

# Ecological patterns of genome size variation in salamanders

Bianca Sclavi <sup>1\*</sup> and John Herrick <sup>2\*\*</sup>

Author affiliations:

1. LBPA, UMR 8113, ENS de Cachan, Cachan, France
2. Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, British Columbia V5A 1S6, Canada

\* Corresponding author

\*\* Corresponding author at 3, rue des Jeûneurs, 75002 Paris, France.

E-mail addresses: jhenryherrick@yahoo.fr (J. Herrick), sclavi@lbpa.ens-cachan.fr (B. Sclavi).

*Abstract:* Salamanders (urodela) have among the largest vertebrate genomes, ranging in size from 10 to over 80 pg. The urodela are divided into ten extant families each with a characteristic range in genome size. Although changes in genome size often occur randomly and in the absence of selection pressure, non-random patterns of genome size variation are evident among specific vertebrate lineages. Here we report that genome size in salamander families varies inversely with species richness and other ecological factors: clades that began radiating earlier (older crown age) tend to have smaller genomes, higher levels of diversity and larger geographical ranges. These observations support the hypothesis that urodel families with larger genomes either have a lower propensity to diversify or are more vulnerable to extinction than families with smaller genomes.

## *Introduction*

Genome size in vertebrates varies more than two hundred fold from 0,4 picograms (pg) in pufferfish to over 120 pg in lungfish (*I*). Evolution of genome size is believed to be due to the non-adaptive consequences of genetic drift with most if not all of the variation corresponding to differences in non-coding DNA such as transposable elements (2-4). Genome size therefore reflects the balance between the passive gain and loss of neutral or nearly neutral DNA sequences during the course of evolution (5). This balance is related to the effective population size, with genome size tending to increase inversely with the effective population size (4, 6).

In contrast, non-neutral changes in genome size are expected to coincide with speciation events. One recent proposal suggests that speciation events occur as a result of relatively rapid amplifications in genome size followed by long periods of slow DNA loss (7). According to this scenario, speciation corresponds primarily to the acquisition of new genes and new regulatory sequences. Expansions in genome size beyond a certain level, however, are considered maladaptive (8). Phylogenetic lineages in plants with large genomes, for example, correlate with low levels of species-richness (9).

In amphibians, biodiversity generally depends on latitude: the highest biodiversity occurs in amphibian families located near the equator (10). The latitudinal gradient has been attributed to differences in speciation and extinction rates between the tropics and temperate zones (11). Lineages near the tropics have higher than expected rates of speciation and lower than expected rates of extinction, while the reverse was found for lineages occupying temperate zones (11). Rates of diversification therefore increase along the latitudinal gradient resulting in higher species richness towards the equator.

To date, some 655 salamander species have been identified and grouped into ten distinct families. Although salamander families tend to be poor in the number of species they contain, some salamander families such as the Plethodontidae have exceptionally high levels of diversity (12). The Bolitoglossinae and Plethodontinae lineages are the two most species rich genera in the Plethodontidae (8), while the Bolitoglossinae account for most of the species diversity among salamanders in the tropics (12). The latitudinal gradient in salamander species richness remains unexplained, but ecological factors such as environmental energy and carrying capacity are believed to play important roles in promoting species diversity (13, 14).

Life history traits such as body size and generation time have also been invoked to explain variations in species richness (15, 16). Although life history traits frequently correlate with species richness (17), the exact nature of the relationship remains unclear. Physiology, which is closely related to life history traits, is also an important factor in determining a species adaptive response to the environment. Salamanders, for example, have very low metabolic rates compared to other vertebrates (12).

One of the principal factors influencing life history traits in salamanders is their exceptionally large genomes compared to other vertebrates (18, 19). Cell size is tightly correlated with the amount of nuclear DNA in the genome (20), and exceptionally large cells have imposed constraints on salamander development and physiology (19, 21). Large cells in salamanders, for example, resulted in simplified brains (22). Large genomes, via their impact on cell size, can also have a pronounced effect on metabolic rate (23), which might explain the low metabolic rates found in salamanders.

Although variations in genome size primarily reflect neutral or non-adaptive mutational processes, genome size clearly has an effect on other traits that are likely subject to and influenced by natural selection. Developmental time in Plethodontidae, for example, is positively correlated with genome size (24). The influence of genome size on species richness and rates of speciation in vertebrates, however, remains an open question. In the following, we address the relationship between genome size, species richness and evolutionary age in salamanders, and examine how these and other parameters such as area and climatic niche rate interact in influencing the course of salamander evolution.

*Significance:* We found a pronounced negative correlation between genome size and species richness across the ten salamander families. Similar correlations are observed between genome size and geographical range, clade age (crown age) and niche rate. These observations therefore relate the effects of time, area and niche heterogeneity on genome size, and suggest that species with smaller genomes in salamanders have

an adaptive advantage over larger species in a time dependent, area dependent and niche dependent manner.

Why does genome size in salamanders vary with species richness and its ecological and evolutionary correlates? Genome size in salamanders has been found to vary with a number of life history and physiological traits. Salamanders, which frequently inhabit anoxic habitats and habitats with low oxygen tension, have very low metabolic rates compared to other vertebrates. Likewise, a strong positive correlation between genome size and developmental rate has been demonstrated in the Plethodontidae. We propose a hypothesis according to which speciation events in salamanders are associated with and promoted by reductions in genome size via a selective advantage conferred by increased developmental rates, while at the same time genome sizes across salamander species remain exceptionally large due to advantages conferred by low metabolic rates in environments with low oxygen tension

## Results

*C-value is negatively correlated with species richness.*

The origin of urodela dates from 155 to 170 Mya (25). Urodela inhabit a wide variety of ecological niches and exhibit a large diversity of life history traits, including small and large body sizes, paedomorphy, neoteny, metamorphosis and direct development (12). In an earlier study in amphibia, Pyron and Wiens revealed a number of ecological correlates between species richness and variables such as geographical latitude, environmental energy and climatic niche rate (11). Species richness in frogs, salamanders and caecilians also varies according to abiotic factors such as humidity and temperature (niche composition), and biotic factors such as productivity and rates of diversification (extinction and speciation). Figure 1 shows the phylogenetic tree from Pyron and Wiens that was used here to investigate the relationship between genome size in salamanders and these ecological factors (26).

We examined genome size variation in salamanders as a function of the different parameters from the Pyron and Wiens dataset, and C-values from the Animal Genome Size Database (1). We found a strong correlation between genome size and species richness that appears to divide salamanders into two broad classes in a genome size dependent manner (Figure 2A). We controlled for phylogeny using independent contrasts (27, 28), and found that this division of salamander families into two distinct classes is due to genome size and not to phylogenetic relatedness (Figure 2BC).

Indeed, some sister taxa have widely different genome sizes and differing species richness despite being most closely related (Figure 1). The Hynobidae, for example, have the smallest average C-value while their sister taxon the Cryptobranchidae have much larger genomes and correspondingly lower species richness. Likewise, the Amphiumidae have among the largest salamander genomes and very low species richness, whereas their sister taxon the Plethodontidae have among the smallest average C-value and the highest species richness. The sister taxa Ambystomatidae and Dicamptodontidae exhibit a similar trend between genome size and species richness. We conclude that genome size is a factor that negatively impacts species richness in salamander families.

### *Ecological correlates with genome size: time*

Assuming a nearly constant rate of speciation, species richness is expected to increase over time (29, 30). Older families should therefore contain proportionally more species. Conversely, the older the family the more likely lineages will die out over time. Hence, extant species richness in a family reflects the balance between speciation and extinction events. Phylogenetic stem age corresponds to the time of origin of a given salamander family; and, consequently, older families have experienced longer periods of mutation and genome size evolution. Salamander genomes are exceptionally large among vertebrates because of a mutational insertion bias (31), suggesting that older families will passively accumulate more DNA than younger families. Consistent with other observations on stem age and species richness (32), we found no significant correlation between stem age and genome size (Figure 3A).

Crown age, in contrast, corresponds to the formation of a clade, and hence to the beginning of an adaptive radiation. The longer the clade has existed the more time has passed for new species to appear in the clade (30). Similarly, the more species a clade contains the greater the likelihood of new speciation events (Yule-Simon process). Older clades (crown age) should therefore contain proportionally more species. Figure 3B shows a strong negative correlation ( $r^2 = 0.63$ ) between average genome size and the phylogenetic crown age in the different urodela families. Older clades are therefore associated with smaller genome sizes on average. This observation is consistent with the finding that families with smaller genomes tend to be more species rich, and thus suggests that families with smaller genomes might experience more extensive adaptive radiations.

An examination of Figure 3A supports this suggestion at least at the family level. The family Sirenidae have the oldest stem age at 199.5 Mya, and an average genome size that corresponds approximately to the median size of the ten families (50 pg). The Cryptobranchidae, which have a stem age of 164.5 Mya, also have a genome size that is approximately the median value (50 pg; Figure 3A). The two distinct classes of salamander families evident in Figure 2A and 3A correspond to the obligate paedomorphs including the Sirenidae, Cryptobranchidae, Proteidae and Amphiumidae, which have genome sizes larger than 50 pg on average, whereas families comprising metamorphic, facultative paedomorphs and direct developing species tend to have average genome sizes that are less than 50 pg. We propose these two distinct classes represent different evolutionary trajectories at the family level that correspond to different modes of genome size evolution: expansion and contraction.

### *Ecological correlates with genome size: area*

Figure 3C shows a strong relationship between C-value and geographical area: lineages with smaller genome sizes occupy larger geographical areas. The Hynobidae, with the smallest average genome size, inhabit the broadest geographical range with the exception of the Salamandridae, which span the largest area (over 14,000,000 Km<sup>2</sup>). Similarly, the Ambystomatidae and the Plethodontidae, which have average C-values of about 30 pg, occupy extensive areas of significantly different sizes:

11,000,000 and 7,000,000 Km<sup>2</sup>, respectively. Families with smaller genomes (< 50 pg) therefore exhibit a 2X difference in the respective areas they inhabit.

In contrast, families with genome sizes greater than or equal to 50 pg appear to be restricted to areas that have approximately the same range (2,000,000 Km<sup>2</sup>). Among these families the Proteidae occupy the largest geographical area (3,000,000). This area is significantly smaller than the area occupied by the Plethodontidae (7,000,000), which is the smallest area occupied by salamanders with C-values < 50 pg. Hence, a 2X difference in area exists between families with larger genomes compared to families with smaller genomes.

These observations indicate that dispersal in salamanders with genome sizes  $\geq 50$  pg is severely restricted compared to families with smaller genomes. A restricted geographical area might explain the lower species richness in salamander families with larger genomes; or conversely, an intrinsically lower species richness might have imposed a constraint on the extent of a family's dispersal. Comparing the similarity of Figure 2A and Figure 3C, area appears to be the ecological correlate that best accounts for a family's species richness. These two parameters were previously found to correlate independently of phylogeny for all amphibia (11), which is consistent with the phylogenetic independence of the correlation between genome size and species richness (see Figure 2). Together, these results support the proposal that genome size has a negative impact on species richness that is related to habitat range and diversity.

#### *Genome size is not correlated with latitude*

We next examined the relationship between latitude and genome size. Although latitude does not correlate with genome size, a pattern between genome size and latitude is nonetheless apparent (Figure 3D). Six of the ten salamander families inhabit the same range of latitudes between thirty-one and thirty-eight degrees from the equator. Two, Rhyacotritonidae and Dicamptodontidae, inhabit more elevated latitudes in a narrow range between forty and fort-six degrees in the Pacific Northwest.

The Ambystomatidae and Plethodontidae, in contrast, inhabit relatively lower latitudes ranging from twenty-nine to twenty-two degrees (Figure 3D), indicating a distribution skewed more toward Southwest North America and the tropics. These values are averages; and they therefore correspond to a wide range of latitudes comprising diverse biomes and ecosystems. With the exception of the Amphiumidae, the four outliers nevertheless have similar stem ages, and are younger than the six mid-latitude families (125 Mya versus 165 Mya). The lower latitudes occupied by the Plethodontidae correspond to the adaptive radiation of the Bolitoglossinae situated in the tropics (33).

Chryptobranchidae and Sirenidae represent the median genome size, and are located in Figure 3D at thirty-one and thirty-five degrees latitude, respectively. In this range of latitudes average genome size varies the most: between 20 and 80 pg. In contrast, genome size at higher latitudes varies from 60 to 70 pg between the Rhyacotritonidae and the Dicamptodontidae, while it varies by about 10 % (30 to 35 pg) between the Ambystomatidae and the Plethodontidae at the lower latitudes. The large variation in

genome size at middle latitudes most likely reflects the temperate origin of the ancestor of the ten extant salamander families (12, 33), which is consistent with their older stem ages compared to the four outlying families. Hence, salamander families of more recent origin occupy outlying latitudes North and South of the older families.

Although the Ambystomatidae, Plethodontidae, Rhyacotritonidae and Dicoamptodontidae all have similar stem ages, they differ significantly in terms of species richness (26). Consistent with a latitudinal gradient, the latter two are significantly less speciose than the Ambystomatidae and Plethodontidae. Average genome size, likewise, is nearly 2X larger than Plethodontidae or Ambystomatidae. Conversely, the Hynobidae and Salamandridae occupy similar latitudes in temperate zones; but have similar levels of species richness, suggesting that genome size is more closely associated with levels of species richness than either latitude or stem age.

#### *Ecological correlates with genome size: niche rate and temperature*

With the exception of latitude, the ecological factors examined above are all related and interact with each other in a phylogenetically independent manner. If the process of competitive exclusion operates geographically as well as ecologically (34), then the area that a family occupies will naturally increase as species richness increases. Similarly, larger areas are expected to have higher habitat diversity, and consequently clades with higher species richness should reflect higher niche rates (35). Niche rate refers to climatic changes in a given area over time, and is therefore believed to be related to niche breadth and heterogeneity (variance in niche-width). There should be then a definite relationship between the parameters of time, area and habitat diversity that acts to promote increases in species richness in a genome size dependent manner.

Consistent with salamander families of smaller C-values and higher species diversity occupying larger geographical areas, genome size is negatively correlated with climatic niche rate. Figure 4A shows a more uniform distribution between genome size and niche rate with the exception of the Ambystomatidae, which have niche rates of nearly 2X that of families with similar genome sizes (< 50 pg). This indicates that other lineage-specific effects, for example narrower niches in the tropics (36), impact adaptive radiations. Despite these and other important lineage dependent factors, genome size nevertheless appears to influence niche rate in salamanders, suggesting that species with smaller genomes are more adaptable to climatic changes and fluctuations.

Interestingly, the Plethodontidae are the only family that exhibits a correlation of genome size with niche composition (abiotic factors of temperature and humidity). Using Pyron and Wien's data from their phylogenetically corrected principal component analysis (PCA) reveals that genome size in Plethodontidae (11), and only in that family, is negatively correlated with PC1 (see Figure 4B and Supplementary Figure 1), which is closely related to latitude and strongly dependent on temperature variables such as average annual temperature, temperature seasonality (negatively correlated with PC1) and temperature annual range (positively correlated with PC1). Moreover, PC1 shows a significant relationship with speciation and extinction rates. Within defined lineages, however, genome size does not appear to be correlated with PC1, perhaps because species within lineages such as the Bolitoglossinae and the

Desmognathinae have similar C-values and inhabit, respectively, similar climatic niches.

Why genome size in this family increases as annual average temperatures increase and temperature ranges decrease is unclear. We note, however, that the Bolitoglossinae are the salamander lineages that have most successfully invaded the tropics, and are the most species rich tribe of Plethodontidae. They also have among the largest average genome size compared to other Plethodontidae and the slowest temperature seasonality niche rates and the narrowest niche breadths (36), which is believed to promote species richness via niche divergence (37). We conclude that in the Plethodontidae larger genome sizes and higher species richness correspond to more stable and higher average seasonal temperatures.

## Discussion

The correlations between genome size, crown age and species richness suggests that time for speciation accounts for the observed species diversity in each family: older clades consistently have more species, and began radiating earlier relative to stem age than do less speciose clades (Figure 4BC). No correlation, in contrast, exists between stem age and C-value (Figure 3A), suggesting that clade age and time to speciation rather than family age account for differences in genome size and species diversity between salamander families. Notably, the more speciose families correspond to adaptive radiations that began earlier with respect to the family's stem age (Figure 4BC), indicating that the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of the species in those families might have had a higher propensity to speciate than the MRCA of species in families with the larger genomes.

Two possible interpretations, among others, might explain the observation that families with crown ages nearest to their stem ages tend to be more speciose (Figure 4C). First, these families have been speciating longer relative to stem age, and changes in genome size have either enhanced or diminished speciation events. The Hynobidae and Cryptobranchidae, for example, have the same stem age, being sister taxa; but the Cryptobranchidae have younger crown ages, which suggests the Cryptobranchidae experienced a long period of evolutionary stasis before they began diverging (Figure 1). Consistent with this proposal, morphological traits in salamanders are evolving at a rate that is correlated with species richness: families experiencing slower evolving phenotypic traits are correspondingly less speciose (38), which might reflect a long period of evolutionary stasis before adaptive radiation began.

Conversely, the Hynobidae experienced an earlier adaptive radiation relative to the time when the two lineages diverged, and have been diverging for some 60 million years longer than the Cryptobranchidae (134.7 vs. 67 Mya). The earlier Hynobidae radiation might therefore have been associated with a reduction in genome sizes, which could explain the smaller average C-value in this family compared to its sister taxon, the Cryptobranchidae. Deciding between these two scenarios depends on the MRCA's genome size at the time the two lineages diverged, but whether the MRCA had a larger or smaller genome relative to the sister taxa leads to the same conclusion: reductions in genome size either promote species richness by enhancing rates of

speciation (or by slowing extinction rates), or amplifications in genome size diminish species richness by slowing speciation rates (or by increasing extinction rates).

The second, related interpretation concerns rates of molecular evolution and diversification. We found a weaker negative correlation between species diversification rates and C-value (not shown), but diversification rates reflect both speciation and extinction rates. Which of these two factors principally influences current species richness is difficult to assess. Nevertheless, extant species diversity is likely to decrease if the family is not evolving fast enough (with sufficiently high speciation rates) to compensate for the probability of extinction, which increases over time.

According to this interpretation, the younger crown age in species with larger genomes reflects instead slower evolutionary rates in those families rather than more recent adaptive radiations: either the emergence of distinct species took longer in families with larger genomes, or the emergence of distinct species occurred earlier and faster in families with smaller genomes. This interpretation is consistent with a mechanistic interaction between genome size, molecular rates of evolution and extant species richness.

The Plethodontidae represent an exception to these two alternative interpretations. The Plethodontidae have the highest species richness and the largest range in genome size (10 pg to over 70 pg). Moreover, tribes with larger genomes such as the Bolitoglossinae and Plethodontinae are also more speciose than other tribes with smaller genomes (26). Thus, at the genus level in Plethodontidae no clear correlations, either positive or negative, exist between genome size and species richness (not shown). Interestingly, among the Plethodontidae, family niche width explains variations in diversification rates more substantially than does species niche width (37), indicating that these diverse effects on species richness (genome size and niche width) are apparent primarily at the family rather than the genus level.

The observation of larger variances in genome size and species richness in Plethodontidae is consistent with our earlier reported finding of a larger variance in mutation rates in the *rag1* gene within the Plethodontidae compared to the other salamander families (39). Hence, the Plethodontidae are the most species rich family and have the highest variance in both genome sizes and mutation rates compared to the other salamander families. Indeed, the previous study on mutation rates showed that the Bolitoglossinae have some of the fastest rates of evolution at the molecular level (*rag1*); while the Desmognathinae, with some of the smallest genome sizes, have rates of molecular evolution that are substantially less than tribes with larger C-values. These observations on the variance in rates of molecular evolution and genome size in salamanders remain, however, to be confirmed by more extensive studies concerning the impact of genome size on rates of molecular evolution.

These respective findings nevertheless suggest that rates of molecular evolution and speciation are correlated and could even influence each other. What might be the relationship between mutation rates, rates of speciation and species richness? Changes in genome size reflect *de facto* mutations that are the consequences of DNA repair mechanisms, transposon proliferation and other forms of genomic instability (3). The ancestral salamander genome was comparatively small-- approximately 3 pg, which is



similar to the average mammalian genome size (40). Salamanders have therefore experienced massive genome amplification during the course of evolution. Comparing Hynobidae and Cryptobranchidae, for example, suggests that these closely related families experienced significantly different mutation rates as they evolved, and that these different rates influence the different levels of species richness in these two families. The relationship between mutation rate and speciation rate remains, however, a point of considerable controversy (41-44).

Genome size changes according to non-adaptive and neutral mutational processes. Genome size, however, influences a number of life history traits on which natural selection can act (24). We propose here that genome size, in influencing developmental and metabolic rates in addition to other physiologically relevant parameters, confers a selective advantage or disadvantage that can either promote species richness or undermine it depending on the ecological context.

Vertebrate species such as urodela differ more in their respective amounts of non-coding DNA than in their respective number of genes: the C-value enigma (45, 46). The species specific differences in non-coding DNA therefore distinguishes species perhaps as much as differences in their coding DNA possibly by promoting/enhancing reproductive isolation. We propose that the wide variation in non-coding DNA in eukaryotic genomes implies that non-coding DNA plays a potential role in the mechanisms of speciation and rates of species divergence. In that regard, the distinction made between neutral and adaptive mutations might be more of heuristic rather than explanatory value in interpreting mutation rates and their impact on genome evolution and architecture.

Evidence is emerging in support of such a view. Genetic drift, via the insertion and deletion of neutral DNA, modifies the chromatin and mutational context of genes both across species and during development, and provides the raw material, molecularly and physiologically, on which natural selection can operate for improving overall organism and species fitness (47, 48). A recent hypothesis proposes that variations in intra-genomic mutation rates, which are mediated by DNA replication timing and chromatin context (heterochromatin versus euchromatin), can explain gene positions according to gene ontology in a manner that reflects the kinetics of differential DNA repair mechanisms (49). More recently a study, which confirms and extends earlier studies (50, 51), has demonstrated that gene ontology and gene age correlate with replication timing: genes of older origin replicate early, whereas more recently acquired genes replicate late, (52), which suggests they experience correspondingly higher rates of mutation.

Consequently, genetic drift can redirect natural selection and shape evolutionary trajectories that result in changes in genome size and genome organization. While most non-coding DNA has no explicit function and therefore is physiologically dispensable, its potential impact on mutation rates and gene positions within the genome might nevertheless influence, directly and indirectly, adaptation and species fitness in the ecological context. At the same time, a limit on genome size is apparent from the maladaptive effect of large genomes on species richness, presumably through its impact on life-history traits such as developmental times at both the cellular level (cell cycle duration and cell size) and at the organismal level (time to sexual maturity). We propose that salamanders and other vertebrates with

exceptionally large genomes are at their lowest permissible mutational and adaptive limits for rates of speciation (39).

Our principal conclusions are twofold: 1) genome size in salamanders correlates with a number of important ecological parameters such as niche rate and area; and 2) genome size influences species richness at the family level. Genome size is therefore responsive to these ecological factors, and in conjunction with these factors contributes to explaining species richness in the respective families. These findings indicate that while genome size evolves neutrally, the impact of genome size on species richness is non-random and constitutes a component in the array of phenotypes on which natural selection acts. The proposals advanced here are based more on argument at this point than evidence, but they can soon be put to the test after more eukaryotic genomes have been sequenced (53). The mystery of non-coding, junk DNA and what exactly it is doing in the genome will likely persist, however, for some time to come.

## Materials and methods

Genome sizes were obtained from the Animal Genome Size Database (1). The data on crown age, stem age, area, niche rate, latitude and PC1 were obtained from Pyron and Wiens (11). Independent contrasts were carried out in R using the ape library ([http://www.r-phylo.org/wiki/HowTo/Phylogenetic\\_Independent\\_Contrasts](http://www.r-phylo.org/wiki/HowTo/Phylogenetic_Independent_Contrasts)) based on the branch lengths of the tree shown in Figure 1 as obtained from the tree of Pyron and Wiens (26). The regression of the independent contrasts was forced through the origin.

## Acknowledgements

BS is supported by a grant from Human Frontier Science Program (RGY0079). JH benefited from support from John Bechhoefer's lab, Physics Department, Simon Fraser University.

## Figure legends

**Figure 1.** Phylogenetic tree of the ten urodela families obtained from Pyron and Wiens (26). The average C-value is shown next to the family name. The size of the triangle (black) is proportional to the number of species subtending the crown of each clade. The branch length is indicated by the scale bar. The letters denote the node identities used in the analysis of phylogenetically independent contrasts (see Figure 2). Six families form three sister-pair taxa: nodes i, f and b, which correspond to the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of the subtending families.

**Figure 2.** Species richness and C-value are negatively correlated at the family level in salamanders. A) Regression between species richness,  $\ln(\text{species})$ , and C-value revealing two distinct classes of salamander ( $> 50$  pg and  $< 50$  pg). B) Contrasts scaled using the expected variances: adjusted  $R^2$ : 0.71; P-value: 0.001; Slope: -10. C) Contrasts not scaled using the expected variances: adjusted  $R^2$ : 0.74; P-value: 0.0008; Slope: -9.8 Letters refer to nodes in the phylogenetic tree in Figure 1 that was used for calculating the contrasts.

**Figure 3.** Correlations between C-value and time and area. A) Regression of stem age on C-value reveals no correlation between family age and genome size for the ten named families. B) Regression of crown age (time) on C-value reveals a strong correlation between clade age and C-value ( $R^2 = 0.63$ ). C) Regression of area on C-value reveals a similarly strong correlation between the geographic ranges occupied by the ten families and their respective C-values ( $R^2 = 0.59$ ). D) Regression of latitude on C-value reveals no correlation between family genome size and geographic position. Note, however, that the species rich Ambysmatidae and Plethodontidae occupy lower latitudinal positions (22 to 28° N) while the Dicamptodontidae and Rhyacotritonidae, which have larger average C-values and lower species richness, occupy higher latitudinal positions (42 to 46° N). Most families occupy mid-latitude positions (32 to 36° N), reflecting the temperate origin of urodela.

**Figure 4.** Niche rate and evolutionary history (time between stem age and crown age). A) Regression of niche rate on C-value reveals a strong negative correlation between rates of climactic niche evolution and differences in genome size ( $R^2 = 0.43$ ). B) Regression of PC1 (temperature variables influencing climactic niche) on C-value in Plethodontidae ( $R^2 = 0.24$ ). C) Regression of temporal difference between stem age and crown age on species richness reveals that families experiencing longer periods of evolutionary and adaptive inertia are less species rich ( $R^2 = 0.68$ ). D) Regression of stem age vs. crown age on C-value reveals that families experiencing higher levels of evolutionary inertia tend to have larger genomes ( $R^2 = 0.61$ ). Figures 4C and 4D indicate that species richness and C-value are tightly coupled and negatively associated in urodela.


## References

1. T. R. Gregory. (<http://www.genomesize.com>, 2015).
2. J. S. Hawkins, H. Kim, J. D. Nason, R. Wing, J. F. Wendel, Differential lineage-specific amplification of transposable elements is responsible for genome size variation in *Gossypium*. *Genome research* **16**, 1252--1261 (2006).
3. C. Sun *et al.*, LTR retrotransposons contribute to genomic gigantism in plethodontid salamanders. *Genome Biol Evol* **4**, 168-183 (2012).
4. M. Lynch, J. S. Conery, The origins of genome complexity. *Science* **302**, 1401-1404 (2003).
5. M. J. Oliver, D. Petrov, D. Ackerly, P. Falkowski, O. M. Schofield, The mode and tempo of genome size evolution in eukaryotes. *Genome Res* **17**, 594-601 (2007).
6. M. Lynch, L.-M. Bobay, F. Catania, J.-F. Gout, M. Rho, The repatterning of eukaryotic genomes by random genetic drift. *Annual review of genomics and human genetics* **12**, 347--366 (2011).
7. Y. I. Wolf, E. V. Koonin, Genome reduction as the dominant mode of evolution. *Bioessays* **35**, 829-837 (2013).


8. C. J. Metcalfe, D. Casane, Accommodating the load: The transposable element content of very large genomes. *Mob Genet Elements* **3**, e24775 (2013).
9. C. A. Knight, N. A. Molinari, D. A. Petrov, The large genome constraint hypothesis: evolution, ecology and phenotype. *Ann Bot* **95**, 177-190 (2005).
10. E. J. Dowle, M. Morgan-Richards, S. A. Trewick, Molecular evolution and the latitudinal biodiversity gradient. *Heredity (Edinb)* **110**, 501-510 (2013).
11. R. A. Pyron, J. J. Wiens, Large-scale phylogenetic analyses reveal the causes of high tropical amphibian diversity. *Proc Biol Sci* **280**, 20131622 (2013).
12. D. Wake, What Salamanders have Taught Us about Evolution. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, 333-352 (2009).
13. D. L. Rabosky, Ecological limits and diversification rate: alternative paradigms to explain the variation in species richness among clades and regions. *Ecol Lett* **12**, 735-743 (2009).
14. D. L. Rabosky, Ecological limits on clade diversification in higher taxa. *Am Nat* **173**, 662-674 (2009).
15. N. J. Isaac, K. E. Jones, J. L. Gittleman, A. Purvis, Correlates of species richness in mammals: body size, life history, and ecology. *Am Nat* **165**, 600-607 (2005).
16. R. M. Bonett, M. A. Steffen, S. M. Lambert, J. J. Wiens, P. T. Chippindale, Evolution of paedomorphosis in plethodontid salamanders: ecological correlates and re-evolution of metamorphosis. *Evolution* **68**, 466-482 (2014).
17. J. M. Eastman, A. Storfer, Correlations of life-history and distributional-range variation with salamander diversification rates: evidence for species selection. *Syst Biol* **60**, 503-518 (2011).
18. A. Trochet *et al.*, A database of life-history traits of European amphibians. *Biodivers Data J*, e4123 (2014).
19. S. K. Sessions, A. Larson, Developmental correlates of genome size in plethodontid salamanders and their implications for genome evolution. *Evolution* **41**, 1239-1251 (1987).
20. T. Cavalier-Smith, Nuclear volume control by nucleoskeletal DNA, selection for cell volume and cell growth rate, and the solution of the DNA C-value paradox. *J Cell Sci* **34**, 247-278 (1978).
21. G. Roth, K. C. Nishikawa, D. B. Wake, Genome size, secondary simplification, and the evolution of the brain in salamanders. *Brain Behav Evol* **50**, 50-59 (1997).
22. G. Roth, J. Blanke, D. B. Wake, Cell size predicts morphological complexity in the brains of frogs and salamanders. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **91**, 4796-4800 (1994).
23. J. Kozłowski, M. Konarzewski, A. T. Gawelczyk, Cell size as a link between noncoding DNA and metabolic rate scaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **100**, 14080-14085 (2003).
24. E. Jockusch, An evolutionary correlate of genome size change in plethodontid salamanders. *Proc. R. Soc. Land. B* **264**, 597-604 (1997).
25. D. Marjanovic, M. Laurin, An updated paleontological timetree of lissamphibians with comments on the anatomy of Jurassic crown-group salamanders (Urodela). *Historical Biology: An International Journal of Paleobiology*, (2013).
26. R. A. Pyron, J. J. Wiens, A large-scale phylogeny of Amphibia including over 2800 species, and a revised classification of extant frogs, salamanders, and caecilians. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* **61**, 543-583 (2011).

27. J. Felsenstein, Comparative methods with sampling error and within-species variation: contrasts revisited and revised. *The American naturalist* **171**, 713--725 (2008).
28. F. J. Phylogeny and the Comparative Method. *Am. Nat.* **125**, 1-15 (1985).
29. J. J. Wiens, The causes of species richness patterns across space, time, and clades and the role of "ecological limits". *Q Rev Biol* **86**, 75-96 (2011).
30. M. A. McPeck, J. M. Brown, Clade age and not diversification rate explains species richness among animal taxa. *Am Nat* **169**, E97-106 (2007).
31. C. Sun, J. R. López Arriaza, R. L. Mueller, Slow DNA loss in the gigantic genomes of salamanders. *Genome Biol Evol* **4**, 1340-1348 (2012).
32. D. L. Rabosky, G. J. Slater, M. E. Alfaro, Clade age and species richness are decoupled across the eukaryotic tree of life. *PLoS Biol* **10**, e1001381 (2012).
33. J. J. Wiens, G. Parra-Olea, M. García-París, D. B. Wake, Phylogenetic history underlies elevational biodiversity patterns in tropical salamanders. *Proc Biol Sci* **274**, 919-928 (2007).
34. M. A. McPeck, Limiting factors, competitive exclusion, and a more expansive view of species coexistence. *Am Nat* **183**, iii-iv (2014).
35. K. H. Kozak, J. J. Wiens, Accelerated rates of climatic-niche evolution underlie rapid species diversification. *Ecol Lett* **13**, 1378-1389 (2010).
36. M. C. Fisher-Reid, K. H. Kozak, J. J. Wiens, How is the rate of climatic-niche evolution related to climatic-niche breadth? *Evolution* **66**, 3836-3851 (2012).
37. C. Gomez-Rodriguez, A. Baselga, J. J. Wiens, Is diversification rate related to climatic niche width? *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, (2014).
38. D. L. Rabosky, D. C. Adams, Rates of morphological evolution are correlated with species richness in salamanders. *Evolution* **66**, 1807-1818 (2012).
39. J. Herrick, B. Sclavi, A new look at genome size, evolutionary duration and genetic variation in salamanders. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* **13**, 611-615 (2014).
40. C. L. Organ, A. Canoville, R. R. Reisz, M. Laurin, Paleogenomic data suggest mammal-like genome size in the ancestral amniote and derived large genome size in amphibians. *J Evol Biol* **24**, 372-380 (2011).
41. X. Goldie, R. Lanfear, L. Bromham, Diversification and the rate of molecular evolution : no evidence of a link in mammals. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **11**, 286 (2011).
42. R. Lanfear, S. Y. Ho, D. Love, L. Bromham, Mutation rate is linked to diversification in birds. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**, 20423-20428 (2010).
43. C. Venditti, M. Pagel, Speciation as an active force in promoting genetic evolution. *Trends Ecol Evol* **25**, 14-20 (2010).
44. C. Venditti, M. Pagel, Plenty of room for punctuational change. *Trends Ecol Evol* **29**, 71-72 (2014).
45. S. Sessions, Evolutionary cytogenetics in salamanders. *Chromosome Res.* **16**, 183-201 (2008).
46. T. R. Gregory, The C-value enigma in plants and animals: a review of parallels and an appeal for partnership. *Ann Bot* **95**, 133-146 (2005).
47. J. Stamatoyannopoulos *et al.*, Human mutation rate associated with DNA replication timing. *Nat Genet* **41**, 393-395 (2009).
48. B. Schuster-Böckler, B. Lehner, Chromatin organization is a major influence on regional mutation rates in human cancer cells. *Nature* **488**, 504--507 (2012).

49. J. Herrick, Genetic variation and replication timing, or why is there late replicating DNA? *Evolution*, (2011).
50. C. Díaz-Castillo, K. G. Golic, Evolution of gene sequence in response to chromosomal location. *Genetics* **177**, 359-374 (2007).
51. J. H. Chuang, H. Li, Functional bias and spatial organization of genes in mutational hot and cold regions in the human genome. *PLoS Biol* **2**, E29 (2004).
52. D. Juan, D. Rico, T. Marques-Bonet, O. Fernández-Capetillo, A. Valencia, Late-replicating CNVs as a source of new genes. *Biol Open* **2**, 1402-1411 (2013).
53. O. Seehausen *et al.*, Genomics and the origin of species. *Nat Rev Genet* **15**, 176-192 (2014).




**Figure 1.** Phylogenetic tree of the ten urodela families obtained from Pyron and Wiens (26). The average C-value is shown next to the family name. The size of the triangle (black) is proportional to the number of species subtending the crown of each clade. The branch length is indicated by the scale bar. The letters denote the node identities used in the analysis of phylogenetically independent contrasts (see Figure 2). Six families form three sister-pair taxa: nodes i, f and b, which correspond to the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of the subtending families.




**Figure 2.** Species richness and C-value are negatively correlated at the family level in salamanders. A) Regression between species richness,  $\ln(\text{species})$ , and C-value revealing two distinct classes of salamander ( $> 50$  pg and  $< 50$  pg). B) Contrasts scaled using the expected variances: adjusted  $R^2$ : 0.71; P-value: 0.001; Slope: -10. C) Contrasts not scaled using the expected variances: adjusted  $R^2$ : 0.74; P-value: 0.0008; Slope: -9.8 Letters refer to nodes in the phylogenetic tree in Figure 1 that was used for calculating the contrasts.






**Figure 3.** Correlations between C-value and time and area. A) Regression of stem age on C-value reveals no correlation between family age and genome size for the ten named families. B) Regression of crown age (time) on C-value reveals a strong correlation between clade age and C-value ( $R^2 = 0.63$ ). C) Regression of area on C-value reveals a similarly strong correlation between the geographic ranges occupied by the ten families and their respective C-values ( $R^2 = 0.59$ ). D) Regression of latitude on C-value reveals no correlation between family genome size and geographic position. Note, however, that the species rich Ambysomatidae and Plethodontidae occupy lower latitudinal positions ( $22$  to  $28^\circ$  N) while the Dicamptodontidae and Rhyacotritonidae, which have larger average C-values and lower species richness, occupy higher latitudinal positions ( $42$  to  $46^\circ$  N). Most families occupy mid-latitude positions ( $32$  to  $36^\circ$  N), reflecting the temperate origin of urodela.



**Figure 4.** Niche rate and evolutionary history (time between stem age and crown age). A) Regression of niche rate on C-value reveals a strong negative correlation between rates of climatic niche evolution and differences in genome size ( $R^2 = 0.43$ ). B) Regression of PC1 (temperature variables influencing climatic niche) on C-value in Plethodontidae ( $R^2 = 0.25$ ). C) Regression of temporal difference between stem age and crown age on species richness reveals that families experiencing longer periods of evolutionary and adaptive inertia are less species rich ( $R^2 = 0.68$ ). D) Regression of stem age vs. crown age on C-value reveals that families experiencing higher levels of evolutionary inertia tend to have larger genomes ( $R^2 = 0.61$ ). Figures 4C and 4D indicate that species richness and C-value are tightly coupled and negatively associated in urodela.



**Supplementary Figure 1.** PC1 as a function of genome size in Amphibia (A), within Anura (B), Urodela (C), where the plethodontidae are shown in red and Plethodontidae alone (D).