They are minuscule females (< 1mm), who can lay several dozens of parthenogenetic eggs in the course of their 40-day adult lifetime. Bdelloids are found in freshwater and the geological record tells us that they have been around for at least 35 million year. In this sense, they are clearly among the most long lived "taxonomic species" in existence (I specify taxonomic here since the biological species concept only applies to sexual organisms), and they can be found all around the world, testifying of the success of their reproductive strategy. The downside of this is, however, that they probably have extremely limited capacities for evolution, since they have apparently not yielded any more elaborate descendants over that very long period. It therefore seems fair to say that they may well be stuck in an evolutionary dead end, from which more elaborate life forms are extremely unlikely to arise. Outside of their asexual lifestyle, Bdelloids have three very special peculiarities which, I contend, are related to the need to cleanse their diploid genome from recessive mutations:

- They are only found in wet or moist habitats that are prone to successive rounds of desiccation and rehydration. This correlates with what is called anhydrobiosis, i.e. the capacity to survive complete dehydration at any stage of their life cycle.

- Individuals kept under continuous state of hydration will quite rapidly show reduced fitness compared to individuals undergoing regular cycles of dehydration, which maintain the level of fitness seen in the seeding stock [115]. A very recent study suggests that the main reason for this reduced fitness is presumably due to pathogens such as parasitic yeasts, which the bdelloids are not armed to eliminate. During the desiccation cycles, however, bdelloids will scatter randomly to other locations, where the pathogens will not have followed them, and will then be able to resume their life cycle without the pathogens, at least for a while [116].

- They are the most radiation resistant organisms known to date [117], due to an amazing capacity to repair damages to their genomic DNA, which can be explained by the fact that during the dehydration which is part of their natural life cycle, DNA will sustain multiple damages and strand breakage.

My interpretation of the observation that bdelloids are primarily founds in environments that are prone to regular desiccation rather than in permanently hydrated surroundings is that the desiccation cycles could act in place of sexual reproduction to fight off the accumulation of deleterious mutations. Indeed, after DNA has been extensively chopped up by desiccation, DNA repair will involve chromosomal pairing and gene conversion will presumably cause significant homogenisation of the DNA sequences. In addition, I envisage that Bdelloids may have very good DNA repair, but rather low faithfulness in DNA replication. Indeed, this later trait may be required to maintain some level of adaptability in those asexual organisms. The coupled processes of relatively unfaithful DNA replication, together with homogenisation triggered as a result of reiterated DNA damage occurring during desiccation, may thus be replacing sex as a mean to keep some level of adaptability in Bdelloids, whilst fighting off infectious pathogens and Muller's ratchet at the same time. This is in fact exactly equivalent to the lottery that is played by sexual reproduction with a degree of inbreeding, by keeping only those individuals that have at least one good copy of each gene, and eliminating the unlucky ones that get two copies of a bad one. In the short term, this will result in reduced numbers of individuals recovering from desiccation. But given the bdelloid's individual prolificacy, repopulating their environment after a cycle of desiccation does presumably not represent a major challenge, whilst keeping their genome functional must be one ! This is why I suggest that, in Bdelloids, the desiccation cycles would thus act in place of sexual reproduction to fight off the accumulation of deleterious recessive mutations. And other classes of animals that undergo anhydrobiosis, such as the tardigrades or the darwinulids, may also be taking advantage of desiccation for regular shearing of their DNA to ensure homogenisation of their diploid genomes.

Radiations induce damages to DNA that are very similar to those caused by desiccation. In several places on our planet, the use of nuclear power by humans has caused and still causes the natural environment to be exposed to very high levels of radiation. As a rather wild prediction, I would not be surprised if certain asexual forms of life turned out to be able to adapt to those environments, using radiations instead of the cycles of desiccation used by the bdelloids, both to provoke intermittent haploidisation of some of their genome, and to destroy any infectious pathogens.

Addendum 2 : Three particular examples of the occurrence of haploidy in eukaryotes:

How does it feel…. to be on your own ? Bob Dylan

- **Haploid stages**: Within the frame of the biological species concept, the phenomenon of speciation is only relevant to the organisms that can reproduce sexually, i.e. that can go through meiosis. Through the process of meiosis, a diploid cell will become haploid by eliminating half of its chromosomes, and later fuse with another haploid cell to restore a state of diploidy. A critical step in the process leading to meiosis is the pairing of chromosomes, during which many events of recombination occur such as crossing-overs and gene conversion, which ultimately contribute to homogenisation of sequences, and can influence the rate of occurrence of mutations via processes such as biased gene conversion [118]. Depending on the organisms, the haploid state can last for more or less time, and even implicate stages of haploid cell division. Certain classes of organisms, such as yeasts, fungi, algi, many plants and social insects, systematically pass via haploid stages during their life cycles. All these species hence go through the most thorough screen possible for eliminating recessive deleterious mutations, and would not need inbreeding to fight Muller's ratchet. Social insects (ants, bees, wasps and termites) are known as haplodiploids because the males are haploid, whilst the females are diploid. An explanation for the fact that this strategy has promoted their social behaviour is that, in species where the queen mates with only one male, such as honey bees, the female workers are more related to the offspring of their mother (75%) than to any offspring they would produce themselves if they were to mate (50%). Hence, at every generation, half of a social insect's genome goes through a haploid stage that must give rise to a fully fit and sexually active male. The fact that haplodiploid insects do not require inbreeding for the maintenance of their genome is supported by the fact that they actually have a safeguard against inbreeding: according to the complementary allele model, the sex-determining locus of social insects must be heterozygous for the generation of a female [119]. In haploid males, the locus is necessarily hemizygous. If inbreeding takes place, i.e. if the allele of the sex-determining locus carried by the male matches that of one of the two carried by the queen, half of the eggs will be homozygous at the sex-determining locus, and this will give rise to males, but they will be infertile because their offspring would be triploid.

- **Sex chromosomes**: Although not all animal species where males and females can be found have sexual chromosomes, this is by far the most common situation. In such species, including ours, the genomes of males and females differ in the chromosomal composition, with either the males being heterogametic (XY, as in mammals, or flies), or the females (ZW, as in certain insects, fish, reptiles and birds). The platypus, the only known egg-laying mammal, carries as many as 10 sex chomosomes (5X and 5Y), which share features with both the mammals and the bird sex chromosomes [120, 121]. Yet another possibility of sex chromosome arrangements is for the males to carry just one copy of the sex chomosome (XO, in certain insects like grasshoppers and roaches), or the females (ZO, in some butterflies), whilst the rest of their genomes is diploid. For all those species, the sex chromosomes they contain will be in a haploid state either all the time (Y and W chromosomes), or in half of the individuals (X in males and Z in females). For the genes carried by these chromosomes, the accumulation of recessive mutations will hence not be a particular problem. The selective pressures that they are submitted to, and the rate at which these genes evolve has, indeed, been found to differ quite significantly from the genes carried by autosomes (see [122] for recent review), and the recent comparison of the human and chimpanzee Y chromosomes has revealed an unexpectedly high level of divergence between the two, both in sequence and structure [123]. As developed in section II, the haploid character of sexual chromosomes in heterogametic individuals could be a central factor in allowing selective pressures to give rise to hybrid sterility in those heterogametic individuals whilst remaining silent in homogametic ones (Haldane's rule [40]), thereby favouring the inbreeding that will ultimately lead to speciation. Another very interesting question relates to what evolutionary forces can drive the selection of systems involving males and females having different roles in reproduction, and what advantages these various systems may have compared to one another. I plan to come back to those questions at a later date, but for the time being, I will simply limit myself to proposing that one of the reasons favouring the development of those various systems implicating sexual chromosomes may be the difference in selective pressures in males and females on the genes carried by those chromosomes (such as, for an example different from sexually related characters, the opsin genes, which lead to frequent colour blindness in men, and very seldom in women).

- **Endosymbionts**: Apart from a nuclear envelope, the second characteristic feature of most eukaryotes is that they possess mitochondria, the powerhouses of eukaryotic cells, which provide ATP via respiration. Since Lynn Margulis proposed it in the late 60's, it has been globally accepted that the ancestral aerobic eukaryote arose as a symbiotic arrangement whereby an aerobic bacteria, probably related to the rickettsia, was engulfed by the anaerobic ancestor of eukaryotes, which probably helped it to cope with the levels of oxygen which started rising 2.5 billion years ago due to the appearance of photosynthetic cyanobacteria on our planet. This engulfed aerobic bacterium was the ancestor of the mitochondria found in the cytoplasms of virtually all eukaryotes today. On at least three separate occasions, photosynthetic eukaryotes would later arise by the engulfment of cyanobacteria by early eukaryotes, giving rise respectively to the green, red and the glaucophytes'chloroplasts. One remarkable aspect regarding all these endosymbiotic organelles is that they

28/09/10   41

have been maintained as separate entities for billions of years in the cytoplasm of their hosts, where they still replicate by fission, similarly to their bacterial ancestors. And during all that time, although some of their genes have 'migrated' to their hosts' genomes, all those endosymbionts have maintained their own self-replicating circular genomes. Yet, in most species, the endosymbiotic organelles are inherited from only one parent [124]. The fact that, in yeasts, sexual reproduction results in bi-parental transmission of mitochondria argues in favour of the view that, when sex evolved in the ancestral diploid eukaryote, both parents probably contributed to the offspring's initial stocks of mitochondria. And at first glance, this may seem like a very suitable solution, since having two populations of mitochondria would effectively be equivalent to being diploid, and should hence favour adaptive evolution by promoting the occurrence of new gene combinations. The fact that bi-parental inheritance of mitochondria has almost universally evolved into uni-parental modes (mostly from the mother, but sometimes also from the father) does, however, suggest that bi-parental inheritance of mitochondria must have had more disadvantages than advantages. The first obvious problem would be that it would inevitably lead to Darwinian competition between the two stocks of bacteria, and that the host could end up paying the price of this intestinal wrestling [125]. The second problem is the one related to the subject being discussed here, i.e. the maintenance of the integrity of diploid genomes. Although the main role of mitochondria is respiration, they are also endowed with many other functions such as regulation of cell potential, calcium signalling, apoptosis, and various metabolic pathways. If the stocks of mitochondria were systematically inherited from both parents, they would effectively behave as diploids, and recessive mutations in the genomes of some of them could be tolerated because they would be complemented by the function of the others. This could not be fixed by recombination between the genomes of the mitochondria because they do no perform sexual reproduction, and hence recombine only rarely. But during mitosis of eukaryotic cells, mitochondria are passed onto daughter cells following simple passive distribution. Over several divisions, many cells will hence end up with only one type of mitochondria. This would not necessarily be very serious for a mono-cellular organism because those unlucky cells inheriting just mutated mitochondria would simply die out and make more room for the others. In certain plants, chloroplasts can be inherited from both parents. In such plants, it is possible to isolate variegated varieties, due to the fact that one of the parents carries mutant chloroplasts that can no longer make chlorophyll. The variegations correspond to areas of the plants that have, randomly, lost the chloroplasts that could make chlorophyll. Such plants are, however, not found in natural environments. For animal mitochondria, it is rather easy to picture how the inheritance of a diploid pool of mitochondria could rapidly become a significant problem rather than an advantage because, for the harmonious development of multi-cellular organisms, if they had inherited a mixed pool of mutated and un-mutated mitochondria, they would end up loosing a significant portion of their cells in certain organs where the mutated mitochondria would have randomly taken over. The final picture that delineates itself from this type of reasoning underlines the close relationship that ties sex and the need to cleanse obligatory diploid genomes off the recessive mutations that they tend to accumulate silently.

▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪

Addendum 3 : The social lifestyle of a lowly amoeba.
Dictyostelium discoideum (Dd) is an amoeba, which is found in the soil of forests, where it feeds on bacteria. On rare occasions, when Dds of different mating types find themselves growing side by side in conditions of darkness and moderate abundance of nutrients, they undergo sexual reproduction, which involves the formation of a macrocyst [126]. Most of the time, however, Dd amoebas multiply asexually, by mitosis. When food becomes scarce, these unicellular eukaryotes, that were until then growing completely independently from one another, will gather to form a microscopic slug that can then migrate towards the surface, and form a minuscule plant-like structure, with a stalk and a spore-containing head. Of the 100.000 cells that gathered at the start, around 60 to 70 % will end up as spores, with an increased chance of reaching more suitable environments. But this will be at the cost of 30 to 40 % of the initial stock having sacrificed their chances of survival to differentiate in stalk cells, or other cells types. In the lab, one can see that slugs will form by incorporating amoebae that are not necessarily related to one another, and at first glance, this would seem particularly prone to promote the evolution of selfish behaviour, whereby some individuals would avoid ever becoming stalk cells [127]. This can actually be found under experimental conditions, where the amoebae are grown in bulk, but this is not what is seen in the wild : Dictyostelium amoebae that are found in forest soils are usually all prone to forming well proportioned fruiting bodies, with the optimal proportion of cells sacrificing themselves towards the doomed stalk lineage. I contend that, if Dictyostelids have been able to evolve this social lifestyle, it is because of their capacity to sporulate and disseminate, and hence for single individuals (or at most a handful of amoebae originating from the same fruiting body) to colonise new isolated niches. The resulting populations must thus be comprised of groups of individuals that are highly related to one another, or even very often clonal. Under such conditions, selfish mutants will be doomed because, when they find themselves on their own, their incapacity to form stalk cells will condemn the fate of their offspring to staying in the same spot.

▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪▪

Addendum 4: Chromosomal translocations and saeptation

Here, I consider how chromosomal translocations could fit within the types of scenario envisaged in section II of the main text, i.e. at the very early stages of speciation. As discussed in that section, it seems very difficult to conceive that a chromosomal rearrangement could ever reach fixation within any population unless it was directly associated with an advantageous phenotype that would at least compensate the reduced fertility inherent to that rearrangement. Many types of advantages could be envisaged, but the two most likely would seem to be either increased fitness (such as strength, sexual attraction, resistance to harsh conditions) or adaptation to a new environment, and that advantageous phenotype associated to the rearrangement could have either a dominant, recessive, or co-dominant phenotype. We can thus repeat an analysis similar to that performed for recessive, dominant, or co-dominant (co-recessive) mutations, with the added dimension of the reduced fertility conferred by the rearrangement itself.

If the rearrangement results in a fully dominant increase in fitness, that trait will have a natural tendency to spread in the population despite the reduction of fertility conferred by the chromosomal rearrangement, and could thus quite possibly reach fixation without actually undergoing bona fide saeptation. If the rearrangement results in a dominant trait that drives individuals to colonise a new environment, this will, as seen earlier, automatically result in some significant degree of inbreeding in the newly adapted group, which could favour fixation of the rearrangement, and promote further saeptation by promoting the surfacing of additional adaptive, but recessive mutations.

If the phenotype is actually co-dominant (or co-recessive), with homozygous individuals being even fitter than heterozygotes, this may actually promote inbreeding to some degree, and thus a reduction of the gene flow towards the rest of the population. In addition, individuals becoming homozygous for the chromosomal rearrangement will have a further significant advantage in breeding with one another because this would eliminate the reduction of fertility due to chromosomal misassortments.

If the phenotype associated to the chromosomal rearrangement is recessive, given the inherent disadvantage of rearrangements due to reduced fertility, one would only ever expect a few heterozygotes to arise in the population since those would not benefit from the phenotype. Such mutations would therefore seem unlikely to persist in the population for many generations, and revelation of the beneficial phenotype would thus occur mostly in individuals with very high degrees of consanguinity. Furthermore, in the case of a reciprocal translocation, only one in 6 of the viable offspring from two heterozygotes would be homozygous (corresponding to one out of 16 possible zygotes, Fig. 1). This type of scenario would thus presumably result in very tight population bottlenecks. Among the few individuals becoming homozygotes, however, fixation of the rearrangement would be immediate, and breeding with the ancestral stock would result in offspring with the double disadvantage of the reduced fertility, and loss of the recessive advantageous trait.

References:

1.   van Dyke DL, Weiss L, Roberson JR, Babu VR: **The frequency and mutation rate of balanced autosomal rearrangements in man estimated from prenatal genetic studies for advanced maternal age.** *Am J Hum Genet* 1983, **35:**301-308.

2.   Dobzhansky T: **Speciation as a Stage in Evolutionary Divergence.** *The American Naturalist* 1940, **74:**312-321.

3.   Maynard Smith J: *The Evolution of Sex*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press; 1978.

4.   Fisher RA: **Average excess and average effect of a gene substitution.** *Annals of Eugenics* 1941, **11:**53-63.

5.   Dawkins R: *The selfish gene*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 1976.

6.   Bateson P: **Optimal Outbreeding.** In *Mate Choice*. Edited by Bateson P. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1983: 257-277

7.   Kokko H, Ots I: **When not to avoid inbreeding.** *Evolution* 2006, **60:**467-475.

8.   Gould SJ: *Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 1984.

9.   Stephens JC, Reich DE, Goldstein DB, Shin HD, Smith MW, Carrington M, Winkler C, Huttley GA, Allikmets R, Schriml L, et al: **Dating the origin of the CCR5-Delta32 AIDS-resistance allele by the coalescence of haplotypes.** *Am J Hum Genet* 1998, **62:**1507-1515.

10.   Pujol B, Zhou SR, Sanchez Vilas J, Pannell JR: **Reduced inbreeding depression after species range expansion.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2009, **106:**15379-15383.

11.   Grobbelaar CS: **Crisis inbreeding: rapid evolution in large, ecologically intact populations ?** *Evolutionary Theory* 1989, **8:**365-395.

12.   Muller HJ: **The relation of recombination to mutational advance.** *Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis* 1964, **1:**2-9.

13.   Muller HJ: **Our load of mutations.** *Am J Hum Genet* 1950, **2:**111-176.

14.   Kacser H, Burns JA: **THE MOLECULAR BASIS OF DOMINANCE.** *Genetics* 1981, **97:**639-666.

15.   Wright S: **Physiological and Evolutionary Theories of Dominance.** *The American Naturalist* 1934, **68:**24-53.

16.   Swindell WR, Bouzat JL: **Ancestral inbreeding reduces the magnitude of inbreeding depression in Drosophila melanogaster.** *Evolution* 2006, **60:**762-767.

17.   Lynch M: **The origins of eukaryotic gene structure.** *Mol Biol Evol* 2006, **23:**450-468.

18.   Lynch M, Burger R, Butcher D, Gabriel W: **The mutational meltdown in asexual populations.** *J Hered* 1993, **84:**339-344.

19.   Nachman MW, Crowell SL: **Estimate of the mutation rate per nucleotide in humans.** *Genetics* 2000, **156:**297-304.

20.   Roach JC, Glusman G, Smit AF, Huff CD, Hubley R, Shannon PT, Rowen L, Pant KP, Goodman N, Bamshad M, et al: **Analysis of genetic inheritance in a family quartet by whole-genome sequencing.** *Science* 2010, **328:**636-639.

21.   van Valen L: **A new evolutionary law.** *Evol Theory* 1973, **1:**1-30.

22.   Eldredge N, Gould SJ: **Punctuated equilibria: an alternative to phyletic gradualism**
. In *Model in Paleobiology*. Edited by Schopg TJM. San Francisco: Freeman, Cooper and Co.; 1972: 82-115

23.   Gould SJ, Eldredge N: **Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered.** *Paleobiology* 1977, **3:**115-151.

24.   Hamilton WD: **The genetical evolution of social behaviour. II.** *J Theor Biol* 1964, **7:**17-52.

25.   Hamilton WD: **The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I.** *J Theor Biol* 1964, **7:**1-16.

26.   Wilson DS, Wilson EO: **Rethinking the theoretical foundation of sociobiology.** *Q Rev Biol* 2007, **82:**327-348.

27.   Queller DC, Strassmann JE: **Beyond society: the evolution of organismality.** *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2009, **364:**3143-3155.

28.   Nei M, Maruyama T, Wu CI: **Models of evolution of reproductive isolation.** *Genetics* 1983, **103:**557-579.

29.   Lawlor DA, Ward FE, Ennis PD, Jackson AP, Parham P: **HLA-A and B polymorphisms predate the divergence of humans and chimpanzees.** *Nature* 1988, **335:**268-271.

30.   Figueroa F, Gunther E, Klein J: **MHC polymorphism pre-dating speciation.** *Nature* 1988, **335:**265-267.

31.   Orr HA: **The population genetics of speciation: the evolution of hybrid incompatibilities.** *Genetics* 1995, **139:**1805-1813.

32.   Moyle LC, Nakazato T: **Hybrid incompatibility "snowballs" between Solanum species.** *Science* 2010, **329:**1521-1523.

33.   Matute DR, Butler IA, Turissini DA, Coyne JA: **A test of the snowball theory for the rate of evolution of hybrid incompatibilities.** *Science* 2010, **329:**1518-1521.

34.   Rieseberg LH: **Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation.** *Trends Ecol Evol* 2001, **16:**351-358.

35. Fukuoka Y, Inaoka H, Kohane I: **Inter-species differences of co-expression of neighboring genes in eukaryotic genomes.** *BMC Genomics* 2004, **5:**4.
36. Jacobs PA: **Mutation rates of structural chromosome rearrangements in man.** *Am J Hum Genet* 1981, **33:**44-54.
37. Oliver-Bonet M, Navarro J, Carrera M, Egozcue J, Benet J: **Aneuploid and unbalanced sperm in two translocation carriers: evaluation of the genetic risk.** *Mol Hum Reprod* 2002, **8:**958-963.
38. Noor MA, Grams KL, Bertucci LA, Reiland J: **Chromosomal inversions and the reproductive isolation of species.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2001, **98:**12084-12088.
39. Turelli M, Orr HA: **The Dominance Theory of HALDANE's Rule.** *Genetics* 1995, **140:**389-402.
40. Haldane JBS: **Sex-ratio and unisexual sterility in hybrid animals.** *Journal of Genetics* 1922, **12:**101-109.
41. Thorpe RS, Surget-Groba Y, Johansson H: **Genetic tests for ecological and allopatric speciation in anoles on an island archipelago.** *PLoS Genet* 2010, **6:**e1000929.
42. Fitzpatrick MJ: **Pleiotropy and the genomic location of sexually selected genes.** *Am Nat* 2004, **163:**800-808.
43. Price TD, Bouvier MM: **The evolution of F1 postzygotic incompatibilities in birds.** *Evolution* 2002, **56:**2083-2089.
44. Templeton AR: **The theory of speciation via the founder principle.** *Genetics* 1980, **94:**1011-1038.
45. Irwin DE, Irwin JH, Price TD: **Ring species as bridges between microevolution and speciation.** *Genetica* 2001, **112-113:**223-243.
46. Navarro A, Barton NH: **Chromosomal speciation and molecular divergence--accelerated evolution in rearranged chromosomes.** *Science* 2003, **300:**321-324.
47. May RM: **How many species inhabit the earth ?** *Scientific American* 1992, **267:**42-48.
48. Makarieva AM, Gorshkov VG: **On the dependence of speciation rates on species abundance and characteristic population size.** *J Biosci* 2004, **29:**119-128.
49. Raup DM: **A Kill Curve For Phanerozoic Marine Species.** *Paleobiology* 1991, **17:**37-48.
50. van Valen L: **Group Selection, Sex, and Fossils.** *Evolution* 1975, **29:**87-94.
51. van Valen L, Sloan RE: **The Extinction of the Multituberculates.** *Systematic Zoology* 1966, **15:**261-278.
52. Jansen VA, van Baalen M: **Altruism through beard chromodynamics.** *Nature* 2006, **440:**663-666.
53. Dettman JR, Anderson JB, Kohn LM: **Divergent adaptation promotes reproductive isolation among experimental populations of the filamentous fungus Neurospora.** *BMC Evol Biol* 2008, **8:**35.
54. Bateson P: **Sexual imprinting and optimal outbreeding.** *Nature* 1978, **273:**659-660.
55. Gatenby RA, Frieden BR: **The role of non-genomic information in maintaining thermodynamic stability in living systems.** *Math Biosci Eng* 2005, **2:**43-51.
56. Venditti C, Meade A, Pagel M: **Phylogenies reveal new interpretation of speciation and the Red Queen.** *Nature* 2010, **463:**349-352.
57. Silvertown J, Servaes C, Biss P, Macleod D: **Reinforcement of reproductive isolation between adjacent populations in the Park Grass Experiment.** *Heredity* 2005, **95:**198-205.
58. Barluenga M, Stolting KN, Salzburger W, Muschick M, Meyer A: **Sympatric speciation in Nicaraguan crater lake cichlid fish.** *Nature* 2006, **439:**719-723.
59. Seehausen O, Alphen JJMv, Witte F: **Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual Selection.** *Science* 1997, **277:**1808-1811.
60. Roberts RB, Ser JR, Kocher TD: **Sexual conflict resolved by invasion of a novel sex determiner in Lake Malawi cichlid fishes.** *Science* 2009, **326:**998-1001.
61. Thunken T, Bakker TC, Baldauf SA, Kullmann H: **Active inbreeding in a cichlid fish and its adaptive significance.** *Curr Biol* 2007, **17:**225-229.
62. Landry C, Garant D, Duchesne P, Bernatchez L: **'Good genes as heterozygosity': the major histocompatibility complex and mate choice in Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar).** *Proc Biol Sci* 2001, **268:**1279-1285.
63. Yeates SE, Einum S, Fleming IA, Megens H-J, Stet RJM, Hindar K, Holt WV, Van Look KJW, Gage MJG: **Atlantic salmon eggs favour sperm in competition that have similar major histocompatibility alleles.** *Proceedings Biological sciences / The Royal Society* 2009, **276:**559-566.
64. Olsen KH, Grahn M, Lohm J, Langefors A: **MHC and kin discrimination in juvenile Arctic charr, Salvelinus alpinus (L.).** *Anim Behav* 1998, **56:**319-327.
65. Kelley J, Walter L, Trowsdale J: **Comparative genomics of major histocompatibility complexes.** *Immunogenetics* 2005, **56:**683-695.
66. Reusch TB, Haberli MA, Aeschlimann PB, Milinski M: **Female sticklebacks count alleles in a strategy of sexual selection explaining MHC polymorphism.** *Nature* 2001, **414:**300-302.
67. Milinski M, Griffiths S, Wegner KM, Reusch TB, Haas-Assenbaum A, Boehm T: **Mate choice decisions of stickleback females predictably modified by MHC peptide ligands.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2005, **102:**4414-4418.

68. Frommen JG, Bakker TCM: **Inbreeding avoidance through non-random mating in sticklebacks.** *Biology Letters* 2006, **2:**232-235.

69. Boughman JW, Rundle HD, Schluter D: **Parallel Evolution of Sexual Isolation in Sticklebacks.** *Evolution* 2005, **59:**361-373.

70. Rundle HD, Nagel L, Wenrick Boughman J, Schluter D: **Natural selection and parallel speciation in sympatric sticklebacks.** *Science* 2000, **287:**306-308.

71. Colosimo PF, Hosemann KE, Balabhadra S, Villarreal G, Jr., Dickson M, Grimwood J, Schmutz J, Myers RM, Schluter D, Kingsley DM: **Widespread parallel evolution in sticklebacks by repeated fixation of Ectodysplasin alleles.** *Science* 2005, **307:**1928-1933.

72. Chan YF, Marks ME, Jones FC, Villarreal G, Jr., Shapiro MD, Brady SD, Southwick AM, Absher DM, Grimwood J, Schmutz J, et al: **Adaptive evolution of pelvic reduction in sticklebacks by recurrent deletion of a Pitx1 enhancer.** *Science* 2010, **327:**302-305.

73. Bateson P: **Preferences for cousins in Japanese quail.** *Nature* 1982, **295:**236-237.

74. Abzhanov A, Protas M, Grant BR, Grant PR, Tabin CJ: **Bmp4 and morphological variation of beaks in Darwin's finches.** *Science* 2004, **305:**1462-1465.

75. Abzhanov A, Kuo WP, Hartmann C, Grant BR, Grant PR, Tabin CJ: **The calmodulin pathway and evolution of elongated beak morphology in Darwin's finches.** *Nature* 2006, **442:**563-567.

76. Grant BR, Grant PR: **Fission and fusion of Darwin's finches populations.** *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2008, **363:**2821-2829.

77. Sherborne AL, Thom MD, Paterson S, Jury F, Ollier WE, Stockley P, Beynon RJ, Hurst JL: **The genetic basis of inbreeding avoidance in house mice.** *Curr Biol* 2007, **17:**2061-2066.

78. Cheetham SA, Smith AL, Armstrong SD, Beynon RJ, Hurst JL: **Limited variation in the major urinary proteins of laboratory mice.** *Physiol Behav* 2009, **96:**253-261.

79. Roberts SA, Simpson DM, Armstrong SD, Davidson AJ, Robertson DH, McLean L, Beynon RJ, Hurst JL: **Darcin: a male pheromone that stimulates female memory and sexual attraction to an individual male's odour.** *BMC Biol* 2010, **8:**75.

80. Karn RC, Laukaitis CM: **The Mechanism of Expansion and the Volatility it created in Three Pheromone Gene Clusters in the Mouse (Mus musculus) Genome.** *Genome Biol Evol* 2009, **2009:**494-503.

81. Logan DW, Marton TF, Stowers L: **Species specificity in major urinary proteins by parallel evolution.** *PLoS One* 2008, **3:**e3280.

82. Bush GL, Case SM, Wilson AC, Patton JL: **Rapid speciation and chromosomal evolution in mammals.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1977, **74:**3942-3946.

83. Kerth G: **Causes and Consequences of Sociality in Bats.** *BioScience* 2008, **58:**737-746.

84. Capanna E, Castiglia R: **Chromosomes and speciation in Mus musculus domesticus.** *Cytogenet Genome Res* 2004, **105:**375-384.

85. Hauffe HC, Panithanarak T, Dallas JF, Pialek J, Gunduz I, Searle JB: **The tobacco mouse and its relatives: a "tail" of coat colors, chromosomes, hybridization and speciation.** *Cytogenet Genome Res* 2004, **105:**395-405.

86. Ciszek D: **New colony formation in the "highly inbred" eusocial naked mole-rat: outbreeding is preferred.** *Behav Ecol* 2000, **11:**1-6.

87. Peacock MM, Smith AT: **Nonrandom mating in pikas Ochotona princeps: evidence for inbreeding between individuals of intermediate relatedness.** *Mol Ecol* 1997, **6:**801-811.

88. Bretman A, Newcombe D, Tregenza T: **Promiscuous females avoid inbreeding by controlling sperm storage.** *Mol Ecol* 2009, **18:**3340-3345.

89. Simmons LW, Beveridge M, Wedell N, Tregenza T: **Postcopulatory inbreeding avoidance by female crickets only revealed by molecular markers.** *Mol Ecol* 2006, **15:**3817-3824.

90. Dobzhansky T: **How Do the Genetic Loads Affect the Fitness of Their Carriers in Drosophila Populations?** *The American Naturalist* 1964, **98:**151-166.

91. Brown KM, Burk LM, Henagan LM, Noor MA: **A test of the chromosomal rearrangement model of speciation in Drosophila pseudoobscura.** *Evolution* 2004, **58:**1856-1860.

92. Linn CE, Jr., Dambroski HR, Feder JL, Berlocher SH, Nojima S, Roelofs WL: **Postzygotic isolating factor in sympatric speciation in Rhagoletis flies: reduced response of hybrids to parental host-fruit odors.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004, **101:**17753-17758.

93. White MJD: **Models of Speciation.** *Science* 1968, **159:**1065-1070.

94. White MJD: **Chain Processes in Chromosomal Speciation.** *Systematic Zoology* 1978, **27:**285-298.

95. Chamberlain NL, Hill RI, Kapan DD, Gilbert LE, Kronforst MR: **Polymorphic butterfly reveals the missing link in ecological speciation.** *Science* 2009, **326:**847-850.

96. Rieseberg LH, Willis JH: **Plant speciation.** *Science* 2007, **317:**910-914.

97. Baker HG: **Self-Compatibility and Establishment After 'Long-Distance' Dispersal.** *Evolution* 1955, **9:**347-349.

98.   Heilbuth JC: **Lower Species Richness in Dioecious Clades.** *The American Naturalist* 2000, **156:**221-241.

99.   Baker HG: **Reproductive methods as factors in speciation in flowering plants.** *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 1959, **24:**177-191.

100.   Foxe JP, Slotte T, Stahl EA, Neuffer B, Hurka H, Wright SI: **Recent speciation associated with the evolution of selfing in Capsella.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2009, **106:**5241-5245.

101.   Bradshaw HD, Schemske DW: **Allele substitution at a flower colour locus produces a pollinator shift in monkeyflowers.** *Nature* 2003, **426:**176-178.

102.   Burger WC: **The Species Concept in Quercus.** *Taxon* 1975, **24:**45-50.

103.   Curtu AL, Gailing O, Finkeldey R: **Evidence for hybridization and introgression within a species-rich oak (Quercus spp.) community.** *BMC Evol Biol* 2007, **7:**218.

104.   Rushton B: **Natural hybridization within the genus Quercus L.** *Ann For Sci* 1993, **50:**73s-90s.

105.   Green RE, Krause J, Briggs AW, Maricic T, Stenzel U, Kircher M, Patterson N, Li H, Zhai W, Fritz MH, et al: **A draft sequence of the Neandertal genome.** *Science* 2010, **328:**710-722.

106.   Rasmussen M, Li Y, Lindgreen S, Pedersen JS, Albrechtsen A, Moltke I, Metspalu M, Metspalu E, Kivisild T, Gupta R, et al: **Ancient human genome sequence of an extinct Palaeo-Eskimo.** *Nature* 2010, **463:**757-762.

107.   Campbell H, Rudan I, Bittles AH, Wright AF: **Human population structure, genome autozygosity and human health.** *Genome Med* 2009, **1:**91.

108.   Nalls MA, Simon-Sanchez J, Gibbs JR, Paisan-Ruiz C, Bras JT, Tanaka T, Matarin M, Scholz S, Weitz C, Harris TB, et al: **Measures of autozygosity in decline: globalization, urbanization, and its implications for medical genetics.** *PLoS Genet* 2009, **5:**e1000415.

109.   Bittles AH, Black ML: **Evolution in health and medicine Sackler colloquium: Consanguinity, human evolution, and complex diseases.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010, **107 Suppl 1:**1779-1786.

110.   Bittles AH: **A community genetics perspective on consanguineous marriage.** *Community Genet* 2008, **11:**324-330.

111.   Bittles AH, Neel JV: **The costs of human inbreeding and their implications for variations at the DNA level.** *Nat Genet* 1994, **8:**117-121.

112.   Helgason A, Palsson S, Gudbjartsson DF, Kristjansson T, Stefansson K: **An association between the kinship and fertility of human couples.** *Science* 2008, **319:**813-816.

113.   Haldane J: **The cost of natural selection.** *Journal of Genetics* 1957, **55:**511-524.

114.   Rodriguez-Munoz R, Bretman A, Slate J, Walling CA, Tregenza T: **Natural and sexual selection in a wild insect population.** *Science* 2010, **328:**1269-1272.

115.   Ricci C, Caprioli M, Fontaneto D: **Stress and fitness in parthenogens: is dormancy a key feature for bdelloid rotifers?** *BMC Evol Biol* 2007, **7 Suppl 2:**S9.

116.   Wilson CG, Sherman PW: **Anciently asexual bdelloid rotifers escape lethal fungal parasites by drying up and blowing away.** *Science* 2010, **327:**574-576.

117.   Gladyshev E, Meselson M: **Extreme resistance of bdelloid rotifers to ionizing radiation.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2008, **105:**5139-5144.

118.   Duret L, Galtier N: **Biased gene conversion and the evolution of mammalian genomic landscapes.** *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 2009, **10:**285-311.

119.   van Wilgenburg E, Driessen G, Beukeboom LW: **Single locus complementary sex determination in Hymenoptera: an "unintelligent" design?** *Front Zool* 2006, **3:**1.

120.   Grutzner F, Rens W, Tsend-Ayush E, El-Mogharbel N, O'Brien PC, Jones RC, Ferguson-Smith MA, Marshall Graves JA: **In the platypus a meiotic chain of ten sex chromosomes shares genes with the bird Z and mammal X chromosomes.** *Nature* 2004, **432:**913-917.

121.   Rens W, Grutzner F, O'Brien P C, Fairclough H, Graves JA, Ferguson-Smith MA: **Resolution and evolution of the duck-billed platypus karyotype with an X1Y1X2Y2X3Y3X4Y4X5Y5 male sex chromosome constitution.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004, **101:**16257-16261.

122.   Qvarnstrom A, Bailey RI: **Speciation through evolution of sex-linked genes.** *Heredity* 2009, **102:**4-15.

123.   Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Pyntikova T, Graves TA, van Daalen SKM, Minx PJ, Fulton RS, McGrath SD, Locke DP, Friedman C, et al: **Chimpanzee and human Y chromosomes are remarkably divergent in structure and gene content.** *Nature* 2010, **463:**536-539.

124.   Neiman M, Taylor DR: **The causes of mutation accumulation in mitochondrial genomes.** *Proc Biol Sci* 2009, **276:**1201-1209.

125.   Hastings IM: **Population genetic aspects of deleterious cytoplasmic genomes and their effect on the evolution of sexual reproduction.** *Genet Res* 1992, **59:**215-225.

126.   Chang MT, Raper KB: **Mating types and macrocyst formation in Dictyostelium.** *J Bacteriol* 1981, **147:**1049-1053.

127.   Pal C, Papp B: **Selfish cells threaten multicellular life.** *Trends Ecol Evol* 2000, **15:**351-352.