A Transcriptomic Approach to Ribbon Worm Systematics (Nemertea): Resolving the Pilidiophora Problem
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Abstract

Resolving the deep relationships of ancient animal lineages has proven difficult using standard Sanger-sequencing approaches with a handful of markers. We thus reassess the relatively well-studied phylogeny of the phylum Nemertea (ribbon worms)—for which the targeted gene approaches had resolved many clades but had left key phylogenetic gaps—by using a phylogenomic approach using Illumina-based de novo assembled transcriptomes and automatic orthology prediction methods. The analysis of a concatenated data set of 2,779 genes (411,138 amino acids) with about 78% gene occupancy and a reduced version with 95% gene occupancy, under evolutionary models accounting or not for site-specific amino acid replacement patterns results in a well-supported phylogeny that recovers all major accepted nemertean clades with the monophyly of Heteronemertea, Hoplonemertea, Monostilifera, being well supported. Significantly, all the ambiguous patterns inferred from Sanger-based approaches were resolved, namely the monophyly of Palaeonemertea and Pilidiophora. By testing for possible conflict in the analyzed supermatrix, we observed that concatenation was the best solution, and the results of the analyses should settle prior debates on nemertean phylogeny. The study highlights the importance, feasibility, and completeness of Illumina-based phylogenomic data matrices.
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Introduction

Of all the animal phyla, nemerteans are unique in presenting an excretory system similar to that of some acoelomates while possessing true coeloms, the rhynchocoel and the closed circulatory system (see Turbeville 2002). This taxon includes about 1,280 species (Gibson 1995; Kajihara et al. 2008), which is more than many other well-known animal phyla, but it is still considered a “minor” phylum by some, despite inhabiting marine, freshwater and some terrestrial environments. The phylum includes what is considered to be the longest metazoan ever recorded, Lineus longissimus, which can reach more than 30 m in length (Mclntosh 1873–1874), but many species are small, and some even microscopic. Most nemertean species are carnivorous or scavengers, using their unique proboscis apparatus for capturing prey.

The classification of nemerteans has been in flux for decades but a consensus has arisen with the relatively recent use of molecular systematics (e.g., Sundberg et al. 2001; Thollesson and Norenburg 2003; Sundberg and Strand 2007; Andrade et al. 2012; Kvist et al. 2014). The traditional classification system of nemerteans for most of the last 100 years followed largely Stiasny-Wijnhoff (1936), which accepted as classes Schultze’s (1851) division of nemerteans into Anopla and Enopla. Stiasny-Wijnhoff (1936) divided Anopla into Palaeonemertea and Heteronemertea, and Enopla into Hoplonemertea and Bdellonemertea. Hoplonemertea was further subdivided into Monostilifera and Polystilifera. Recent accounts of the systematics of Nemertea were provided by Andrade et al. (2012) and Kvist et al. (2014). In those studies, the authors produced a
comprehensive analysis of ribbon worm relationships based on six molecular markers obtained by Sanger sequencing for a large taxon sample, including all major lineages. Although many relationships were conclusive, and the major groupings (e.g., Heteronemertea and Hoplonemertea) were well supported, their relationship to Palaeonemertea and Hubrechtidae, and the monophyly of Palaeonemertea were not satisfactorily resolved. Andrade et al. (2012) therefore concluded their study with a plea for Next Generation Sequence data to resolve the deepest nodes in the tree, as phylogenomic matrices assembled this way have proven informative at resolving basal metazoan and protostome relationships (e.g., Dunn et al. 2008; Hejnol et al. 2009; Pick et al. 2010; Kocot et al. 2011; Smith et al. 2011; Struck et al. 2011; von Reumont et al. 2012; Fernández, Laumer, et al. 2014).

Nemertean transcriptomic data are scarce and based on Sanger data for the species *Cerebratulus lacteus* (Heteronemertea) and *Carinoma mutabile* (Palaeonemertea) (Dunn et al. 2008). More recently, two additional species have been sequenced using Illumina, *Cephalothrix hongkongiensis* (Palaeonemertea) and *C. marginatus* (Heteronemertea) (Riesgo, Andrade, et al. 2012), both included in this study. Here, we use an RNA-seq approach to generate new transcriptomes for 11 nemertean species with Illumina (including the ones from Riesgo, Andrade, et al. 2012) and Roche-454 to address four outstanding questions in nemertean phylogeny. We selected species from all the major ribbon-worm lineages, spanning their entire diversity, and obtained fresh RNA from live or RNAlater preserved specimens. Our aims were to 1) test the monophyly of Palaeonemertea by including a member of each of the three lineages obtained by Andrade et al. (2012); (2) test the monophyly of Anopla, which has been falsified by most phylogenetic analyses; 3) test the position of Heteronemertea, which has remained in flux in most studies; and 4) address the position of Hubrechtidae, a family of uncertain affinities, originally classified in Palaeonemertea, but more recently found to be the possible sister group of Heteronemertea, thus forming a clade named Pilidiophora for the presence of a plidium larva which occurs in both taxa (Thollesson and Norenburg 2003).

**Results**

The number of sequence reads, used reads, contigs, and other values to assess the quality of the assembled transcriptomes can be found in **table 1**. Our smallest Illumina library used approximately 12 million reads (assembled into 29,292 contigs for *Protopelagonemertes beebei*), whereas our largest one used almost 80 million reads (assembled into 70,286 contigs for *Carinoma hamanako*). Interestingly, smaller libraries yielded more assembled contigs (see **table 1**), although some with a smaller n50, such as *Nipponemertes* sp., which had 62 million used reads assembled into 34,065 contigs greater than 199 bp, n50 = 816, whereas *C. marginatus* had 28 million used reads assembled into 117,335 contigs greater than 150 bp, n50 = 1,103. In fact, the relatively small library of *C. marginatus* had some of the longest contigs, the largest number of contigs greater than 999 bp, and the longest total number of assembled base pairs. This indicates that transcriptome quality may not be directly correlated to the number of raw reads or the number of used reads, but instead with library quality and diversity.

We obtained a total of 42,730 clusters from the ortholog clustering analyses, from which 7,581 had five taxa or more. Although previous studies have compared alternative matrices (e.g., Hejnol et al. 2009; Smith et al. 2011), this was done to compare results between large numbers of genes (which came with low matrix completeness) and more complete matrices. The most densely populated matrix from Hejnol et al. (2009), with only 53 genes, was only 50% complete. Likewise, the “small” matrix of Smith et al. (2011), consisting of 301 genes, has 50% gene occupancy and 27% character occupancy, whereas the “big” matrix consists of 1,185 genes with 40% gene occupancy and 21% character occupancy. Our original gene occupancy threshold is much higher than any of these matrices, and we obtained 89% and 80% of character occupancy for the reduced and large matrices, respectively. As support is optimal for almost all nodes, we did not find it necessary to evaluate more than two alternative matrices with more or less occupancy (**fig. 1**). The number of ortholog groups represented per taxon ranged from 704 to 2,613 for the large matrix and from 247 to 458 for the reduced matrix (**table 2**).

The maximum likelihood (ML) tests using the two alternative models, LG and LG4X, produced an identical topology on the best-scoring trees. The log-likelihood score for them was −6,056,455.0098 and −5,973,224.5499, respectively. For the reduced matrix, only the LG4X model was used, and the best-scoring tree had a log-likelihood value of −1,236,158.9849. The phylogenetic analyses of our two data matrices yielded identical topologies for the ML analysis using a partitioned model approach and for the Bayesian analyses (**fig. 2**), the only differences being in the internal resolution of Palaeonemertea and in one of the outgroup taxa. Each node in the nemertean tree received 100% bootstrap support or a posterior probability of 1.00, with the exception of the sister group relationship of *Carinoma* and *Cephalothrix*, not supported in the small data matrix. Monophyly of Nemertea, Palaeonemertea, Neonemertea, Hoplonemertea, Monostilifera, Pilidiophora, and Heteronemertea are thus found in all analyses with maximum support. One result evident in our analyses, as well as in previously published work, is the rejection of the order Bdellonemertea (with its only representative genus *Malacobdella*), as it nests deep within the Monostilifera. Monostilifera also shows the deep split between the clades Cratenemertea (*Nipponemertes* and Distronematonemertea (*Argonemertes*, *Paranemertes*, and *Malacobdella*). Within Heteronemertea our data also support a deep split between *Baseodiscus* and the other represented genera.

Outgroup relationships are outside the scope of this article, but our analyses support the monophyly of all the represented mollusks and annelids (including the represented sipunculan). Other well-established nodes in molluscan and annelid phylogeny, including a relationship of the three conchiferan mollusks or the two clitellate annelids, are also well
Table 1. Species Included in the Analysis, Including New and Publicly Available Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>MCZ Voucher</th>
<th>Sampling Location</th>
<th>Sequence Method/Source</th>
<th>N Raw Reads</th>
<th>N Reads after Filtering</th>
<th>Assembler</th>
<th>N Contigs (&gt; 150 bp)</th>
<th>n50</th>
<th>Longest Contig (&gt; 999 bp)</th>
<th>N Contigs</th>
<th>Average Contig Length (bp)</th>
<th>Total Length (bp)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tubulanus punctatus</td>
<td>IZ-134221</td>
<td>Akkeshi, Hokkaido, Japan</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>69,672</td>
<td>63,219</td>
<td>NovoExpress</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>488.9</td>
<td>2,061,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinoma hamanako</td>
<td>IZ-135326</td>
<td>Ikarise Island, Honshu, Japan</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>103,234,742</td>
<td>80,199,393</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>70,286</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>10,084</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>825.4</td>
<td>72,037,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalothrix hongkongiensis</td>
<td>IZ-135329</td>
<td>Akkeshi, Hokkaido, Japan</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>51,634,374</td>
<td>41,432,780</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>73,445</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>9,337</td>
<td>14,514</td>
<td>539.6</td>
<td>52,901,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holothuria iijimai</td>
<td>IZ-135342</td>
<td>Hamanako, Honshu, Japan</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>72,768,612</td>
<td>50,847,602</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>110,394</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>5,458</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>343.2</td>
<td>49,058,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basodiscus uricolor</td>
<td>IZ-135322</td>
<td>Bocas del Toro, Panama</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>175,593,324</td>
<td>78,906,444</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>89,321</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>17,032</td>
<td>745.3</td>
<td>72,397,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerberatulus marginatus</td>
<td>IZ-134484</td>
<td>San Juan Island, WA</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>52,515,657</td>
<td>28,486,396</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>117,305</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>16,854</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>90,860,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rissoella occulta</td>
<td>IZ-135375</td>
<td>Liverpool, UK</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>115,328,860</td>
<td>71,403,264</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>91,728</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>16,082</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>368.5</td>
<td>53,276,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragonemertes australiensis</td>
<td>IZ-135314</td>
<td>Tasmania, Australia</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>128,371,852</td>
<td>39,211,148</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>43,999</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>473.1</td>
<td>24,144,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malacobdella grossa</td>
<td>IZ-133743</td>
<td>Tjärnö, Skagerak, Sweden</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>47,277,586</td>
<td>35,241,626</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>49,596</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>9,108</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>688.9</td>
<td>52,064,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipponamnitidae sp.</td>
<td>IZ-135354</td>
<td>Biobío, Chile</td>
<td>Illumina-PE</td>
<td>178,923,604</td>
<td>62,354,396</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>28,772</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>12,963</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>584.4</td>
<td>20,995,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paronemertes peregrina</td>
<td>IZ-134480</td>
<td>San Juan Island, WA</td>
<td>Illumina-SE</td>
<td>24,392,996</td>
<td>16,521,215</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>30,456</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>21,949</td>
<td>16,859</td>
<td>913.1</td>
<td>52,515,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protopaglenemertes beebei</td>
<td>IZ-135370</td>
<td>Sagami Bay, Japan</td>
<td>Illumina-SE</td>
<td>22,321,639</td>
<td>12,011,532</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>29,295</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>19,285</td>
<td>6,275</td>
<td>709.4</td>
<td>23,997,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus vulgaris</td>
<td>DNA-106283</td>
<td>Blanes, Girona, Spain</td>
<td>Blumen-PE</td>
<td>94,283,868</td>
<td>66,501,336</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>56,949</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>19,747</td>
<td>10,435</td>
<td>689.4</td>
<td>39,263,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiton olivaceus</td>
<td>MAL-378064</td>
<td>Tossa de Mar, Girona, Spain</td>
<td>Blumen-PE</td>
<td>82,814,628</td>
<td>55,901,966</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>109,413</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>7,118</td>
<td>15,108</td>
<td>55.72</td>
<td>60,964,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadilal tormisit</td>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>Smith et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>78,360</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>54.22</td>
<td>42,664,182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enarrowula tersit</td>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>Smith et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>64,402</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>18,317</td>
<td>13,928</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>48,144,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicaconus nata</td>
<td>IZ-130438</td>
<td>Fort Pierce, FL</td>
<td>Blumen-PE</td>
<td>195,601,190</td>
<td>34,173,928</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>121,416</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>13,337</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>55,360,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormogaster samnica</td>
<td>GEL6®</td>
<td>Gello, Toscana, Italy</td>
<td>Blumen-PE</td>
<td>53,956,780</td>
<td>31,623,984</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>59,853</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>11,613</td>
<td>67.71</td>
<td>40,526,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitella teleta</td>
<td>JGI database</td>
<td>Velvvet/Oases</td>
<td>59,360,968</td>
<td>31,623,984</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>59,853</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>11,613</td>
<td>67.71</td>
<td>40,526,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holobdella robusta</td>
<td>JGI database</td>
<td>Velvvet/Oases</td>
<td>59,360,968</td>
<td>31,623,984</td>
<td>Velvet/Oases</td>
<td>59,853</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>9,307</td>
<td>11,613</td>
<td>67.71</td>
<td>40,526,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE.—The sequencing method for new data or the source of the data is indicated in the third column. The public archive used was JGI—http://www.jgi.doe.gov/ (last accessed September 7, 2014). MCZ voucher accession numbers beginning with IZ and DNA are at the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology. See Materials and Methods for details on sample preparation protocols.

aAssemblies were obtained directly from Casey W. Dunn referring to Smith et al. (2011).

bMaterial deposited in the Department of Zoology and Physical Anthropology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

cUsed the translated assemblies from the JGI database.
supported in our data set, serving as a test for interpreting the nemertean support values.

The different incongruence inferences presented some different results, probably due to limitations of “internode certainty” when dealing with missing data (Salichos et al. 2014). The relative tree certainty (TC) (Salichos and Rokas 2013) for the large matrix (2,779 partitions) including all conflicting bipartitions (TC-All) was 0.996, whereas for the reduced matrix (464 partitions), retrieved a value of 0.924, clearly indicating no conflict. The split network from SuperQ v1.1 identifies some intergene conflict with respect to the specific positions of Hubrechtella iijimai and the hoplonemerteans (fig. 3) for both matrices. Conclustador resulted in just one cluster for each matrix, and the small matrix supernetwork also showed conflict between Cep. hongkongiensis and Ca. hamanako, as evidenced on the tree presented on figure 2.

**Discussion**

Resolving the Tree of Life has been seen as one of the most important 125 unresolved scientific questions in 2005 by Science Magazine (July 1, 2005, vol. 309, p. 96), and the advent of phylogenomics has aided in resolving many contentious aspects in animal phylogeny (Delsuc et al. 2005; Dunn et al. 2008; Bleidorn et al. 2009; Hejnol et al. 2009; Meusemann et al. 2010; Kocot et al. 2011; Rehm et al. 2011;
FIG. 2. Phylogenetic hypothesis based on the large data matrix analyzed in RAxML (\( -\ln L = -5,973,224.55 \)) with support values (bootstrap values or posterior probabilities) plotted as follows: Large matrix RAxML/large matrix ExaBayes/small matrix RAxML/small matrix ExaBayes. Squares indicate maximum support in all four analyses. Nemertean lineages shown in color/shades. Photos are of representatives of the different lineages of nemerteans: (a) Palaeonemertea (Tubulanus rhadatus), (b) Hubrechtidae (Hubrechtella ijimai), (c) Heteronemertea (Cerebratulus leucopsis), (d) Hoplonemertea, Polystilifera (Drepanophorus spectabilis), and (e) Hoplonemertea, Monostilifera (Tetrastemmatidae sp.).

FIG. 3. Unrooted SuperQ ML splits network for the large data matrix. Colors/shades are as in figure 2.

Smith et al. 2011; Struck et al. 2011; Hartmann et al. 2012; von Reumont et al. 2012; Fernández, Hormiga, et al. 2014; Fernández, Laumer, et al. 2014). This is not without controversy, and several aspects have been identified that negatively impact phylogenomic reconstructions, perhaps foremost, gene occupancy (missing data) (Roure et al. 2013), taxon sampling (Pick et al. 2010), and quality of data (both for paralogy, ortholog prediction, and exogenous contamination).
(Philippe et al. 2011; Salichos and Rokas 2011). In addition, issues of concatenation (Salichos and Rokas 2013) and model selection (Lartillot and Philippe 2008) have also been identified as possible pitfalls for phylogeny reconstruction in a phylogenomics framework. Finally, it has been shown that conflict may exist between classes of genes and some have proposed the use of slow-evolving genes to resolve deep metazoan splits (Nosenko et al. 2013). These issues have been recently analyzed in detail in two studies on arachnid phylogeny (Fernandez, Hormiga, et al. 2014; Sharma et al. 2014), and we follow the same basic strategy explored there. First, we have minimized the amount of missing data and worked with one of the most complete phylogenomic matrices for nonmodel organisms, with gene completeness between 78% and 95%. Given our levels of missing data and matrix completeness, it is unlikely that our well-supported results are a consequence of a problem with gene occupancy or missing data. Likewise, taxon sampling has been optimized to represent all major nemertean lineages, including a representative of each of the three main groups of Palaeonemertea, Hubrechtidae, the two main clades of Heteronemertea, and within Hoplonemertea, both Polystilifera and Monostilifera. No major hypothesis on nemertean phylogenetics thus remains untested with our sampling, although it would be desirable to add a second hubrechtid species to further test the Pilidiophora hypothesis (Thollesson and Norenburg 2003), a clade supported by the pilidium larva and the striking way the juvenile worm develops inside the larva from a series of isolated rudiments, called the imaginal discs (Maslakova 2010a, 2010b), and other synapomorphies, such as proboscis musculature (Chernyshev et al. 2013) and caudal cirrus and dermal musculature (Chernyshev et al. 2013). Orthology prediction is another important issue in phylogenomic analysis, and we have followed an automated methodology (see Materials and Methods). Given the strong similarity of our results to Sanger-based phylogenies, we have no reason to suspect that the support obtained for our relationships is artifactual.

An issue remains untested with our data set, the effects of concatenation, and gene incongruence among data partitions (Jeffroy et al. 2006; Nosenko et al. 2013; Salichos and Rokas 2013). These authors question the exclusive reliance on concatenation, and argue that selecting genes with strong phylogenetic signals and demonstrating the absence of significant incongruence are essential for accurately reconstructing ancient divergences. This idea contrasts with the basic premises of phylogenetic inference and the additive nature of signal versus the nonadditive signal of noise (Wenzel and Siddall 1999), and it has been suggested that the conclusions reached by Salichos and Rokas (2013) about the higher levels of incongruence and lower phylogenetic signal reported for conserved genes are due to sampling error and not necessarily due to conflict (Betancur-R. et al. 2014).

Detecting incongruence between large numbers of genes is empirically difficult, and gene tree approaches (Edwards et al. 2007; Liu et al. 2008, 2009) can account for the discordance between gene trees and species trees (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006). These methods are now routinely applied to multilocus data sets as an alternative to concatenation: However, in both empirical and theoretical applications of this paradigm, data sets analyzed are almost always for closely related species or multiple individuals per species (Degnan and Rosenberg 2006; Heled and Drummond 2010; McCormack et al. 2011; Satler et al. 2011). This is not our case, where hundreds or thousands of species could be placed between any two terminals included in our phylogeny, and thus the expectation that genes would coalesce prior to the bifurcating event tends to zero. In addition, our protein-encoding, transcriptomic-based phylogeny is highly similar to previous hypotheses on nemertean phylogenetics using a much smaller set of genes (Thollesson and Norenburg 2003; Andrade et al. 2012; Kvist et al. 2014)—none of which were included in this study—thus supporting the idea that our results are not artifactual. Our hypothesis is also 100% compatible with a mitogenomics hypothesis, although with much more limited sampling (Chen et al. 2012), again, stressing the congruence between such three disparate data sets.

In summary, our analytical approach using the presented tools seems appropriate for resolving the phylogenetic relationships among nemerteans. We found strong support for the monophyly of the phylum, as well as for its constituent clades Palaeonemertea, Neonemertea, Pilidiophora, Heteronemertea, Hoplonemertea, Monostilifera, Cratenemertea, and Distromatonemertea, all with maximal support, stability to model and method selection, and with high gene support frequency. Hubrechtidae and Polystilifera are represented by a single species and therefore their monophyly is untested in this study, but unlikely to be disrupted according to prior morphological and molecular work. With a phylogenomic approach we are able to infer a stable tree for nemerteans in contrast to Sanger-sequencing approaches, which failed to resolve some relationships, demonstrating the feasibility and utility of phylogenomics for neglected, but nonetheless unique, phyla.

**Materials and Methods**

**Species Selection**

After identifying all the major nemertean lineages, we obtained live specimens for approximately 30 nemertean species and selected 12 of these for sequencing after examination of RNA quality and cDNA library quality. RNA was extracted from specimens frozen in liquid nitrogen or from RNAlater-preserved specimens. Tissues preserved in RNAlater were processed as soon as possible to avoid RNA degradation.

Outgroup selection was based on recent phylogenomic studies (Dunn et al. 2008; Hejnol et al. 2009; Struck et al. 2014) which placed Nemertea in a clade with Brachiopoda, Annelida, and Mollusca in the larger Trochozoa (Hejnol et al. 2009). Based on this evidence and data availability, the following eight representatives were selected as outgroups: Four molluscs (Chiton olivaceus, Octopus vulgaris, Gadila tolmiei, and Ennucula tenuis) and four annelids, including a sipunculan (Sipunculus nudus, Hormogaster samnitica, Helobdella robusta, and Capitella teleta).
Specimen vouchers, leftover tissues, as well as RNA and DNA are deposited in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, either in the collections of the Department of Invertebrate Zoology or in the Cryogenic collection. Specimen details are available online at MCZbase (http://mczbase.mcz.harvard.edu, last accessed September 7, 2014). Accession numbers for the sequence data specimens are provided on the supplementary table S1, Supplementary Material online.

**Molecular Techniques**

**RNA Extraction**

Tissues were preserved in at least ten volumes of RNA later soon after the animals were collected; if sent to the laboratory alive, animals were flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen. All samples were stored at 80°C until RNA was extracted. Tissues were cut into pieces ranging from 0.25 to 0.5 cm in thickness, except for tissues of *Cep. hongkongiensis*, *P. beebei*, and *Hu. ijimai*, which were not subsampled due to small size. Total RNA was extracted using Tri-Reagent (Ambion), following the manufacturer’s instructions. Subsequent mRNA purification was performed with the Dynabeads mRNA Purification Kit for mRNA (Invitrogen). Purification from Total RNA preps followed the manufacturer’s protocol. Quantity and quality (purity and integrity) of mRNA were assessed by two different methods. Quantity of mRNA was assessed with the fluorometric quantitation performed by the Qubit dsDNA High Sensitivity (HS) Assay Kit using the Qubit Fluorometer (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA). The quality of the library and size selection were checked using the “HS DNA assay” in a DNA chip for an Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies). All samples sequenced on Illumina GAII had 150 bp read length. Details on the sequencing method (if paired or single-end) and number of raw and processed reads are presented in table 1.

**Quantitative and Quality Control of mRNA**

Quantity and quality (purity and integrity) of mRNA were assessed by two different methods. Quantity of mRNA was measured with the fluorometric quantitation performed by the Qubit Fluorometer (Invitrogen, CA). Also, capillary electrophoresis in an RNA Pico 6000 chip was done using an Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 System with the “HS DNA assay” in a DNA chip for an Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies, CA). Integrity of mRNA was estimated by the electropherogram profile and lack of rRNA contamination (based on rRNA peaks for 18S and 28S rRNA given by the Bioanalyzer software).

**Illumina Sequencing**

Next-generation sequencing was performed using the Illumina platform Genome Analyzer GAII (Illumina, Inc, San Diego, CA). Each library was run in a full lane at the FAS Center for Systems Biology at Harvard University. mRNA concentrations between 20.1 and 53.4 ng/µl were used for cDNA synthesis, which was performed following methods published elsewhere (Riesgo, Perez-Porro, et al. 2012). The Illumina samples were prepared with the NEBNext mRNA Sample Prep kit (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA). cDNA was ligated to Illumina adapters, as described earlier (Riesgo, Andrade, et al. 2012). Size-selected cDNA fragments of around 300 bp excised from a 2% agarose gel were amplified using Illumina polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers for paired-end reads (Illumina, Inc.) and 18 cycles of the PCR program consisting of 98°C—30 s, 98°C—10 s, 65°C—30 s, and 72°C—30 s, followed by an extension step of 5 min at 72°C. The concentration of the cDNA libraries was measured with the Qubit dsDNA High Sensitivity (HS) Assay Kit using the Qubit Fluorometer (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA). The quality of the library and size selection were checked using the “HS DNA assay” in a DNA chip for an Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies). All samples sequenced on Illumina GAII had 150 bp read length. Details on the sequencing method (if paired or single-end) and number of raw and processed reads are presented in table 1.
therefore, an inflation value of 2.0 was selected, which is within the range of inflation parameters used in similar studies. Clusters with at least 15 taxa ( > 75% gene occupancy) were aligned by using MAFFT L-INS-i v.7.149b (Katoh et al. 2005; Katoh and Toh 2008), followed by trimming with TrimAl v1.2 to account for alignment uncertainty, with gap threshold of 80% and conserving a minimum of 20% of the original alignment (Capella-Gutiérrez et al. 2009). After trimming, we obtained, for each partition, one ML phylogenetic tree with RAxML v.7.7.5 (Stamatakis 2006). In this analysis, we applied 50 rapid bootstraps and PROTGAMMALG as evolution model.

Monophyly masking was conducted to reduce the number of monophyletic sequences from the same taxon to one sequence. The resultant 2,779 phylogenies from the previous step were then analyzed by an iterative paralogy pruning procedure using PhyloTreePruner (http://sourceforge.net/projects/phylotreepruner/, last accessed September 7, 2014), by which maximally inclusive subtrees with no more than one sequence per taxon were pruned and retained. FASTA-formatted files were generated from subtrees that were produced by the paralogy pruning procedure. These files were then aligned with MAFFT-INS-i v.7.149b, trimmed with trimAl, and concatenated into the final matrices.

### Phylogenetic Analyses

We conducted the phylogenetic analyses with two matrices: 1) A large matrix with 2,779 orthogroups (genes) including 411,138 aligned amino acid positions and with a 78% gene occupancy and 2) a reduced matrix with 464 genes, 82,012 amino acid positions, and 95% gene occupancy. Both matrices (summarized in fig. 1) were analyzed using the same methods.

An ML analysis was conducted using RAxML v.7.7.5 (Stamatakis 2006). The best-fit model of amino acid evolution per partition was estimated by ProtTest 3.4 (Darriba et al. 2011), using the corrected Akaike Information Criterion. The most frequent model of evolution, LG (2,255 of 2,779 partitions in the large matrix and 401 of 464 in the reduced matrix) was used as base model as long with the “partition.txt” input for the ML analysis. Due to the outperformance of the flexible LG4X model, which can provide gains of up to hundreds of log-likelihood units and seems better adjusted for the complexity of amino acid replacements and more efficient than models which use single replacement matrices (Le et al. 2012), we ran two preliminary tests with the large matrix, using LG and LG4X as main models. Best-scoring ML trees were inferred for each gene under the selected model (with the gamma model of rate variation, but no invariant term) from 100 replicates of parsimony starting trees. In total, 160 traditional (nonrapid) bootstrap replicates for the large matrix and 200 for the reduced matrix were also inferred. To draw the bipartition information on the best tree given by RAxML, we used its function “-f b” along with “-t” based on multiple trees (provided by the bootstrap output file).

Bayesian inference was conducted with ExaBayes version 1.3 (The Exelixis Lab, http://sco.h-its.org/exelixis/web/software/exabayes/, last accessed September 7, 2014). ExaBayes is a Bayesian phylogenetic tool that implements Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling approach similar to the one implemented in MrBayes (Ronquist et al. 2012). It is however better adapted for large data sets by its ability to parallelize each independent run, each chain, and the data (i.e., unique site patterns of the alignment). We used the revMat model prior, which integrates over amino acid general time reversible matrices (189 free parameters). Two and five independent MCMC chains, for 1,000,000 generations each, were run for the reduced and large matrices, respectively. The first 100,000 trees (10%) were discarded as burn-in for each MCMC run prior to convergence (i.e., when maximum discrepancies across chains <0.1).

### Gene Tree Analyses

To investigate potential incongruence between individual gene trees, we followed three different approaches for both matrices. First, Salichos and Rokas (2013) stressed the need of choosing genes with strong phylogenetic signals for accurately reconstructing ancient divergences. These can be derived from the bootstrap support from the inferred trees, a measurement called “internode certainty,” which estimates the level of conflict among internodes. To calculate the “internode certainty,” the function -L from RAxML was implemented and the relative tree certainty (from now on, TC) was calculated. TC is the sum of all internode certainty (IC) scores for all trees, which is computed by taking all conflicting bipartitions that have ≥5% support into account, where a TC = 1 means no conflict among internodes. Second, we employed SuperQ v.1.1 (Grünwald et al. 2013) to visualize predominant intergenic conflict. Here the gene trees were decomposed into quartets, and a supernetwork assigning edge lengths based on the quartet frequencies was inferred from these quartets selecting the “balanced” edge-weight optimization function, with no filter (see Fernández, Laumer, et al. 2014). Finally, we employed Conclustator v.0.4a (Leigh et al. 2011), using the default settings as an automated incongruence-detection algorithm using the bootstrap tree files from ML. In order to visualize the networks from the latter two approaches results, we used SplitsTree v.4.13.1 (Huson and Bryant 2006).

### Supplementary Material

Supplementary table S1 is available at Molecular Biology and Evolution online (http://www.mbe.oxfordjournals.org/).

### Acknowledgments

Many colleagues have assisted with fieldwork, specimens, and laboratory protocols. FedEx is acknowledged for the constant delivery of live nemertans for RNA work and Robert Mesibov for Tasmanian specimens. Alicia Rodríguez Pérez Porro and Ana Riesgo were instrumental in the development of the RNA and Illumina sequencing protocols. S.C.S.A. is indebted to Casey Dunn for guidance during the first steps on bioinformatics and cDNA libraries sample preparation. The Bauer Core from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard...
and the Research Computing Group, also from Harvard, are deeply acknowledged for their assistance at many stages of the data acquisition and analyses. Marcelo Brandão and the Bioinformatics Group at Esalq-Usp are acknowledged for access to the Cluster Thunder. This work was funded by the NSF projects Collaborative Research: Resolving old questions in Mollusca phylogenetics with new EST data and developing general phylogenomic tools (DEB-0844881) and Collaborative Research: ATol: Phylogeny on the half-shell—Assembling the Bivalve Tree of Life (DEB-0732903) to G.G. and by a FAPESP scholarship (2012/02906-4) to H.M.

References


Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article-abstract/31/12/3206/2925666 by guest on 24 November 2018


