

The Dynamic Nature of Eukaryotic Genomes

Laura Wegener Parfrey,* Daniel J. G. Lahr,* and Laura A. Katz*†

*Program in Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, University of Massachusetts; and †Department of Biological Sciences, Smith College, Northampton, MA

Analyses of diverse eukaryotes reveal that genomes are dynamic, sometimes dramatically so. In numerous lineages across the eukaryotic tree of life, DNA content varies within individuals throughout life cycles and among individuals within species. Discovery of examples of genome dynamism is accelerating as genome sequences are completed from diverse eukaryotes. Though much is known about genomes in animals, fungi, and plants, these lineages represent only 3 of the 60–200 lineages of eukaryotes. Here, we discuss diverse genomic strategies in exemplar eukaryotic lineages, including numerous microbial eukaryotes, to reveal dramatic variation that challenges established views of genome evolution. For example, in the life cycle of some members of the “radiolaria,” ploidy increases from haploid (N) to approximately $1,000N$, whereas intrapopulation variability of the enteric parasite *Entamoeba* ranges from $4N$ to $40N$. Variation has also been found within our own species, with substantial differences in both gene content and chromosome lengths between individuals. Data on the dynamic nature of genomes shift the perception of the genome from being fixed and characteristic of a species (typological) to plastic due to variation within and between species.

Introduction

Genomes are traditionally perceived as having fixed karyotypes within eukaryotic species (e.g., Lewin 2000; Hartwell et al. 2004). Under such a model, closely related individuals (within populations or species) share nearly identical genomes, and genomic integrity is maintained through the cell cycle. This static notion of the genome is challenged by studies in a variety of lineages that demonstrate considerable variation in genomic DNA content throughout organismal life cycles and among members of a single species. As discussed below, data from diverse eukaryotic lineages reveal extensive intra- and interspecific variation in genome content. These data, along with recognition of the widespread influence of epigenetics on the genome (Cerutti and Casas-Mollano 2006; Katz 2006; Richards 2006; Bird 2007), illuminate an increasingly dynamic picture of the eukaryotic genome.

Examining the phylogenetic distribution of genome dynamics enhances interpretation of the evolution of genome features. The phylogenetic framework of eukaryotes has shifted from the 5 (Whittaker 1969; Margulis and Schwartz 1988) or 6 (Cavalier-Smith 2002) kingdom systems emphasizing plants, animals, and fungi toward systems recognizing that these macroscopic groups are only 3 of an estimated 60–200 lineages (Patterson 1999), the rest are diverse microbial lineages. The current view of eukaryotic classification divides eukaryotes into 6 “supergroups” that encompass both macrobial and microbial members (Baldauf et al. 2000; Adl et al. 2005; Keeling et al. 2005), although this classification is likely premature as some groups are poorly supported (Parfrey et al. 2006). The diverse microbial lineages employ many genomic strategies and are known to provide extreme examples of some, such as genome processing in some ciliates that generates up to 25,000,000 somatic chromosomes (Raikov 1982; McGrath and Katz 2004; Zufall et al. 2005). Thus, the con-

sideration of microbial eukaryotes expands understanding of both the distribution and types of genome dynamics.

To elucidate the range of variation in eukaryotic genomes, we focus on 2 aspects of intraspecific genome dynamics: 1) variation in nuclear cycles within lineages and 2) variation in genome content among individuals within species. Selected examples are presented to highlight the broad phylogenetic distribution of dynamic features of eukaryotic genomes (bold lineages fig. 1; images of representative taxa fig. 2). Elsewhere there are extensive discussions of related topics such as the evolution of sex and meiosis (Kondrashov 1994; Mable and Otto 1998; Archetti 2004; Nuismer and Otto 2004) and changes in ploidy associated with speciation (genome duplication, hybridization, etc.; e.g., Otto and Whitton 2000; Bennett 2004).

We first consider changes in ploidy levels and genome content during the life cycles of exemplar lineages. To facilitate discussion, we present a generalized nuclear cycle for eukaryotes that depicts the progression through meiosis and karyogamy with intervening rounds of mitosis, such as occurs in the alternation of generations in plants (fig. 3*a*). This generalized nuclear cycle provides a common framework and terminology that enable comparison among diverse eukaryotic lineages. Meiosis and karyogamy, which, respectively, halve and double genome ploidy (coded yellow and red in fig. 3), are the basis of the sexual haploid–diploid cycle that underlies the typified nuclear cycles of plants, animals, and fungi (fig. 3*a–c*). Variation in nuclear cycles can be imparted through elimination of some stages (e.g., asexual eukaryotes reproduce via mitosis alone and in many vertebrate lineages, haploid nuclei do not undergo mitosis). Our focus is on the diversity of nuclear cycles that deviate from “textbook” versions of haploid–diploid cycles (fig. 3*d–i*).

A second aspect of dynamic genomes explored here is the heterogeneity of DNA content among conspecific individuals (\blacklozenge fig. 1; fig. 4). In contrast to the perception that single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) are responsible for intraspecific differentiation, emerging data demonstrate a greater range of variation. This intraspecific genomic variation ranges from insertions and deletions of short stretches of DNA through population differences in karyotype and ploidy. Examples from animals, fungi, and microbes are used to illustrate intraspecific genomic variability.

Key words: polyploidy, microbial eukaryotes, genome evolution, epigenetics, life cycle variation, genome rearrangements.

E-mail: lwegener@nsm.umass.edu.

Mol. Biol. Evol. 25(4):787–794. 2008

doi:10.1093/molbev/msn032

Advance Access publication February 6, 2008




FIG. 1.—Distribution of genomic features. Dynamic genomes are widespread across the eukaryotic tree of life. Occurrence of 3 metrics of genome dynamism are plotted onto our cartoon of the eukaryotic tree of life, the topology of which is derived from our interpretation of multigene genealogies (Parfrey et al. 2006; Rodriguez-Ezpeleta et al. 2007; Yoon et al. 2008). (p) indicates paraphyly in radiolaria and green algae. Symbols indicate that the feature is reported in at least 1 taxon within the lineage. ↑: Somatic polyploidy, ↑↓: Cyclic polyploidy, and ◆: Intraspecific genome variation.

Underlying the diversity of genomic processes are similarities that suggest an ancient origin of the basic features of the genome propagation including meiosis and mitosis. We argue that eukaryotes share mechanisms, possibly epigenetic, to maintain the integrity of genetic material for transmission to future generations while also allowing extensive variation within life cycles and among conspecific individuals. From the observed diversity, several trends in genome dynamics emerge such as: 1) elevated ploidy levels in large cells coupled with diverse mechanisms for reducing ploidy (e.g., Foraminifera, Phaeodarea, and the bacterium *Epulopiscium fishelsoni*), 2) dynamism in the somatic genome in lineages with sequestered germ lines (e.g., ciliates and animals), and 3) ploidy cycles in asexual lineages (e.g., *Giardia*, *Entamoeba*, and *Amoeba*). We further suggest that intraspecific variation in genome content is a widespread source of phenotypic variation.

Varying DNA Content during Nuclear Cycles

DNA content elevated over the diploid level is the most common manifestation of dynamic eukaryotic genomes (fig. 1) and even occurs in some bacteria and archaea. Two mechanisms by which organisms increase their DNA content are endoreplication resulting in polyploidy and genome amplification (Box 1). There are 2 fates of polyploid cells: 1) terminal polyploidy and 2) cyclic polyploidy that is later reduced by a nonmeiotic mechanism (fig. 1 ↑ and ↑↓, respectively). Terminal polyploidy occurs in differentiated somatic tissues in many multicellular taxa, including red algae, green algae, and animals, and in the somatic nuclei of ciliates (fig. 3*d* and *e*). In lineages characterized by cyclic polyploidy, increasing genome content is a phase in the life cycle and ploidy levels are reduced prior to either sexual or asexual reproduction (fig. 3*g–i*). These groups have diverse strategies for reducing ploidy level, such as genome segregation in which one polyploid nucleus yields thousands of haploid daughter nuclei (Box 1; Raikov 1982). Genomic DNA levels can also be reduced during life cycles of some lineages when portions of the genome are eliminated in response to stress or during development (fig. 3*d–f*). Below we introduce examples of these types of dynamic genomes, though in many cases, the molecular details of genome processes have yet to be elucidated.

Ciliates are microbial eukaryotes (fig. 2*a*) that undergo extensive genomic processing through genome amplification and chromosome fragmentation during the development of the somatic macronucleus (Box 1; fig. 3*d*; Prescott 1994; Katz 2001). During conjugation, 2 cells exchange meiotically produced micronuclear-derived gametic nuclei that fuse to become the zygotic nucleus. Both the macronucleus and the germ line micronucleus, which does not undergo genome processing, differentiate from the zygotic nucleus following conjugation. The nuclear cycle of the germ line micronucleus is similar to animals in that it is sequestered from the somatic genome, though in ciliates this all occurs within a single cell. Macronuclear genomes are highly polyploid, with a range of 60 copies of each chromosome in *Tetrahymena* to as many as 1,000 copies of a chromosome in *Stylonychia*. The parental macronucleus degrades during conjugation but influences the developing macronucleus through epigenetic processes (Mochizuki and Gorovsky 2004). The somatic macronuclear genomes of the model ciliates *Tetrahymena* (Eisen et al. 2006) and *Paramecium* (Aury et al. 2006) have recently been completed, and planned micronuclear genome sequencing will elucidate further genome processing in this lineage.

Selective elimination of germ line-limited DNA during somatic development also occurs in widely distributed lineages of animals, including hagfish (Vertebrata), dicyemid worms (Mesozoa), ascarids (Nematoda), and **copepods** (Crustacea) (Kloc and Zagrodzinska 2001; Redi et al. 2001; Zufall et al. 2005; Awata et al. 2006). In animals, this process is referred to as chromatin diminution and results in the loss of 15–95% of germ line DNA (Kloc and Zagrodzinska 2001). Following fertilization in copepods, the genome is endoreplicated 5- to 10-fold. Roughly half of the germ line genome, predominately highly repetitive heterochromatin,




FIG. 2.—Exemplar microbial eukaryotes. Images of microbial organisms discussed reveal morphological diversity in addition to genomic diversity described in the text. Approximate size is given for reference. (a) *Uronychia* sp. (ciliate): 150 μm , (b) *Ammonia* sp. (Foraminifera): 300 μm , (c) *Amoeba proteus*: 300 μm , (d) *Aulacantha scolymantha* (Phaeodarea): 200 μm , (e) *Entamoeba* sp.: 25 μm , and (f) *Giardia* sp.: 12 μm . All except (d) are images of live organisms, (d) is a drawing from Haeckel (1862) from the library of Kurt Stueber (<http://caliban.mpiz-koeln.mpg.de/~stueber/haeckel/radiolarien>). All images used with permission from micro*scope (<http://starcentral.mbl.edu/microscope/portal.php>).

is then eliminated during diminution (fig. 3e; Beerman 1977). The resulting diminuted somatic nuclei (diploid) contain the same amount of DNA as the haploid sperm cells (Rasch and Wyngaard 2001; Drouin 2006). The broad phylogenetic distribution of somatic chromosome processing in animals indicates that extensive modification of the somatic genome may be ancient in lineages with sequestered germ line genomes. We anticipate that numerous additional examples will be discovered.

In the plant **flax** (*Linum usitatissimum*), reduction of DNA content occurs as a response to stress in the lifetime of the individual (fig. 3i; Cullis 2005). Several studies find that the amount of DNA in the genome can be reduced by 15% when the plant is grown under stress (fig. 3f), and this reduction appears to effect high, middle, and low repetitive classes of DNA equally (Evans et al. 1966; Cullis 1973, 1981). Thus, it is possible that coding regions are lost in addition to highly repetitive, noncoding DNA. The genomic response to stress is nonrandom as the same stress-induced genomic changes occur repeatedly (Cullis 2005). Intriguingly, an increase in homologous recombination has also been measured in *Arabidopsis* when this model plant is exposed to stress by ultraviolet light or pathogens (Molinier et al. 2006). In the case of flax, Cullis (2005) argues that genomic changes are reversible as after 6 generations in native conditions the full genome complement returns in new tissues. These observations suggest that this response may be epigenetic in nature.

Foraminifera, a diverse group of amoebae (fig. 2b), have dynamic genomes that provide examples of genome segregation and possibly genomic processing. Nuclear cycles have been studied in fewer than 1% of extant

Foraminifera species (Goldstein 1999) but are generally characterized by an alternation between multinucleated diploid agamonts and uninucleate haploid gamonts (fig. 3g). The large agamonts reproduce by meiosis and multiple fission, yielding numerous haploid gamonts. The single gamontic nucleus then increases in size and DNA content as the organism grows, reaching 400 μm in diameter in some species (Goldstein 1997; Bowser et al. 2006). It is not known whether DNA content increases through polyploidization, by differentially amplifying some portion of the genome, or through a combination of the 2. Just prior to gametogenesis nuclear products, predominantly nucleoli plus some DNA, are expelled from the gamontic nucleus and degraded in a process referred to as “Zerfall” (Føyn 1936). This “nuclear cleansing” during Zerfall may facilitate a return to the haploid genome before reproduction (Bowser et al. 2006). The retained DNA proliferates through many rounds of mitosis (Føyn 1936; Arnold 1955) to generate hundreds to thousands of small ($\sim 5 \mu\text{m}$) haploid gametes (Bé and Anderson 1976; Goldstein 1997).

Amoeba proteus is reported to reduce the DNA levels in its nucleus by depolyploidization in the absence of mitosis (figs. 2c and 3h). *Amoeba proteus*, an asexual lobose amoebae, contains over 500 chromosomes and is believed to be polyploid (Raikov 1982). Though there are no direct measurements, several indirect methods have been applied to show ploidy variations (Afonkin 1986). Cytofluorimetric data show that the DNA content of *A. proteus* increases and decreases by up to 2.9-fold during interphase of the cell cycle (Makhlin et al. 1979). DNA synthesis is reported to occur in bursts, with one major peak right after mitosis and another smaller peak immediately before subsequent




FIG. 3.—Diversity of nuclear cycles. Depiction of changes in DNA content through the nuclear cycles of 9 lineages of eukaryotes. Horizontal axis and colors correspond to the nuclear cycle stage as shown in the inset diagram, whereas the vertical axis measures approximate DNA content within the nucleus. Gray shading represents periods of multicellularity or multinuclearity. Inset diagram in panel (a) is the generalized nuclear cycle as exemplified by plants. Arrows represent progression of genome through karyogamy (red), mitosis as a diploid (blue), meiosis (yellow), and mitosis as a haploid (green). Amitosis in ciliates is black. The nuclear cycle of organisms may include some or all components of the generalized nuclear cycle. A dashed arrow indicates the absence of intervening steps. Panels (d) and (e) depict the fate of the somatic genomes; therefore, they are dead ends.

mitosis and cell division (Ord 1968). Taken together, these studies suggest that *A. proteus* becomes polyploid during interphase and that prior to reproduction, this surplus of DNA is eliminated by depolyploidization to recover the haploid genome. Under this hypothesis, the genome is then replicated and passed on to daughter *A. proteus* cells by mitosis (fig. 3h). Intriguingly, *A. proteus* is a congener of *Amoeba dubia*, the eukaryote with the largest reported genome at 670,000 Mb (Friz 1968), and may share mechanisms for managing huge amounts of DNA during its life cycle with *A. proteus*.

Phaeodarea, a member of the polyphyletic “radiolaria” that is currently placed within the ‘Cercozoa,’ reduce ploidy levels in their large polyploid nucleus by genome segregation (figs. 2d and 3i; Grell 1953; Raikov 1982). Although the complete nuclear cycle of this lineage has not been fully elaborated, in part as no member of this clade has yet to be maintained in culture, Phaeodarea members are reported to be asexual and have a single nucleus that increases in ploidy by endoreplication. Ploidy is reduced prior to reproduction as the chromatin in this large (~100 μm in diameter) nucleus condenses into thousands of polytene




FIG. 4.—Range of intraspecific variation. Individuals within a species (and population) do not have identical genomes. Intraspecific genomes can be different from the level of a few nucleotides, to chromosomes, to ploidy of the whole genome. We plot examples of this variation discussed in the text along a gradient of variation. The number of nucleotides involved increases from left to right.

“chromosomes” that segregate along microtubules, each becoming a nucleus (fig. 3i; Grell and Ruthmann 1964). These polytene chromosomes later break down into 10–12 smaller chromosomes, presumably the haploid genome complement. The subsequent nuclei undergo rounds of mitosis yielding thousands of daughter nuclei that are individually packaged into biflagellate spores along with other organelles. Production of spores consumes the entire cytoplasm of the parent and allows alternation between a large vegetative cell and small reproductive cells (Raikov 1982).

Although not the focus of this manuscript, variation in ploidy levels is also reported from bacteria and archaea. DNA content in *Escherichia coli* varies from 2, 4, or 8 genome equivalents in stationary phase up to 11 genome equivalents per cell in early exponential phase (Akerlund et al. 1995). Similar variability is reported for *Methanococcus jannaschii*, *Micrococcus radiodurans*, *Synechococcus* PCC6301, *Desulfovibrio gigas*, *Borrelia hermsii*, and *Azotobacter vinlandii* (Bendich and Drlica 2000 and references therein). The giant bacterium *E. fishelsoni* (up to

600 μm in length) has a 3,000-fold range in ploidy variation that corresponds to a similar range in cell size (Bresler and Fishelson 2003), suggesting that polyploidy is associated with large cell sizes in this domain of life as well. Ploidy levels are reduced during reproduction in *E. fishelsoni* when numerous daughter cells are produced simultaneously in the mother cell (Angert 2005).

Intraspecific Variation in DNA Content

Genomes also vary dramatically among individuals within species of diverse eukaryotic lineages (♦ fig. 1). The portion of the genome that varies ranges from polyploidization of the entire genome to insertions and deletions of megabase stretches of genomic DNA (fig. 4). Such variation contrasts markedly with the SNP variants that are the focus of many current studies of genomic variation within species.

Substantial levels of among individual variation in DNA content have recently been found in **humans**, where the phenomenon is called copy number variation (Freeman et al. 2006; Redon et al. 2006). Redon et al. (2006) found insertions and deletions of kilobase to megabase segments of DNA that lead to polymorphisms in the presence/absence of chromosome regions and genes contained within them. The scale of this variation is enormous; a survey of 270 individuals found that 360 Mb (13% of the genome) varied (Redon et al. 2006), presenting a marked contrast to the genomic conservation symbolized by the 99% similarity in orthologous sequences between humans and chimps (Mikkelsen et al. 2005). Geneticists are struggling to conceptualize the species genome and redefine “normal” in this context as they search for the disease implications of this variability (Kehrer-Sawatzki 2007).

The **ciliate** macronucleus displays intraspecific variability on the level of whole chromosomes. The macronucleus is inherited by amitosis during asexual reproduction, an imprecise mechanism resembling binary fission or budding in which chromosomes are replicated and distributed to daughter nuclei without a mitotic spindle. Amitosis can lead to differential inheritance of alleles or paralogs (Robinson and Katz 2007) and contribute to overall elevated rates of protein evolution seen in ciliates (Katz et al. 2004; Zufall and Katz 2007). In both cases, epigenetic mechanisms likely play a role in regulating genome dynamics. Hence, ciliates within a population may have identical, or very similar, germ line nuclei, whereas their somatic nuclei can vary in the presence/absence of chromosomes.

Box 1

Karyotype	The number and length of chromosomes in the haploid chromosome complement.
Polyploidy	Nucleus containing more than 2 copies of the genome; widespread in eukaryotes.
Endoreplication (syn. endoreduplication, endomitosis)	Increase in nuclear ploidy levels by replication of DNA in the absence of mitosis; widespread in eukaryotes.
Genome amplification	Selective replication of portions of genomic DNA during development; extensive amplification in ciliate macronucleus and rDNA amplification is widespread.
Chromatin diminution	Selective elimination of chromosomes or portions of chromosomes during development; found in animals such as copepods, hagfish, dicyemids, and nematodes.
Genome segregation	Separation of a polyploid genome into haploid genome components prior to reproduction in polyploid protists such as Phaeodarea and other radiolaria.
Depolyploidization	Enigmatic reduction in DNA levels in the absence of nuclear division or mitosis reported in <i>Amoeba proteus</i> .
Reduction	Ploidy is reduced by nuclear division not preceded by replication, occurs in <i>Entamoeba</i> , <i>Giardia</i> , and human fibroblasts.

Populations of *Entamoeba*, the causative agent of amoebic dysentery in humans (fig. 2e; Stauffer and Ravdin 2003), demonstrate heterogeneity in nuclear ploidy due to varying levels of endomitosis. *Entamoeba* alternates between infective resting cysts with 4 haploid nuclei and metabolically active trophozoites with one or more nuclei. DNA levels within a population of trophozoites exhibit continuous variation from $4N$ to $40N$, and this variation is present both within multinucleate individuals and among the nuclei of separate individuals (Lohia 2003). Populations can be synchronized to $4N$ by starvation but achieve the same 10-fold range of variation within 2 h of addition of serum (Lohia 2003).

The diplomonad *Giardia*, a causative agent of diarrhea in humans, is an anaerobic flagellate with a hypervariable karyotype whereby the number and lengths of chromosomes vary among isolates (fig. 2f; Hou et al. 1995; Adam 2000). Though *Giardia* is a putative asexual lineage, it has a ploidy cycle due to endoreplication and reduction (Bernander et al. 2001). Analysis of *Giardia* chromosomes by pulsed field gel electrophoresis reveals several size variants for each chromosome, and there is no fixed karyotype for this species (Le Blancq and Adam 1998). Whereas the core portions of the chromosomes appear to be stable, there is considerable variation in the subtelomeric region (Le Blancq and Adam 1998; Adam 2000). Heterogeneity in karyotypes contrasts starkly with the almost complete lack of nucleotide heterogeneity in protein-coding genes between strains (Morrison et al. 2007; Teodorovic et al. 2007; Lasek-Nesselquist E, personal communication). As *Giardia* is asexual, one would expect large amounts of allelic variation to accumulate.

Intraspecific DNA sequence variation has also been found in **arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi** (AMF), which supply essential nutrients to plant roots (Smith and Read 1997). Vegetative AMF cells contain numerous nuclei, as do fungi in general; however, AMF are unusual in that hundreds to thousands of nuclei appear to be transferred to each spore (Pawlowska 2005). Within individual and within spore, genetic variation is documented for ribosomal DNA and protein-coding genes in several species of AMF (reviewed in Pawlowska [2005]). These results contradict the expected clonal population structure and haploid genome expected for fungi considered ancient asexuals (Judson and Normark 1996). It remains to be seen whether this variation is harbored in each nucleus as either duplicated genes or polyploid genomes (Pawlowska and Taylor 2004) or in genetically distinct nuclei (each presumably haploid) that are passed to each spore (Kuhn et al. 2001; Hijri and Sanders 2005).

Synthesis

We demonstrate that genomes are dynamic within and between eukaryotic lineages. This dynamism elaborates the generalized textbook view of nuclear cycles (fig. 3a–c) through addition of ploidy cycles, modification of genome content during development or in response to stress, and/or generation of individual variation in karyotypes (figs. 3d–i and 4). For example, cyclic changes in ploidy occur during

the life cycle in many “large” organisms, such as Phaeodarea, Foraminifera, and large prokaryotes. Ploidy cycles may be advantageous as they allow both reproduction via haploid gametes or spores, which is suggested to reduce the mutational load (Kondrashov 1997), and the high levels of DNA that are correlated with large vegetative cells (Mortimer 1958; Kondorosi et al. 2000). These nuclear features are broadly distributed (fig. 1) and likely involve shared mechanisms. The observed variation in genome content is underlain by conservation in at least some of the molecular machinery regulating meiosis and mitosis—2 basic components of the nuclear cycle—across the diversity of eukaryotes (Nurse 1990; Ramesh et al. 2005). Hence, the broad phylogenetic distribution of ploidy cycles suggests that mode of genome propagation evolves quickly but within the constraints of the conserved regulatory framework that was likely present in the last common ancestor of eukaryotes. The limited data on ploidy levels in prokaryotes hint that the molecular machinery may be even more ancient.

Data on the population level variation in DNA content are changing further perceptions on the nature of the eukaryotic genome. Recognized cases of intraspecific genomic heterogeneity are already widespread in eukaryotes (fig. 4), with examples coming from genome array studies on humans and limited data on microbial eukaryotes such as *Giardia* and *Entamoeba*. Intraspecific genome variability is likely a broad phenomenon that awaits detection in many more groups and may be a common source of phenotypic variation.

Elucidating the scope of genome dynamics is essential for understanding the relationship between genomes and phenotypes. Recent studies suggest that genome features can affect evolution by altering population genetic parameters such as effective population size (Lynch 2007) and rates of molecular evolution (Zufall et al. 2006). Understanding the wide range of ploidy levels found in diverse eukaryotes may also shed light on the intolerance of vertebrate cells to such fluctuations, where departure from diploidy often leads to cancer and aneuploid defects such as trisomy 21 (Ganem et al. 2007).

Though much remains to be discovered about the mechanisms behind genome dynamics during life cycles and within species, candidate mechanisms are most likely epigenetic. Epigenetic phenomena such as methylation, acetylation, and genome scanning through RNAi (e.g., Mochizuki and Gorovsky 2004; Cerutti and Casas-Mollano 2006; Goldberg et al. 2007) may enable cells to differentiate between germ line and somatic genomes, even in the context of a single nucleus. Under such scenarios, nuclei mark “germ line” genetic information for transmission to subsequent generations. Such a distinction between germ line and soma may be key in enabling variation in genomes within life cycles and among individuals within populations while also maintaining integrity between generations.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Ben Normark and David Lahti for providing helpful comments and to David Patterson for permission to

use micro*scope images. The work was supported by grant National Institutes of Health (1R15GM081865-01) and National Science Foundation Assembling the Tree of Life (DEB 043115) to L.A.K.

Literature Cited

- Adam RD. 2000. The *Giardia lamblia* genome. *Int J Parasitol.* 30:475–484.
- Adl SM, Simpson AGB, Farmer MA, et al. (28 co-authors). 2005. The new higher level classification of eukaryotes with emphasis on the taxonomy of protists. *J Eukaryot Microbiol.* 52:399–451.
- Afonkin SJ. 1986. Spontaneous depolyploidization of cells in *Amoeba* clones with increased nuclear-DNA content. *Arch Protistenkunde.* 131:101–112.
- Akerlund T, Nordstrom K, Bernander R. 1995. Analysis of cell-size and DNA content in exponentially growing and stationary-phase batch cultures of *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol.* 177: 6791–6797.
- Angert ER. 2005. Alternatives to binary fission in bacteria. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 3:214–224.
- Archetti M. 2004. Loss of complementation and the logic of two-step meiosis. *J Evol Biol.* 17:1098–1105.
- Arnold ZM. 1955. Life history and cytology of the foraminiferan *Allogromia laticollaris*. *Univ Calif Publ Zool.* 61:167–252.
- Aury JM, Jaillon O, Duret L, et al. (43 co-authors). 2006. Global trends of whole-genome duplications revealed by the ciliate *Paramecium tetraurelia*. *Nature.* 444:171–178.
- Awata H, Noto T, Endoh H. 2006. Peculiar behavior of distinct chromosomal DNA elements during and after development in dicyemid mesozoan *Dicyema japonicum*. *Chromosome Res.* 14:817–830.
- Baldauf SL, Roger AJ, Wenk-Siefert I, Doolittle WF. 2000. A kingdom-level phylogeny of eukaryotes based on combined protein data. *Science.* 290:972–977.
- Bé AWH, Anderson OR. 1976. Gametogenesis in planktonic foraminifera. *Science.* 192:890–892.
- Beerman S. 1977. The diminution of heterochromatic chromosomal segments in *Cyclops* (Crustacea, Copepoda). *Chromosoma.* 60:297–344.
- Bendich AJ, Drlica K. 2000. Prokaryotic and eukaryotic chromosomes: what's the difference? *Bioessays.* 22:481–486.
- Bennett MD. 2004. Perspectives on polyploidy in plants—ancient and neo. *Biol J Linn Soc.* 82:411–423.
- Bernander R, Palm JED, Svard SG. 2001. Genome ploidy in different stages of the *Giardia lamblia* life cycle. *Cell Microbiol.* 3:55–62.
- Bird A. 2007. Perceptions of epigenetics. *Nature.* 447:396–398.
- Bresler V, Fishelson L. 2003. Polyploidy and polyteny in the gigantic eubacterium *Epulopiscium fishelsoni*. *Marine Biology.* 143:17–21.
- Bowser SS, Habura A, Pawlowski J. 2006. Molecular evolution of Foraminifera. In: Katz LA, Bhattacharya D, editors. *Genome evolution in eukaryotic microbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 78–93.
- Cavalier-Smith T. 2002. The phagotrophic origin of eukaryotes and phylogenetic classification of protozoa. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 52:297–354.
- Cerutti H, Casas-Mollano JA. 2006. On the origin and functions of RNA-mediated silencing: from protists to man. *Curr Genet.* 50:81–99.
- Cullis CA. 1973. DNA differences between flax genotypes. *Nature.* 243:515–516.
- Cullis CA. 1981. DNA sequence organization in the flax genome. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 652:1–15.
- Cullis CA. 2005. Mechanisms and control of rapid genomic changes in flax. *Ann Bot.* 95:201–206.
- Drouin G. 2006. Chromatin diminution in the copepod *Mesocyclops edax*: diminution of tandemly repeated DNA families from somatic cells. *Genome.* 49:657–665.
- Eisen JA, Coyne RS, Wu M, et al. (53 co-authors). 2006. Macronuclear genome sequence of the ciliate *Tetrahymena thermophila*, a model eukaryote. *PLoS Biol.* 4:1620–1642.
- Evans GM, Durrant A, Rees H. 1966. Associated nuclear changes in the induction of flax genotrophs. *Nature.* 212:697–699.
- Freeman JL, Perry GH, Feuk L, et al. (13 co-authors). 2006. Copy number variation: new insights in genome diversity. *Genome Res.* 16:949–961.
- Friz CT. 1968. The biochemical composition of the free-living Amoebae *Chaos chaos*, *Amoeba dubia* and *Amoeba proteus*. *Comp Biochem Physiol.* 26:81–90.
- Føyn B. 1936. Über die Kernverhältnisse der Foraminifere *Myxotheca arenilega* Schaudinn. *Arch Protistenkunde.* 87:272–295.
- Ganem NJ, Storchova Z, Pellman D. 2007. Tetraploidy, aneuploidy and cancer. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.* 17:157–162.
- Goldberg AD, Allis CD, Bernstein E. 2007. Epigenetics: a landscape takes shape. *Cell.* 128:635–638.
- Goldstein ST. 1997. Gametogenesis and the antiquity of reproductive pattern in the Foraminiferida. *J Foraminiferal Res.* 27:319–328.
- Goldstein ST. 1999. Foraminifera: a biological overview. In: Sen Gupta BK, editor. *Modern Foraminifera*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (Netherlands). p. 37–56.
- Grell KG. 1953. Die Chromosomen von *Aulacantha scolymantha* Haeckel. *Arch Protistenkunde.* 99:1–54.
- Grell KG, Ruthmann A. 1964. Über die Karyologie des Radiolar *Aulacantha scolymantha* und die Feinstruktur seiner Chromosomen. *Chromosoma.* 15:158–211.
- Haeckel E. 1862. Die Radiolarien (Rhizopoda Radiaria): eine monographie. Berlin (Germany): G. Reimer.
- Hartwell LH, Hood L, Goldberg ML, Reynolds AE, Silver LM, Veres RC. 2004. *Genetics: from genes to genomes*. New York: McGraw Hill. p. 1–12.
- Hijri M, Sanders IR. 2005. Low gene copy number shows that arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi inherit genetically different nuclei. *Nature.* 433:160–163.
- Hou GY, Leblancq SM, Yaping E, Zhu HX, Lee MGS. 1995. Structure of a frequently rearranged ribosomal RNA encoding chromosome in *Giardia lamblia*. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 23:3310–3317.
- Judson OP, Normark BB. 1996. Ancient asexual scandals. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 11:A41–A46.
- Katz LA. 2001. Evolution of nuclear dualism in ciliates: a reanalysis in light of recent molecular data. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 51:1587–1592.
- Katz LA. 2006. Genomes: epigenomics and the future of genome sciences. *Curr Biol.* 16:R996–R997.
- Katz LA, Lasek-Nesselquist E, Bornstein J, Muse SV. 2004. Dramatic diversity of ciliate histone H4 genes revealed by comparisons of patterns of substitutions and paralog divergences among eukaryotes. *Mol Biol Evol.* 21:555–562.
- Keeling PJ, Burger G, Durnford DG, Lang BF, Lee RW, Pearlman RE, Roger AJ, Gray MW. 2005. The tree of eukaryotes. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 20:670–676.
- Kehrer-Sawatzki H. 2007. What a difference copy number variation makes. *Bioessays.* 29:311–313.
- Kloc M, Zagrodzinska B. 2001. Chromatin elimination—an oddity or a common mechanism in differentiation and development? *Differentiation.* 68:84–91.
- Kondorosi E, Roudier F, Gendreau E. 2000. Plant cell-size control: growing by ploidy? *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 3:488–492.

- Kondrashov AS. 1994. The asexual ploidy cycle and the origin of sex. *Nature*. 370:213–216.
- Kondrashov AS. 1997. Evolutionary genetics of life cycles. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst.* 28:391–435.
- Kuhn G, Hijri M, Sanders IR. 2001. Evidence for the evolution of multiple genomes in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Nature*. 414:745–748.
- Le Blancq SM, Adam RD. 1998. Structural basis of karyotype heterogeneity in *Giardia lamblia*. *Mol Biochem Parasitol.* 97:199–208.
- Lewin B. 2000. *Genes VII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lohia A. 2003. The cell cycle of *Entamoeba histolytica*. *Mol Cell Biochem.* 253:217–222.
- Lynch M. 2007. *Origins of genome architecture*. Sunderland (MA): Sinauer Associates.
- Mable BK, Otto SP. 1998. The evolution of life cycles with haploid and diploid phases. *Bioessays*. 20:453–462.
- Makhlin E, Kudryavtseva M, Kudryavtsev B. 1979. Peculiarities of changes in DNA content of *Amoeba proteus* nuclei during interphase—cytofluorometric study. *Exp Cell Res.* 118:143–150.
- Margulis L, Schwartz K. 1988. *Five kingdoms: an illustrated guide to the phyla of life on earth*, 2nd ed. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- McGrath CL, Katz LA. 2004. Genome diversity in microbial eukaryotes. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 19:32–38.
- Mikkelsen TS, Hillier LW, Eichler EE, et al. (67 co-authors). 2005. Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and comparison with the human genome. *Nature*. 437:69–87.
- Mochizuki K, Gorovsky MA. 2004. Small RNAs in genome rearrangement in *Tetrahymena*. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.* 14:181–187.
- Molinier J, Ries G, Zipfel C, Hohn B. 2006. Transgenerational memory of stress in plants. *Nature*. 442:1046–1049.
- Morrison HG, McArthur AG, Gillin FD, et al. (29 co-authors). 2007. Genomic minimalism in the early diverging intestinal parasite *Giardia lamblia*. *Science*. 317:1921–1926.
- Mortimer RK. 1958. Radiobiological and genetic studies on a polyploid series (haploid to hexaploid) of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Radiat Res.* 9:312–326.
- Nuismer SL, Otto SP. 2004. Host-parasite interactions and the evolution of ploidy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 101:11036–11039.
- Nurse P. 1990. Universal control mechanism regulating onset of M-phase. *Nature*. 344:503–508.
- Ord MJ. 1968. Synthesis of DNA through cell cycle of *Amoeba proteus*. *J Cell Sci.* 3:483–491.
- Otto SP, Whitton J. 2000. Polyploid incidence and evolution. *Annu Rev Genet.* 34:401–437.
- Parfrey LW, Barbero E, Lasser E, Dunthorn M, Bhattacharya D, Patterson DJ, Katz LA. 2006. Evaluating support for the current classification of eukaryotic diversity. *PLoS Genet.* 2:2062–2073.
- Patterson DJ. 1999. The diversity of eukaryotes. *Am Nat.* 154:S96–S124.
- Pawlowska TE. 2005. Genetic processes in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *FEMS Microbiol Lett.* 251:185–192.
- Pawlowska TE, Taylor JW. 2004. Organization of genetic variation in individuals of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Nature*. 427:733–737.
- Prescott DM. 1994. The DNA of ciliated protozoa. *Microbiol Rev.* 58:233–267.
- Raikov IB. 1982. *The protozoan nucleus: morphology and evolution*. Wien (Germany): Springer-Verlag.
- Ramesh MA, Malik SB, Logsdon JM. 2005. A phylogenomic inventory of meiotic genes: evidence for sex in *Giardia* and an early eukaryotic origin of meiosis. *Curr Biol.* 15:185–191.
- Rasch EM, Wyngaard GA. 2001. Evidence for endoreduplication: Germ cell DNA levels prior to chromatin diminution in *Mesocyclops edax*. 49:796–796.
- Redi CA, Garagna S, Zacharias H, Zuccotti M, Capanna E. 2001. The other chromatin. *Chromosoma.* 110:136–147.
- Redon R, Ishikawa S, Fitch KR, et al. (43 co-authors). 2006. Global variation in copy number in the human genome. *Nature*. 444:444–454.
- Richards EJ. 2006. Inherited epigenetic variation—revisiting soft inheritance. *Nat Rev Genet.* 7:395–401.
- Robinson T, Katz LA. 2007. Non-Mendelian inheritance of paralogs of two cytoskeletal genes in the ciliate *Chilodonella uncinata*. *Mol Biol Evol.* 24:2495–2503.
- Rodriguez-Ezpeleta N, Brinkmann H, Burger G, Roger AJ, Gray MW, Philippe H, Lang BF. 2007. Toward resolving the eukaryotic tree: the phylogenetic positions of jakobids and cercozoans. *Curr Biol.* 17:1420–1425.
- Smith SE, Read DJ. 1997. *Mycorrhizal symbiosis*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press.
- Stauffer W, Ravdin JJ. 2003. *Entamoeba histolytica: an update*. *Curr Opin Infect Dis.* 16:479–485.
- Teodorovic S, Bravermanj JM, Elmendorf HG. 2007. Unusually low levels of genetic variation among *Giardia lamblia* isolates. *Eukaryot Cell.* 6:1421–1430.
- Whittaker RH. 1969. New concepts of kingdoms of organisms. *Science.* 163:150–160.
- Yoon HS, Grant J, Tekle YI, Wu M, Chaon BC, Cole JC, Logsdon JM, Patterson DJ, Bhattacharya D, Katz LA. 2008. Broadly sampled multigene trees of eukaryotes. *BMC Evol Biol.* 8:doi:10.1186/1471-2148-1188-1114.
- Zufall RA, Katz LA. 2007. Micronuclear and macronuclear forms of beta-tubulin genes in the ciliate *Chilodonella uncinata* reveal insights into genome processing and protein evolution. *J Eukaryot Microbiol.* 54:275–282.
- Zufall RA, McGrath CL, Muse SV, Katz LA. 2006. Genome architecture drives protein evolution in ciliates. *Mol Biol Evol.* 23:1681–1687.
- Zufall RA, Robinson T, Katz LA. 2005. Evolution of developmentally regulated genome rearrangements in eukaryotes. *J Exp Zool B Mol Dev Evol.* 304B:448–455.

Martin Embley, Associate Editor

Accepted January 29, 2008