

Chromosomal rearrangements as barriers to genetic homogenization between archaic and modern humans

Rebekah L. Rogers¹

Research Article

1) Dept of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley

Running head: Genome Structure in archaic humans

Key words: Neanderthals, Denisovans, genome structure, evolutionary novelty

Corresponding author: Rebekah L. Rogers, Dept. of Integrative Biology University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

Phone: 949-824-0614

Fax: 949-824-2181

Email: bekah@berkeley.edu

Abstract

Chromosomal rearrangements, which shuffle DNA across the genome, are an important source of divergence across taxa that can modify gene expression and function. Using a paired-end read approach with Illumina sequence data for archaic humans, I identify changes in genome structure that occurred recently in human evolution. Hundreds of rearrangements indicate genomic trafficking between the sex chromosomes and autosomes, raising the possibility of sex-specific changes. Additionally, genes adjacent to genome structure changes in Neanderthals are associated with testis-specific expression, consistent with evolutionary theory that new genes commonly form with expression in the testes. I identify one case of new-gene creation through transposition from the Y chromosome to chromosome 10 that combines the 5' end of the testis-specific gene *Fank1* with previously untranscribed sequence. This new transcript experienced copy number expansion in archaic genomes, indicating rapid genomic change. Finally, loci containing genome structure changes show diminished rates of introgression from Neanderthals into modern humans, consistent with the hypothesis that rearrangements serve as barriers to gene flow during hybridization. Together, these results suggest that this previously unidentified source of genomic variation has important biological consequences in human evolution.

Introduction

Chromosomal rearrangements, which move DNA from one location to another, are a known source of genomic divergence across related taxa. While distantly related species commonly share large numbers of orthologous genes (Jaillon et al., 2004; Putnam et al., 2008; Murphy et al., 2005), syntenic tracts display genome shuffling across all metazoan clades (Jaillon et al., 2004; Putnam et al., 2008; Murphy et al., 2005; Eichler and Sankoff, 2003; Bhutkar et al., 2008; Bennetzen, 2000). Such genome shuffling events are a source of genetic novelty that can form new genes (Miller et al., 1993; Bennetzen, 2005), modify expression patterns (Duhl et al., 1994), and create linkage between previously unlinked genes (Rieseberg, 2001). Mammalian genomes experienced active genome shuffling (Murphy et al., 2005), and even close relatives such as humans and gibbons differ by over a hundred syntenic breaks (Roberto et al., 2007). This alternative source of genomic variation remains understudied in comparison to SNPs, especially in human evolution.

Yet, these large-scale mutations that alter whole genomic segments can alter gene expression and function. Genome shuffling and transposition can modify expression patterns for neighboring genes (Slotkin and Martienssen, 2007; Kidwell and Lisch, 1997), and positionally relocated genes produce regulatory changes between humans and chimpanzees (De, Teichmann and Babu, 2009). Movement of DNA, especially when facilitated by transposable elements, can fortuitously place regulatory machinery next to genes, thereby modifying gene expression (Kidwell and Lisch, 1997; Cridland, Thornton and Long, 2015) or chromatin modeling effects for a gene (Argeson, Nelson and Siracusa, 1996; Michaud et al.,

1994; Slotkin and Martienssen, 2007). As with all variation, while some of these mutations may be beneficial, many are associated with disease. Chromosomal rearrangements are associated with multiple types of cancer (Mitelman, Johansson and Mertens, 2007), infertility (Stern et al., 1999; Dong et al., 2012; Alves et al., 2002), spontaneous abortions (De Braekeleer and Dao, 1990), autism (Folstein and Rosen-Sheidley, 2001), and language disorders (Lai et al., 2000; Tomblin et al., 2009). Thus, a better understanding of how rearrangements accumulate along the human lineage will have direct impacts on human health as well as our understanding of human evolution.

Advances in next-generation sequencing allow whole genome surveys of two close relatives of modern humans: Denisovans and Neanderthals. High coverage, high quality, low contamination sequence data is available for one individual from each archaic group (Meyer et al., 2012; Prufer et al., 2014). SNP diversity in Denisovans and Neanderthals has produced a clear snapshot of modern and archaic human differences as well as human-Neanderthal interactions. Archaic and modern humans diverged 270,000-440,000 years ago (Reich et al., 2010) and spread through Eurasia during independent migration events (Sankararaman et al., 2012). Humans and Neanderthals coexisted with overlapping ranges for tens of thousands of years, interbreeding with archaic humans around 47,000-63,000 years ago (Sankararaman et al., 2012). The average Eurasian typically carries $\sim 2\%$ of archaic human DNA (Sankararaman et al., 2014; Green et al., 2010; Prufer et al., 2014) and understanding the mutations that differentiate modern and archaic humans will clarify mutations that might have origins in archaic lineages. The availability of closely related outgroups for

modern humans additionally offers the unique opportunity to trace recent changes that have appeared in modern human genomes.

The Denisovan genome has been sequenced to 38X (Meyer et al., 2012) and the Neanderthal genome was sequenced to 45X (Prufer et al., 2014) allowing an accurate portrait of genomic variation between archaic and modern humans. I have assayed this high-quality genome sequencing data for recent changes in genome architecture that differentiate the archaic and modern human reference genomes. In Illumina sequencing data, chromosomal rearrangements are manifest in cases where two reads for a single read pair map to divergent chromosomal locations (Cridland and Thornton, 2010). Using paired-end read mapping data, I identify hundreds of changes in genome structure between archaic humans and the modern human reference genome. Such methods have successfully identified genome structure changes in model organisms with high accuracy using Illumina data (Corbett-Detig, Cardeno and Langley, 2012; Rogers et al., 2014; Cridland and Thornton, 2010) and a similar paired-end approach identified structural variants in modern human genomes using 454 sequence data (Korbel et al., 2007). Thus, these methods now can be applied to archaic samples with high confidence. DNA fragmentation during degradation produces short insert sizes in Illumina libraries for archaic humans (Meyer et al., 2012; Prufer et al., 2014), and only a fraction of alignments are useful for surveys of genome structure. These data offer a limited portrait of genome structure variation between modern and archaic humans, allowing us to identify this previously unanalyzed source of genomic variation.

Previous CNV detection in Neanderthals has focused on coverage changes to identify

dozens of duplications in modern and archaic humans (Prufer et al., 2014). Coverage-based assays detect many CNVs with high validation rates (Sudmant et al., 2010; Alkan et al., 2009), but they may overestimate the number of independent duplication events if duplicates experience secondary modification or if rearrangements are complex (Rogers et al., 2014). Furthermore, new genomic locations of copy number variants cannot be localized using coverage alone. In contrast, paired-end read mapping offers additional information that can identify duplicative changes as well as non-duplicative changes in genome structure. Read pairs can therefore resolve complex rearrangements with greater precision than coverage based assays and will not be limited by the size of the translocated sequence. Major genome sequencing projects in modern humans have generated human cell lines (Consortium and others, 2012; Cann et al., 2002), which are prone to genomic rearrangements unrelated to natural variation. Here, archaic genomes collected without (the possibility of) generating cell lines offer one major advantage as they will be free of artificially induced rearrangements. Thus, the data presented here include newly-identified variants representative of natural variation including hundreds of mutations not found in previous assays.

Based on these newly identified chromosomal rearrangements, genes adjacent to genome structure changes in Neanderthals are associated with testes specific expression in modern humans, consistent with evolutionary theory that new genes commonly form with expression in the testes (Betran, Thornton and Long, 2002; Kaessmann, 2010; Assis and Bachtrog, 2013). Multiple cases of genomic trafficking between the autosomes and the sex chromosomes differentiate modern and archaic humans, raising the possibility of sex specific changes

in human evolution. Further, loci containing genome structure changes show diminished likelihood of introgression, consistent with the hypothesis that genome structure changes serve as one potential barrier to genetic homogenization between modern and archaic humans through negative selection after interbreeding. Finally, in a chimeric construct formed through chromosomal rearrangement at the *Fank1* locus, a sperm specific promoter is combined with a previously untranscribed region to create a new exon. Subsequent duplication of the newly formed gene sequence in archaic humans points to exceptionally rapid evolution in genome structure at the *Fank1* locus. Together, these results suggest that chromosomal rearrangements are a common source of variation between modern and archaic humans capable of influencing human biology and evolution.

Results

Here, I identify genome structure changes between modern and archaic humans that lie adjacent to hundreds of gene sequences. I describe patterns of genome structure changes on the autosomes and sex chromosomes, expression patterns of neighboring genes, and likelihood of introgression into modern humans. Finally, I describe new gene formation through chromosomal rearrangement with rapid changes in copy number in modern and archaic humans.

Genome Structure Variation

Putative chromosomal rearrangements include mutations dispersed across chromosomes and those that moved DNA within a single chromosome over a distance greater than 1 Mb.

Such variants are expected to capture translocation, dispersed duplication, gene conversion, ectopic recombination, retrogene formation and transposition by selfish genetic elements, all molecular mechanisms that move DNA from one genomic location to another. Paired-end mapping from Neanderthal sequence data identifies 985 changes in genome structure while data from Denisovan indicates 1330 changes in genome structure (Figure 1, Table 1). A total of 326 variants are identified with at least 3 read-pairs in both the Denisovan genome and the Neanderthal genome sequence.

Paired-end read mapping can identify changes in genome structure that occurred between archaic and modern humans, but in isolation cannot identify in which lineage the mutations occurred. Polarizing mutations against outgroups, I identify 216 variants in Neanderthal and 216 variants in Denisova where archaic genomes carry the ancestral rather than the derived state. One well defined example, is shown in Figure 2. Abnormal read pair mapping indicates a reciprocal rearrangement affecting chromosome 14 and chromosome 15 in regions containing multiple olfactory receptors. Read pair mapping indicates two breakpoints capturing 64.1 kb on chromosome 14 and 65.2 kb on chromosome 15. Sequences that correspond to abnormally mapping read pairs in human reference genome match to the same locations in outgroups (Figure 2).

A total of 161 genes have start or stop sequences within 10 kb of changes in genome structure in Neanderthal and 222 genes lie adjacent to genome structure changes in Denisovans. In Denisovan these genes are associated with gene ontology categories of keratin, flotillins and caveola, microtubules, and fibronectins, suggesting an association with

structural peptides (Table 2). In Neanderthal, which has fewer rearrangements, only an association with flotillins and caveola is significant at an EASE cutoff of 1.0 (Table 2). Seven genes adjacent to changes in genome structure in Neanderthal and 4 genes in Denisovan show signals of adaptive bursts in amino acid substitutions with $d_N/d_S > 1.0$ (Table 3). The proportion of derived vs. ancestral mutations along the archaic lineage is significantly greater in Denisovan than Neanderthal ($\chi^2 = 11.6917$, $df = 1$, $p - value = 0.0006278$) and more rearrangements are seen in Denisovan than Neanderthal. Yet, data from the two archaic humans demonstrate agreement in the ability to identify rearrangement mutations that occurred in the modern human genome (216 using Neanderthal and 216 using Denisovan), an indication that these differences are unlikely to be driven by higher false negative rates in Neanderthals. The rate of rearrangements per basepair is inversely correlated with chromosome size in Neanderthal ($R = -0.52$, $t = -2.8742$, $df = 22$, $P = 0.00881$) and Denisovan ($R = -0.48$, $t = -2.6076$, $df = 22$, $P = 0.01607$, Figure 3), falsifying the hypothesis that rates of formation are uniform across the genome.

Genomic trafficking and sex chromosomes

Both high coverage genomes for archaic humans sampled to date are female specimens, as confirmed by low Y coverage relative to the X and autosomes (Prufer et al., 2014; Meyer et al., 2012). Using female archaic samples, we are able to identify a total of 158 putative translocations from the autosomes to the Y in modern humans or from the Y to the autosomes in archaic humans, 110 using Denisova and 98 using Neanderthal. Of these variants, 3 in Denisova and 4 in Neanderthal are between the X and Y, in regions outside

the pseudoautosomal regions PAR1, PAR2, and XTR/PAR3. With autosome-autosome rearrangements, paired-end reads are unable to identify the direction of rearrangement even when it is clear that rearrangement has occurred (e.g. Figure 4), especially in cases where outgroup genomes are poorly assembled or uninformative due to secondary mutations. However, with female genomes, the presence of a full Y is excluded, demonstrating that these rearrangements currently reside on the autosomes or the X. Using the chimpanzee as an outgroup genome, ancestral state for Y-autosome translocations was identified to determine the direction of DNA movement. We can identify 14 cases where there is a match for both reads in a pair within 1 kb of one another on an autosome in chimpanzee, clearly indicating movement to the Y in modern humans. In contrast there are 30 clear cut cases where one read in the pair maps to the chimpanzee Y, indicating Y to autosome movement in archaic humans. The ancestral state for the remaining Y variants cannot be established, possibly due to limitations of chimpanzee genome assemblies.

Polymorphism for genome structure variants in modern humans

Ten samples of Illumina sequence for modern humans confirm genome structure variants identified in archaic human genomes. Data from modern humans validate 556 genome structure variants that were identified in Neanderthal and 548 variants that were identified in Denisovan. In Neanderthal there are 139 (25.0%) at a frequency of 1/10 and 116 (20.9%) at a frequency of 10/10. In Denisovan, there are 147 (26.8%) found at a frequency of 1/10 and 104 (18.9%) identified at a frequency of 10/10 in modern humans. The human reference genome lacks these mutations, and thus many of these mutations will be segregating at high frequency

in modern humans. Folded SFS plots for mutations identified in archaic genomes show large numbers of rare or common variants, with fewer moderate frequency variants (Figure 5). There is no significant difference in the SFS of Denisovan and Neanderthal genome structure variants that have been confirmed in modern humans ($W = 154283$, $P = 0.7104$). Mean frequency of genome structure variants identified in Neanderthal sequences is 4.8/10, and mean frequency of genome structure events identified in Denisova sequences is also 4.8/10. Fifty-two Y variants in Neanderthal and 54 Y variants in Denisova can be confirmed using modern human genome sequences, suggesting that these are unlikely to be artifacts of DNA damage or preparation methods specific to sequencing of ancient DNA.

Testes-specific genes

New genes commonly appear with expression in the testes (Betran, Thornton and Long, 2002; Kaessmann, 2010; Assis and Bachtrog, 2013), and testes-expressed genes are subject to rapid evolution (Wyckoff, Wang and Wu, 2000; Haerty et al., 2007; Voolstra et al., 2007; Dorus et al., 2010). To determine whether genome structure changes identified in archaic humans are associated with testes expression, we analyzed two independent sources of gene expression data for modern humans. Among genes associated with chromosomal rearrangements we identify 123 genes within 10kb in Neanderthals that could be assessed for expression using the Human Protein Atlas (Fagerberg et al., 2014) (<http://www.proteinatlas.org/>, accessed Oct 2014). Of these genes, 15 are associated with testis-specific expression, a gross overrepresentation compared to expectations based on random resampling ($P = 0.0084$, Table 4). Additionally, using previously published data on divergence in gene expression

between humans and chimpanzees, 9 out of 24 genes associated with genome structure that could be assayed show gene expression changes only in the testes (Table 4). The expression divergence data for humans and chimpanzees survey a limited number of genes, but it offers independent confirmation that changes in genome structure identified in Neanderthals are associated with testes-specific effects. Denisovans, in contrast, show a different pattern. Chromosomal rearrangements are associated with testis-specific expression in only 14 genes out of 182 ($P = 0.22$) and 11 out of 46 genes showing testes-specific gene expression changes between humans and chimpanzees ($P = 0.24$, Table 4). These results offer two independent confirmations that genes adjacent to rearrangements in Neanderthals but not Denisovans are associated with testes-specific effects.

Chromosomal rearrangements are resistant to gene flow

Neanderthals and modern humans interbred in Eurasia after the human migration out of Africa and the average European shares roughly 2% of their genome with Neanderthals (Sankararaman et al., 2014; Prufer et al., 2014; Green et al., 2010). Some regions of the genome are more prone to introgression than others, and gene content, gene expression, and sex chromosome status influence introgression rates (Sankararaman et al., 2014). A newly analyzed introgression dataset from Steinrücken et al. places posterior probabilities on introgression for each locus in the genome, offering more nuanced information. Mean probability of introgression genome wide is 0.012, while chromosomal rearrangements experience mean introgression probability of 0.008 ($P < 0.001$). Many chromosomal rearrangements are detrimental, and it is possible that selection against new mutations

could reduce introgression rates. However, when we consider only cases where Neanderthal holds the ancestral state whereas the modern humans hold the derived state, excluding the possibility of selection against newly formed detrimental mutations, mean probability of introgression is 0.007, a significant reduction from neutral expectations ($P < 0.001$, Table 5). Introgression calls from Sankararaman et al. 2014, also point to reduced likelihood of introgression at regions containing genome structure changes. When Neanderthal carries the ancestral state, 228 out of 748 (30%) regions experience introgression. When Neanderthal holds a derived mutation, 181 out of 844 (21%) regions experience introgression. The proportion of sites associated with introgression displays a significant departure from background rates of 35.64% genome-wide for both derived and ancestral rearrangements ($P < 10^{-16}$, $P \leq 0.04$ respectively, Table 5).

Formation of a new gene expressed in the testes

Among genes affected by chromosomal rearrangements, one shows signs of dynamic changes in genome structure. *Fank1* is a testis-specific gene in modern humans, and its ortholog functions during the transition from diploid to haploid chromosome number during meiosis in mice (Zheng, Zheng and Yan, 2007). d_N/d_S for this gene is high, suggesting rapid evolution in the human lineage (Table 3). The first exon of *Fank1* is flanked by 6 different sets of read-pairs indicating rearrangement between chromosome 10 and the Y in Neanderthal and in Denisovan. Coverage for both archaic genomes is consistent with 6 duplications of the first exon of *Fank1* although coverage across the multicopy region varies (Figure 6-7). The region displays high heterozygosity in both the Neanderthal and Denisovan genome, which

correlates well with coverage (Figure 8), an indication of diverged paralogs.

We propose one genetic structure produced by rearrangement, secondary tandem duplication, and deletion that can explain the observed coverage variation and abnormally mapping read-pairs observed in archaic genome sequence. The Y contains a segment of DNA that experienced rearrangement through ectopic recombination or transposition. The mutation moved a segment of DNA from the Y at ~ 58.97 - 59.03 Mb over to chromosome 10, inserting the sequence at ~ 127.61 Mb (Figure 9). Subsequent expansion via tandem duplication then created copy number variation, with 6 copies in archaic genomes (Figure 10). Multiple partial duplications during copy number expansion or secondary deletions (e.g. Rogers et al., 2014) result in multiple unique breakpoints in the paired-end read data. The exact ordering of copies in the region cannot be determined using Illumina sequencing, but one putative structure is shown in Figure 10. In modern human DNA sequences that are not affected by the same degradation and damage as archaic genomes, both paired-end read mapping information and coverage confirm that the region is subject to rearrangements in modern humans, with variation in copy number (Figure 11-12). Additionally, split read mapping of long molecule sequences from a haploid genome publicly available from PacBio (<http://datasets.pacb.com/2014/Human54x/fast.html>, Accessed March 2015) confirms rearrangement between the Y and chromosome 10 at the first exon of *Fank1*. Previous paired end 454 sequencing of restriction enzyme fragments has identified a translocation between the Y chromosome and the *Fank1* locus as well (Chen et al., 2008).

To determine whether the duplicated first exon of *Fank1* can drive expression of

adjacent sequence, we obtained testes expression data from the ENCODE project (www.encodeproject.org, from Michael Snyder's lab). We identify a total of 4 read-pairs in the transcriptome data that indicate fusion transcripts of sequence on chromosome 10:127588640-127600391 and Y:59009858-59031127, each read mapping with 101 matches and no mismatches. Read-pairs are located with the orientation expected based on the orientation of the Y-autosome translocation. Coverage in the RNA seq data from Y:59020171-59031127 indicates that this promoter can drive expression of the relocated region from the Y, thereby forming a novel gene sequence. The new gene would not carry either of the ankyrin conserved domains from *Fank1*, as they are not found in the first exon, unless there exists an unidentified fusion transcript incorporating the new exon into the *Fank1* mRNA. The standard isoform of *Fank1* (ENST00000368695) is expressed with an FPKM of 25.6 across all exons, and is not truncated by the rearrangement (Figure 9).

Discussion

Genome structure changes in hominids

Paired end read mapping identifies 985 chromosomal rearrangements using Neanderthal genome sequences and 1330 using Denisovan sequences. Modern human genomes validate 556 genome structure variants that were identified in Neanderthal and 548 variants that were identified in Denisovan. This validation rate is extremely high given that SFS are generally skewed towards rare variants. Furthermore, 216 rearrangements in each archaic genome that match with the putative ancestral state, indicating mutations occurring in modern

humans. Large numbers of genome shuffling events contribute to the divergence between archaic and modern humans, with higher rates of genome shuffling between Denisovans in comparison to Neanderthals. Differences in the activity of genome shuffling in the two groups might putatively be due to activation of selfish genetic elements, more permissive ectopic recombination, DNA damage due to environmental effects, greater instances of gene conversion, or differences in effective population size.

The number of rearrangements per base pair shows an inverse correlation with chromosome size in Neanderthal and Denisovans. In mammals, chromosomes experience a minimum of one recombination event per meiosis (Darlington, 1937) and chromosome size correlates with recombination rates in model organisms and in humans (Kaback, 1996; Lander et al., 2001). If rates of recombination influence the instance of ectopic exchange, then the excess of recombination per base pair on small chromosomes might contribute to a portion of the pattern observed. Alternatively, if smaller chromosomes are degenerate, containing greater proportions of repetitive DNA (Venter et al., 2001), transposition and ectopic recombination facilitated by selfish genetic elements might contribute to the excess in DNA movement to and from smaller chromosomes. These two mutational forces might together explain the observation that smaller chromosomes experience higher rates of rearrangements. These results imply that genomic location can influence lability of gene sequences, and that mutational pressures will be higher on small chromosomes.

Gene shuffling

One case of shuffling affecting olfactory receptors is particularly well-resolved with two breakpoints of the rearrangement identified and with clear agreement between archaic humans and outgroup genomes, pointing to human-specific mutation. Previous work using microarrays has successfully identified copy number variation for olfactory genes (Hasin et al., 2008) but with next-generation sequencing we can identify shuffled loci even when there is no corresponding change in copy number. Mammalian olfactory receptors fall into distinct clades that show signatures of shuffling and rearrangement across the genome (Niimura and Nei, 2003) and ectopic recombination events are common in regions with olfactory receptors (Trask et al., 1998; Giglio et al., 2001). Evolution of olfactory receptors has been subject to influence of strong selection along the mammalian lineage and there are signatures of positive selection on olfactory genes in humans (Clark et al., 2003). The observed changes in olfactory receptors may therefore be due to adaptive mutations, permissive shuffling due to mutational pressures, or novel detrimental mutation ultimately destined for loss.

Rearrangements occur in the neighborhood of several genes with interesting functions. The Denisovan genome contains a non-duplicative structural rearrangement adjacent to *BARD1*, a BRCA1 associated ring protein that functions as a DNA repair peptide and tumor suppressor. Detrimental mutations in *BARD1* inhibit the ability to perform DNA repair and commonly result in widespread accumulation of chromosomal rearrangements, especially during tumor formation. A second mutation in a gene with a NUDIX DNA repair domain is also observed, though the functional impacts (if any) of these mutations

are unknown. One rearrangement in the Denisova genome shuffles regions adjacent to two neuron-expressed genes *CDK5RAP2* and *CLOCK*. *CDK5RAP2* is a centrosomal protein with high expression in the brain (Nagase et al., 2000). Deleterious mutations in *CDK5RAP2* are associated with microcephaly and brain development abnormalities in humans (Hassan et al., 2007; Bond et al., 2005; Pagnamenta et al., 2012; Lancaster et al., 2013), while *CLOCK* regulates circadian rhythm in model organisms (Darlington et al., 1998; Vitaterna et al., 1994). *CDK5RAP2* has experienced rapid amino acid substitutions in primates relative to rodents (Evans, Vallender and Lahn, 2006). Both genes are known to be expressed in neurons and especially since this individual lived to adulthood there is no reason *a priori* to suspect detrimental effects on gene functions.

Rearrangements as potential barriers to gene flow

Humans and Neanderthals interbred during range overlap in Eurasia, with an average of 1-2% of Neanderthal DNA in modern European genomes (Sankararaman et al., 2014; Green et al., 2010; Prufer et al., 2014). Yet, some portions of the human genome appear more resistant to introgression than others (Sankararaman et al., 2014). Regions containing chromosomal rearrangements are less likely to experience introgression. One potential explanation is that negative selection against new mutations prevents their spread from Neanderthals into modern humans. However, variants that are derived in modern humans and ancestral in Neanderthals also exhibit a significant reduction in the likelihood of introgression. Large chromosomal translocations are identified in spontaneous abortions (De Braekeleer and Dao, 1990; Goddijn and Leschot, 2000; Fryns and Van Buggenhout, 1998) and in individuals

pursuing *in vitro* fertilization treatments (Schreurs et al., 2000), consistent with a role for genome structure changes as barriers to reproduction. Two potential genetic mechanisms can explain how regions housing chromosomal rearrangements that differentiate humans and Neanderthals might be associated with lower rates of introgression through effects of negative selection on F1 hybrids.

First, translocations encompass multiple types of underlying mutations including gene conversion, ectopic recombination, retrogene formation, and transposable element mediated transposition. It is likely that many of these mutations reflect TE activity or TE mediated recombination. If different genomes contain incompatible TE-repressor systems, movement into new genetic backgrounds during interbreeding events could potentially incite activation of previously silenced TEs. TE activations are generally known to be deleterious and are a known source of reproductive incompatibilities in model organisms and plants (Rubin, Kidwell and Bingham, 1982; Petrov et al., 1995; Castillo and Moyle, 2012) and similar molecular expansion of selfish elements has been observed in mammalian hybrids (O'Neill, O'Neill and Graves, 1998). If similar processes were to occur in humans they would explain a portion of the observed reduction in Neanderthal ancestry at regions housing changes in genome structure.

Second, gain or loss of genes in gametes of F1 offspring hemizygous for rearrangements might also reduce hybrid fitness (Presgraves, 2010; Coyne, Orr and others, 2004) and contribute to the observed reduction in introgression from loci near chromosomal rearrangements (Figure 13). Non-duplicative rearrangements form across chromosomes.

During meiosis in a hybrid individual, alternate segregation of chromosomal rearrangements places the mutant chromosomes in opposing daughter cells. The resulting gametes contain duplicate copies of the rearrangement segment on one chromosome and a lack of the complementary rearrangement segment on the other chromosome. If the rearrangement captures functional genes or regulatory elements necessary for survival or reproduction, offspring will have reduced fitness, resulting in barriers to genetic homogenization even in cases where rearrangements in and of themselves have no functional consequences in the F1 hybrid parent.

Chromosomal rearrangements often do not spread through single populations due to lower lowered fitness in hemizygotes as well as potential negative molecular impacts of new mutations. However, divergence for rearrangements could accumulate in allopatric separation, especially when aided by bottlenecks and inbreeding. Modern humans experienced severe bottlenecks during the out of Africa migrations (Li and Durbin, 2011) resulting in lower genetic diversity for Eurasians. Neanderthals experienced independent bottleneck events (Prufer et al., 2014) allowing for accumulation of independent mutations in the two groups. Inbreeding in subpopulations can also spread accumulation of rearrangements as the associated decrease in heterozygosity could fix rearrangements in particular lineages (Rieseberg, 2001). Neanderthals had low effective population sizes, low levels of heterozygosity, and instances of consanguineous mating (Prufer et al., 2014). In the face of an F1 disadvantage described above, interbreeding after inbreeding would then be disfavored. These factors together could contribute to differential accumulation of

chromosomal rearrangements in archaic and modern humans, increasing the likelihood that they might later act as one potential barrier to genetic homogenization.

Sex-specific changes

The X differs from the autosomes in dosage compensation (Charlesworth, 1996), sexual antagonism (Rice, 1984), dominance, recombination rate (Schaffner, 2004), and rate of amino acid substitution (Mank et al., 2010). Similarly, the Y differs from the autosomes and the X in that it is only present in human males. The Y has little recombination outside pseudoautosomal/XTR regions, reducing the efficiency of selection to sweep beneficial mutations to fixation and allowing greater potential for genetic hitchhiking (Bachtrog, 2013). Chromosomal rearrangements with the Y can reduce male fertility (Alves et al., 2002) even in cases of reciprocal translocation where genes are not, in fact, gained or lost (Dong et al., 2012). Thus, changes in genomic locations from the sex chromosomes can result in alternate selective pressures, causing downstream changes in gene sequence evolution and gene expression (Ellegren and Parsch, 2007). Each of these factors could alter the evolutionary trajectories of relocated sequence, with important implications for sex chromosome evolution in humans.

Beyond the typical molecular effects from changing genomic neighborhood, genomic trafficking across the sex chromosomes and autosomes therefore has the potential to alter selective pressures and selective constraints in ways that are not mimicked by autosome-autosome translocation. Using Illumina sequencing for female samples of Neanderthals and Denisovans, paired-end reads identify changes in genome structure that

modify the sex specific status of surrounding DNA. Thirty-three translocations exist between the X and autosomes in Neanderthals and 72 in Denisovans. Further, 98 changes in genome structure map to the Y in Neanderthal and 110 map to the Y in Denisovans. Each of these samples is female. Yet, the data still capture genetic exchange between the Y and the autosomes or X, displaying the influence the Y can have on genome evolution in humans. Rates of rearrangements for small chromosomes are higher than for large chromosomes in both Denisovans and Neanderthals (Figure 3) and the Y shows large numbers of rearrangements relative to its size, consistent with this pattern. The Y is degenerate, and commonly collects repetitive elements (Bachtrog, 2013). Both the size of the Y and its association with selfish genetic elements may explain the large number of rearrangements on the Y. However, given the lack of a Y in these female samples, the true rate of modification involving the Y may in fact be even higher than observations presented here.

Testis biased expression

Previous work in model organisms has shown that new genes commonly appear with expression in the testes and later are exapted for alternative functions in other tissues (Betran, Thornton and Long, 2002; Kaessmann, 2010; Assis and Bachtrog, 2013). An excess of testis-specific genes affected by genome structure changes is found in Neanderthals compared to modern humans, but no such excess was observed in comparisons of Denisovans with modern humans. Selective pressures in the testes commonly force rapid evolution in humans (Wyckoff, Wang and Wu, 2000) and model organisms (Haerty et al., 2007; Voolstra et al., 2007; Dorus et al., 2010). Additionally, large numbers of genes are testes-biased,

and there may be permissive selective pressures that allow spurious expression in the testes. Transposable elements that are active in the germline are more likely to be passed on in subsequent generations and these may also contribute to the observed association between testes expression and chromosomal rearrangements. Testes-expressed genes show resistance to introgression between Neanderthals and modern humans across European populations (Sankararaman et al., 2014). Here, chromosomal rearrangements are adjacent to testis-specific genes and loci with chromosomal rearrangements serve as one genetic factor that can create barriers to introgression due to negative selection on loci after interbreeding. Thus, these results offer one specific genetic mechanism that may explain some portion of the observed association between testes specific expression and barriers to interbreeding.

Formation of a new gene sequence

Among testis-specific genes associated with genome structure changes, one is of considerable interest. Multiple abnormally mapping read-pairs suggest rearrangement in the neighborhood of *Fank1*, a nuclear protein expressed in sperm production during meiosis whose protein sequence is conserved across mammals (Zheng, Zheng and Yan, 2007). Knock-downs of *Fank1* reduce fertility in mice by inducing apoptosis in developing sperm (Dong et al., 2014). *Fank1* also offers a rare example of allele specific methylation in humans (Li et al., 2010) and the gene displays elevated amino acid substitutions indicative of positive selection (Table 3). The rearrangement of the first exon of *Fank1* shows signs of 6-fold copy number variation in archaic genomes, as well as multiple breakpoints suggesting secondary modification. This rearrangement is also identified in 10 out of 10 modern human

genomes used to confirm genome structure changes and in PacBio long molecule sequence data. These 10 genomes indicate copy number variation across the population. Independent confirmations of rearrangement and duplication demonstrate that the rearrangement is not an artifact of ancient DNA sequencing and that modern human populations vary significantly at this locus. *Fank1* lies in a region with low recombination (DeGiorgio, Lohmueller and Nielsen, 2014), and the disrupted synteny caused by the Y translocation can readily explain the observed lack of crossing over. The region has been suggested to have putative signals of balancing selection and ancient segregating polymorphism that matches exceptionally well with the region with identified copy number variation (DeGiorgio, Lohmueller and Nielsen, 2014). Given copy number variation and the precise match between genomic locations of putative balancing selection signals and coverage changes in modern and archaic human genomes, divergence of newly identified paralogs in the first exon and intron of *Fank1* are likely to explain the unusual diversity patterns observed in balancing selection screens.

A novel fusion transcript created by the rearrangement surrounding *Fank1* now drives expression of a new exon in the testes for at least one modern human. The region containing this new transcript has then experienced rampant copy number variation through secondary duplication with 6 copies in Neanderthals and 6 copies in Denisovan. Combined with high rates of amino acid sequence evolution, this locus is subject to exceptionally rapid evolution in humans. Thus, this verified case of genomic exchange between the Y and the autosomes as well as sperm-specific promoter derived from *Fank1* makes this modified locus with new gene formation a strong candidate for functions in human reproduction.

Methods

Identifying structural variation

All reads from the high quality 44X Altai Neanderthal genomic sequence (Prufer et al., 2014) and 38X Denisovan genomic sequence (Meyer et al., 2012) were aligned against the human genome reference GRCh37 and extracted reads with abnormal mapping orientations. A total of 84.4 million reads in Neanderthal and 132.7 million reads in Denisovans are long enough to generate independent alignments for read pairs, amounting to roughly 2.8X and 4.4X coverage that will be informative for genome structure. Read-pairs where both partners were mapped were extracted using samtools (`samtools view -f 1 -F 12`). Cases where reads mapped with a quality score ≥ 20 using only primary alignments where read-pairs aligned on different chromosomes or on the same chromosome at least 1 Mb apart identify putative translocations. Abnormal read-pairs were then clustered within 1000 bp. Variants supported by at least 3 but less than 100 read-pairs were kept. Sequence depth across the genome for reads mapping with a quality score ≥ 20 was extracted using samtools (`samtools depth -q 20`). In addition to the observed translocations above, 22 cases of abnormal read-pair mapping in Neanderthal and 26 in Denisovan match to pseudoautosomal regions (PAR1 and PAR2) and X-translocated-region (XTR/PAR3) region of the X and Y. These sites likely represent allelic variation that happens to match best with the human reference genome Y, in spite of actual location on the X. These pseudoautosomal variants were therefore excluded from all downstream analyses as they are not indicative of translocations.

Many rearrangements affect the Y, even though archaic samples are derived from female

individuals, raising a possibility that false positives through mis-mapping might be driving results. Five rearrangement variants in Neanderthal and 5 rearrangement variants in Denisovan that affect the Y outside pseudoautosomal regions have a second blastn hit in the human reference genome within 2 kb of the autosomal or X read, each with between 91-99% nucleotide identity. These sites could potentially represent false positives due to mis-mapping of reads driven by allelic variation, or alternatively might be regions subject to homology mediated ectopic exchange especially through gene conversion events. Thus, based on 5 out of 98 variants in Neanderthal and 5 out of 110 variants in Denisovan that might putatively be the product of mis-mapping, the false positive rate for translocations involving the Y would lie between 0.00-5.10% in Neanderthals and between 0.00-4.55% in Denisova, consistent with false positive rates using paired-end read data to identify tandem duplications in model organisms (Rogers et al., 2014).

Mean coverage per site across the entire Y is 0.906 for the Altai Neanderthal and 0.56 for the Denisovan while median coverage for the Y in both genomes is 0 (Table 6). In contrast, in Neanderthal regions within 1 kb of a translocation have a mean coverage of 74 while in Denisova regions within 1kb of rearrangement calls have a mean coverage of 52 (Table 6). If Y contamination is uniform, heterogeneity in coverage between the whole Y compared to segments adjacent to rearrangements is not expected. If Y rearrangements were driven by contamination from modern humans or from mis-mapping of reads, one would also expect to observe large numbers of within-chromosome translocations along the Y. No within-chromosome translocations were identified in Neanderthals and only

one putative within-chromosome translocation affecting the Y in Denisovans. This sole within-chromosome translocation lies adjacent to a region with a putative translocation from the Y to an autosome, suggesting secondary rearrangement. Therefore, Y translocations identified in both archaic genomes pass this ‘negative control’.

Identifying Ancestral States

We used the gorilla genome as an outgroup to polarize autosomal sequences and the X. The chimpanzee genome is more closely related to humans, but was assembled relying on the human genome scaffolds (Sequencing, Consortium and others, 2005). In regions subject to genome structure changes, the chimpanzee genome commonly shows ‘N’s indicating assembly uncertainty. The gorilla genome took advantage of technological advantages in next-generation sequencing and incorporated multiple sources of sequence data to resolve and order contigs (Scally et al., 2012) and offers more reliable information. The gorilla genome lacks a Y chromosome sequence, and therefore the chimpanzee genome was used as an outgroup for the Y to polarize the direction of mutations. Autosomal and X mutations were polarized against the Gorilla reference genome r.3.1 provided by ENSEMBL. Sequence matching with abnormally mapping read-pairs as well as 100 bp upstream and downstream was compared with all Gorilla chromosomes in a blastn at an E-value cutoff of 10^{-10} . For translocations mapping to the Y, a blastn search was used to match both breakpoints in the chimpanzee genome (r2.1.4). Sequences matching with read-pairs mapped to the same chromosomal location within 1000 bp of one another were taken as cases where Neanderthals carry the ancestral state.

Confirmation in modern humans

Mutations identified in archaic genomes were confirmed using paired end read mapping for 10 modern human genomes collected and sequenced as part of the Neanderthal genome project (<http://cdna.eva.mpg.de/denisova/BAM/human/>, accessed Feb 2015) (Meyer et al., 2012). Samples were prepared and sequenced in the same lab as part of the Neanderthal genome project and will be less likely to be subject to methodological differences than other human genomic samples (<http://cdna.eva.mpg.de/denisova/BAM/human/>, Accessed Feb 2015) (Meyer et al., 2012). Samples are derived from immortalized cell lines, which commonly accumulate rearrangements. Thus, we do not report the full genome wide structural variation for cell lines but rather focus on confirming mutations that are identified in archaic genomes.

Gene expression in modern humans

Genes whose transcription start or stop positions lie within 10kb of structural variants were identified, and evaluated for expression patterns against the human gene expression atlas. Genes adjacent to structural variants were identified as “expressed” if classified as “medium” or “high” in the Human Protein Atlas (Fagerberg et al., 2014) (<http://www.proteinatlas.org/>, accessed Oct 2014). 10000 replicates of equal numbers of genes were chosen to determine the likelihood that as many genes would have tissue specific expression. Genes with testis specific changes in expression between humans and chimpanzees (Khaitovich et al., 2005). Gene annotations from NCBI (ftp://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/DATA/gene_info.gz, Accessed Jan 25 2015) and DAVID gene ID

converter (<http://david.abcc.ncifcrf.gov/>, Accessed Jan 25 2015) matched previous annotations with ENSEMBL gene identifiers. Out of 11,780 genes, 9,083 genes had identifiers that matched with current annotations in ENSEMBL. Overrepresentation of testes-specific expression patterns was identified by resampling 10,000 replicate datasets of randomly sampled genes of the same size as that observed.

Transcriptome data for testes of a 44 year old male modern human individual from the ENCODE project, provided by Michael Snyder's lab (accession ENCSR693GGB, www.encodeproject.org, accessed March 2015) was used to validate putative new gene formation in the region of *Fank1*. We used tophat-fusion search (Trapnell, Pachter and Salzberg, 2009; Kim and Salzberg, 2011) to map fastq reads to all major chromosomes for the human reference genome GRCh 37.75. We used tophat v.2.0.13, with command line options `--fusion-search --fusion-min-dist 1000000 --fusion-read-mismatches 4`, and all other parameters set to default. Tophat was run using bowtie2 v2.2.5.

Rates of Introgression

Introgression data from Sankararaman et al. 2014 and from Steinrücken et al. 2015 was used to establish whether regions with chromosomal rearrangements were less likely to experience introgression. Steinrücken et al. offer probabilistic calls by window for 500 bp windows across the genome. Mean probability of introgression per site per strain for chromosomal rearrangements was compared with random resampling datasets to establish the probability of observing results as low or lower than random expectations. Resampling estimates used 10,000 replicates, choosing windows at random throughout the genome. Windows on the X

and Y were excluded. The Y does not have introgression data because samples are female and the X is subject to lower levels of introgression for reasons potentially unrelated to genome structure that might influence results. Sankararaman et al's data offers calls for sites that experienced introgression. The proportion of sites with introgression for regions containing genome structure calls was compared with probability of success set to the background rate of 35.64% of the genome using a binomial test.

Rapidly evolving genes

A reciprocal-best-hit blastn search at an E-value cutoff of 10^{-10} defined orthologs for all CDS annotations for *Gorilla gorilla* r.3.1, *Pan troglodytes* r2.1.4, and *Homo sapiens* GRCh 37.75. Genes with clear one to one ortholog calls across Human-Chimp-Gorilla were then used for further analysis. Protein sequences for genes were aligned using clustalw 2.1 (Larkin et al., 2007) and back-translated protein alignments to generate in-frame nucleotide alignments. d_N/d_S was estimated in PAML using the F1x4 a codon model which estimates codon frequencies based on nucleotide frequencies, estimating κ with an initial $\kappa = 2.0$.

PacBio confirmation of structural variation at the *Fank1*

Targeted variants were then confirmed in long molecule sequencing collected from a haploid complete hydatidiform mole provided by Pacific Biosciences (<http://datasets.pacb.com/2014/Human54x/fast.html>, Accessed March 2015) recently used to generate a *de novo* human genome assembly (Steinberg et al., 2014). Reads were aligned to major chromosomes for the human genome reference GRCh37.75 using blasr (Chaisson and Tesler, 2012),

reporting the best 10 matches (`-bestn 10`) and all other parameters set to default. The PacBio aligner `blasr` favors long alignments and often does not report shorter split-read alignments even those with greater nucleotide similarity. All PacBio sequence reads that matched to the location that contains rearrangement signals in Illumina sequences for the targeted site were aligned using a `blastn` search against the human reference genome at a cutoff of $E \leq 10^{-10}$ similar to methods that have successfully confirmed genome structure variation (Rogers et al., 2014). Split read mappings that align at least 1 kb on either side of the breakpoint as defined by Illumina sequencing read-pair data confirmed the putative translocation. Confirming reads were required to match the expected orientation indicated by Illumina sequencing reads.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Kelley Harris, Qi Zhou, and Montgomery Slatkin for helpful input concerning analyses and helpful comments on the manuscript. Thanks also to Kay Prüfer for sending unfiltered bam files for the Denisova analysis. Matthias Steinrücken and Yun Song graciously shared data on Neanderthal introgression prior to publication, which was essential for analyses presented in the current work. RLR is funded by NIH grant R01-GM40282 to Montgomery Slatkin.

References

- Alkan C, Kidd JM, Marques-Bonet T, et al. (11 co-authors). 2009. Personalized copy number and segmental duplication maps using next-generation sequencing. *Nature genetics*. 41:1061–1067.
- Alves C, Carvalho F, Cremades N, Sousa M, Barros A. 2002. Unique (Y;13) translocation in a male with oligozoospermia: cytogenetic and molecular studies. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* 10:467–474.
- Argeson AC, Nelson KK, Siracusa LD. 1996. Molecular basis of the pleiotropic phenotype of mice carrying the hypervariable yellow (ahvy) mutation at the agouti locus. *Genetics*. 142:557–567.
- Assis R, Bachtrog D. 2013. Neofunctionalization of young duplicate genes in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110:17409–17414.
- Bachtrog D. 2013. Y-chromosome evolution: emerging insights into processes of Y-chromosome degeneration. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 14:113–124.
- Bennetzen JL. 2000. Comparative sequence analysis of plant nuclear genomes:microcolinearity and its many exceptions. *Plant Cell*. 12:1021–1029.
- Bennetzen JL. 2005. Transposable elements, gene creation and genome rearrangement in flowering plants. *Current opinion in genetics & development*. 15:621–627.
- Betran E, Thornton K, Long M. 2002. Retroposed new genes out of the X in *Drosophila*. *Genome Res*. 12:1854–1859.
- Bhutkar A, Schaeffer SW, Russo SM, Xu M, Smith TF, Gelbart WM. 2008. Chromosomal rearrangement inferred from comparisons of 12 *Drosophila* genomes. *Genetics*. 179:1657–1680.
- Bond J, Roberts E, Springell K, et al. (11 co-authors). 2005. A centrosomal mechanism involving cdk5rap2 and cenpj controls brain size. *Nature genetics*. 37:353–355.
- Cann HM, De Toma C, Cazes L, et al. (11 co-authors). 2002. A human genome diversity cell line panel. *Science (New York, NY)*. 296:261.
- Castillo DM, Moyle LC. 2012. Evolutionary implications of mechanistic models of te-mediated hybrid incompatibility. *International journal of evolutionary biology*. 2012.
- Chaisson MJ, Tesler G. 2012. Mapping single molecule sequencing reads using basic local alignment with successive refinement (blasr): application and theory. *BMC bioinformatics*. 13:238.

- Charlesworth B. 1996. The evolution of chromosomal sex determination and dosage compensation. *Current Biology*. 6:149–162.
- Chen J, Kim YC, Jung YC, Xuan Z, Dworkin G, Zhang Y, Zhang MQ, Wang SM. 2008. Scanning the human genome at kilobase resolution. *Genome research*. 18:751–762.
- Clark AG, Glanowski S, Nielsen R, et al. (11 co-authors). 2003. Inferring nonneutral evolution from human-chimp-mouse orthologous gene trios. *Science*. 302:1960–1963.
- Consortium GP, et al. (2 co-authors). 2012. An integrated map of genetic variation from 1,092 human genomes. *Nature*. 491:56–65.
- Corbett-Detig RB, Cardeno C, Langley CH. 2012. Sequence-based detection and breakpoint assembly of polymorphic inversions. *Genetics*. 192:131–137.
- Coyne JA, Orr HA, et al. (3 co-authors). 2004. *Speciation*, volume 37. Sinauer Associates Sunderland, MA.
- Cridland JM, Thornton KR. 2010. Validation of rearrangement break points identified by paired-end sequencing in natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genome Biol Evol*. 2:83–101.
- Cridland JM, Thornton KR, Long AD. 2015. Gene expression variation in *Drosophila melanogaster* due to rare transposable element insertion alleles of large effect. *Genetics*. 199:85–93.
- Darlington C. 1937. The biology of crossing-over. *Nature*. 140:759–761.
- Darlington TK, Wager-Smith K, Ceriani MF, Staknis D, Gekakis N, Steeves TD, Weitz CJ, Takahashi JS, Kay SA. 1998. Closing the circadian loop: Clock-induced transcription of its own inhibitors *per* and *tim*. *Science*. 280:1599–1603.
- De S, Teichmann SA, Babu MM. 2009. The impact of genomic neighborhood on the evolution of human and chimpanzee transcriptome. *Genome Res*. 19:785–794.
- De Braekeleer M, Dao TN. 1990. Cytogenetic studies in couples experiencing repeated pregnancy losses. *Hum. Reprod*. 5:519–528.
- DeGiorgio M, Lohmueller KE, Nielsen R. 2014. A model-based approach for identifying signatures of ancient balancing selection in genetic data. *PLoS Genet*. 10:e1004561.
- Dong WW, Huang HL, Yang W, et al. (12 co-authors). 2014. Testis-specific *Fank1* gene in knockdown mice produces oligospermia via apoptosis. *Asian J. Androl*. 16:124–130.
- Dong Y, Du RC, Jiang YT, Wu J, Li LL, Liu RZ. 2012. Impact of chromosomal translocations on male infertility, semen quality, testicular volume and reproductive hormone levels. *J. Int. Med. Res*. 40:2274–2283.

- Dorus S, Wasbrough ER, Busby J, Wilkin EC, Karr TL. 2010. Sperm proteomics reveals intensified selection on mouse sperm membrane and acrosome genes. *Molecular biology and evolution*. 27:1235–1246.
- Duhl DM, Vrieling H, Miller KA, Wolff GL, Barsh GS. 1994. Neomorphic agouti mutations in obese yellow mice. *Nature genetics*. 8:59–65.
- Eichler EE, Sankoff D. 2003. Structural dynamics of eukaryotic chromosome evolution. *Science*. 301:793–797.
- Ellegren H, Parsch J. 2007. The evolution of sex-biased genes and sex-biased gene expression. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 8:689–698.
- Evans PD, Vallender EJ, Lahn BT. 2006. Molecular evolution of the brain size regulator genes *cdk5rap2* and *cenpj*. *Gene*. 375:75–79.
- Fagerberg L, Hallström BM, Oksvold P, et al. (11 co-authors). 2014. Analysis of the human tissue-specific expression by genome-wide integration of transcriptomics and antibody-based proteomics. *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics*. 13:397–406.
- Folstein SE, Rosen-Sheidley B. 2001. Genetics of autism: complex aetiology for a heterogeneous disorder. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 2:943–955.
- Fryns JP, Van Buggenhout G. 1998. Structural chromosome rearrangements in couples with recurrent fetal wastage. *Eur. J. Obstet. Gynecol. Reprod. Biol.* 81:171–176.
- Giglio S, Broman KW, Matsumoto N, et al. (11 co-authors). 2001. Olfactory receptor–gene clusters, genomic-inversion polymorphisms, and common chromosome rearrangements. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. 68:874–883.
- Goddijn M, Leschot N. 2000. Genetic aspects of miscarriage. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 14:855–865.
- Green RE, Krause J, Briggs AW, et al. (11 co-authors). 2010. A draft sequence of the neandertal genome. *science*. 328:710–722.
- Haerty W, Jagadeeshan S, Kulathinal RJ, et al. (11 co-authors). 2007. Evolution in the fast lane: rapidly evolving sex-related genes in *drosophila*. *Genetics*. 177:1321–1335.
- Hasin Y, Olender T, Khen M, Gonzaga-Jauregui C, Kim PM, Urban AE, Snyder M, Gerstein MB, Lancet D, Korb J. 2008. High-resolution copy-number variation map reflects human olfactory receptor diversity and evolution. *PLoS genetics*. 4:e1000249.
- Hassan MJ, Khurshid M, Azeem Z, John P, Ali G, Chishti MS, Ahmad W. 2007. Previously described sequence variant in *cdk5rap2* gene in a pakistani family with autosomal recessive primary microcephaly. *BMC medical genetics*. 8:58.

- Jaillon O, Aury JM, Brunet F, et al. (61 co-authors). 2004. Genome duplication in the teleost fish *Tetraodon nigroviridis* reveals the early vertebrate proto-karyotype. *Nature*. 431:946–957.
- Kaback DB. 1996. Chromosome-size dependent control of meiotic recombination in humans. *Nature genetics*. 13:20–21.
- Kaessmann H. 2010. Origins, evolution, and phenotypic impact of new genes. *Genome Res*. 20:1313–1326.
- Khaitovich P, Hellmann I, Enard W, Nowick K, Leinweber M, Franz H, Weiss G, Lachmann M, Pääbo S. 2005. Parallel patterns of evolution in the genomes and transcriptomes of humans and chimpanzees. *Science*. 309:1850–1854.
- Kidwell MG, Lisch D. 1997. Transposable elements as sources of variation in animals and plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 94:7704–7711.
- Kim D, Salzberg SL. 2011. Tophat-fusion: an algorithm for discovery of novel fusion transcripts. *Genome Biol*. 12:R72.
- Korbel JO, Urban AE, Affourtit JP, et al. (23 co-authors). 2007. Paired-end mapping reveals extensive structural variation in the human genome. *Science*. 318:420–426.
- Lai CS, Fisher SE, Hurst JA, et al. (12 co-authors). 2000. The SPCH1 region on human 7q31: genomic characterization of the critical interval and localization of translocations associated with speech and language disorder. *Am. J. Hum. Genet*. 67:357–368.
- Lancaster MA, Renner M, Martin CA, Wenzel D, Bicknell LS, Hurles ME, Homfray T, Penninger JM, Jackson AP, Knoblich JA. 2013. Cerebral organoids model human brain development and microcephaly. *Nature*. 501:373–379.
- Lander ES, Linton LM, Birren B, et al. (11 co-authors). 2001. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature*. 409:860–921.
- Larkin MA, Blackshields G, Brown N, et al. (11 co-authors). 2007. Clustal w and clustal x version 2.0. *Bioinformatics*. 23:2947–2948.
- Li H, Durbin R. 2011. Inference of human population history from individual whole-genome sequences. *Nature*. 475:493–496.
- Li Y, Zhu J, Tian G, et al. (11 co-authors). 2010. The dna methylome of human peripheral blood mononuclear cells. *PLoS biology*. 8:e1000533.
- Mank JE, Vicoso B, Berlin S, Charlesworth B. 2010. Effective population size and the faster-x effect: empirical results and their interpretation. *Evolution*. 64:663–674.
- Meyer M, Kircher M, Gansauge MT, et al. (34 co-authors). 2012. A high-coverage genome sequence from an archaic Denisovan individual. *Science*. 338:222–226.

- Michaud EJ, Van Vugt M, Bultman SJ, Sweet HO, Davisson MT, Woychik RP. 1994. Differential expression of a new dominant agouti allele (aiapy) is correlated with methylation state and is influenced by parental lineage. *Genes & development*. 8:1463–1472.
- Miller M, Duhl D, Vrieling H, Cordes S, Ollmann M, Winkes B, Barsh G. 1993. Cloning of the mouse agouti gene predicts a secreted protein ubiquitously expressed in mice carrying the lethal yellow mutation. *Genes & development*. 7:454–467.
- Mitelman F, Johansson B, Mertens F. 2007. The impact of translocations and gene fusions on cancer causation. *Nat. Rev. Cancer*. 7:233–245.
- Murphy WJ, Larkin DM, Everts-van der Wind A, et al. (11 co-authors). 2005. Dynamics of mammalian chromosome evolution inferred from multispecies comparative maps. *Science*. 309:613–617.
- Nagase T, Kikuno R, Nakayama M, Hirose M, Ohara O. 2000. Prediction of the coding sequences of unidentified human genes. xviii. the complete sequences of 100 new cDNA clones from brain which code for large proteins in vitro. *DNA research*. 7:271–281.
- Niimura Y, Nei M. 2003. Evolution of olfactory receptor genes in the human genome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 100:12235–12240.
- O’Neill RJW, O’Neill MJ, Graves JAM. 1998. Undermethylation associated with retroelement activation and chromosome remodelling in an interspecific mammalian hybrid. *Nature*. 393:68–72.
- Pagnamenta AT, Murray JE, Yoon G, et al. (11 co-authors). 2012. A novel nonsense cdk5rap2 mutation in a somali child with primary microcephaly and sensorineural hearing loss. *American journal of medical genetics Part A*. 158:2577–2582.
- Petrov DA, Schutzman JL, Hartl DL, Lozovskaya ER. 1995. Diverse transposable elements are mobilized in hybrid dysgenesis in *Drosophila virilis*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 92:8050–8054.
- Presgraves DC. 2010. The molecular evolutionary basis of species formation. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 11:175–180.
- Prufer K, Racimo F, Patterson N, et al. (45 co-authors). 2014. The complete genome sequence of a Neanderthal from the Altai Mountains. *Nature*. 505:43–49.
- Putnam NH, Butts T, Ferrier DE, et al. (37 co-authors). 2008. The amphioxus genome and the evolution of the chordate karyotype. *Nature*. 453:1064–1071.
- Reich D, Green RE, Kircher M, et al. (28 co-authors). 2010. Genetic history of an archaic hominin group from Denisova Cave in Siberia. *Nature*. 468:1053–1060.

- Rice WR. 1984. Sex chromosomes and the evolution of sexual dimorphism. *Evolution*. pp. 735–742.
- Rieseberg LH. 2001. Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. *Trends Ecol. Evol. (Amst.)*. 16:351–358.
- Roberto R, Capozzi O, Wilson RK, et al. (11 co-authors). 2007. Molecular refinement of gibbon genome rearrangements. *Genome research*. 17:249–257.
- Rogers RL, Cridland JM, Shao L, Hu TT, Andolfatto P, Thornton KR. 2014. Landscape of standing variation for tandem duplications in *Drosophila yakuba* and *Drosophila simulans*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31:1750–1766.
- Rubin GM, Kidwell MG, Bingham PM. 1982. The molecular basis of P-M hybrid dysgenesis: the nature of induced mutations. *Cell*. 29:987–994.
- Sankararaman S, Mallick S, Dannemann M, Prüfer K, Kelso J, Paabo S, Patterson N, Reich D. 2014. The genomic landscape of Neanderthal ancestry in present-day humans. *Nature*. 507:354–357.
- Sankararaman S, Patterson N, Li H, Paabo S, Reich D. 2012. The date of interbreeding between Neandertals and modern humans. *PLoS Genet*. 8:e1002947.
- Scally A, Dutheil JY, Hillier LW, et al. (11 co-authors). 2012. Insights into hominid evolution from the gorilla genome sequence. *Nature*. 483:169–175.
- Schaffner SF. 2004. The x chromosome in population genetics. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 5:43–51.
- Schreurs A, Legius E, Meuleman C, Fryns JP, DHooghe TM. 2000. Increased frequency of chromosomal abnormalities in female partners of couples undergoing in vitro fertilization or intracytoplasmic sperm injection. *Fertility and sterility*. 74:94–96.
- Sequencing TC, Consortium A, et al. (3 co-authors). 2005. Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and comparison with the human genome. *Nature*. 437:69–87.
- Slotkin RK, Martienssen R. 2007. Transposable elements and the epigenetic regulation of the genome. *Nat. Rev. Genet*. 8:272–285.
- Steinberg KM, Schneider VA, Graves-Lindsay TA, et al. (11 co-authors). 2014. Single haplotype assembly of the human genome from a hydatidiform mole. *Genome research*. 24:2066–2076.
- Stern C, Pertile M, Norris H, Hale L, Baker HW. 1999. Chromosome translocations in couples with in-vitro fertilization implantation failure. *Hum. Reprod*. 14:2097–2101.
- Sudmant PH, Kitzman JO, Antonacci F, et al. (11 co-authors). 2010. Diversity of human copy number variation and multicopy genes. *Science*. 330:641–646.

- Tomblin JB, O'Brien M, Shriberg LD, Williams C, Murray J, Patil S, Bjork J, Anderson S, Ballard K. 2009. Language features in a mother and daughter of a chromosome 7;13 translocation involving FOXP2. *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.* 52:1157–1174.
- Trapnell C, Pachter L, Salzberg SL. 2009. Tophat: discovering splice junctions with rna-seq. *Bioinformatics.* 25:1105–1111.
- Trask BJ, Massa H, Brand-Arpon V, et al. (11 co-authors). 1998. Large multi-chromosomal duplications encompass many members of the olfactory receptor gene family in the human genome. *Human molecular genetics.* 7:2007–2020.
- Venter JC, Adams MD, Myers EW, et al. (11 co-authors). 2001. The sequence of the human genome. *science.* 291:1304–1351.
- Vitaterna MH, King DP, Chang AM, Kornhauser JM, Lowrey PL, McDonald JD, Dove WF, Pinto LH, Turek FW, Takahashi JS. 1994. Mutagenesis and mapping of a mouse gene, clock, essential for circadian behavior. *Science.* 264:719–725.
- Voolstra C, Tautz D, Farbrother P, Eichinger L, Harr B. 2007. Contrasting evolution of expression differences in the testis between species and subspecies of the house mouse. *Genome research.* 17:42–49.
- Wyckoff GJ, Wang W, Wu CI. 2000. Rapid evolution of male reproductive genes in the descent of man. *Nature.* 403:304–309.
- Zheng Z, Zheng H, Yan W. 2007. Fank1 is a testis-specific gene encoding a nuclear protein exclusively expressed during the transition from the meiotic to the haploid phase of spermatogenesis. *Gene Expr. Patterns.* 7:777–783.

Table 1: Genome structure changes identified in Neanderthals and Denisovans

Species	cross chrom	within chrom	total
Altai Neanderthal	756	229	985
Denisovan	1109	221	1330

Table 2: Overrepresented Gene Ontology Categories

Genome	function	EASE
Altai Neanderthal	flotillin	1.27
Denisovan	keratin	1.28
	microtubule	1.17
	flotillin	1.14
	fibronectin	1.13

Table 3: Genes with $d_N/d_S > 1.0$

Genome	Gene	d_N	d_S	d_N/d_S
Altai Neanderthal	ENSG00000214681	0.003584	0.000004	999.0
	ENSG00000184276	0.006455	0.000006	999.0
	ENSG00000186146	0.000002	0.000000	134.7
	ENSG00000062096	0.004416	0.000004	999.0
	ENSG00000203780	0.000001	0.000001	1.2
	ENSG00000132196	0.001461	0.000007	221.1
	ENSG00000142794	0.005703	0.004413	1.3
Denisovan	ENSG00000184276	0.006455	0.000006	999.0
	ENSG00000203780	0.000001	0.000001	1.2
	ENSG00000178852	0.004800	0.000044	109.7
	ENSG00000196757	0.001320	0.000018	73.6

Table 4: Testes-specific expression patterns

Genome	testis-specific	chimp-human diverged			
Altai Neanderthal	15/124	$P = 0.0074$	9/25	$P = 0.019$	Fisher's $P = 0.0014$
Denisovan	14/182	$P = 0.1422$	10/45	$P = 0.321$	Fisher's $P = 0.18$

Table 5: Introgression rates from Neanderthal into modern humans

Type	introgression probability	genomic background	P -value
All structural	0.008	0.012	$\leq 10^{-3}$
Derived in modern humans	0.007	0.012	0.0015

Table 6: Y Coverage

Genome	Locus	Mean Coverage	Median Coverage	Standard Deviation
Neanderthal	whole Y	0.91	0	18.5
	within 1kb of Y-translocations	74	14	220
Denisovan	whole Y	0.56	0	12.5
	within 1kb of Y-translocation	52	7	160





Figure 1: Chromosomal translocations identified using Neanderthal and Denisova high coverage sequencing data compared with the modern human reference genome. Within-chromosome translocations are not shown. Rearrangements that match the ancestral state, suggestive of derived mutations along the human lineage, are shown in black. All other rearrangements are shown in grey.

Gorilla, Denisovan, Neanderthal



Human




Figure 2: Ectopic recombination captures olfactory receptors in the human lineage. We identified breakpoints of a change in genome structure using abnormal paired-end read mapping to chromosomes 14 and 15 in Illumina short read data for the high coverage Neanderthal and Denisova genomes. Alignments with the outgroup genome match with the state inferred for archaic humans based on paired-end reads from archaic humans.




Figure 3: Rate of rearrangements vs chromosome size for Neanderthal and Denisova. Both samples show a significant negative correlation between the rate of rearrangement and chromosome size. These results may suggest that ectopic recombination is more common for small chromosomes or that small chromosomes are degenerating. Rates of rearrangements are higher in Denisovan than Neanderthal, but chromosomes show consistent patterns across the two species.




Figure 4: Change in genome structure flanking *CDK5RAP2*. The current chromosomal location cannot be inferred from limited data in archaic humans and the mutation might putatively reside on chromosome 4 or chromosome 9. Nonsense mutants in *CDK5RAP2* produce pathogenic microcephaly while *CLOCK* regulates circadian rhythm in model organisms. Both genes are known to be expressed in neurons.




Figure 5: Folded site frequency spectrum for genome structure changes identified in archaic human genomes assayed in a population of 10 individual modern humans. The SFS indicates a skew toward high and low frequency variants with fewer moderate frequency variants.




Figure 6: Genomic coverage with lowess smoothed regression line at the site of a rearrangement at the *Fank1* locus and on the translocated segment of the Y in the Altai Neanderthal. Locations of abnormally mapping read pairs that indicate junctions of rearrangements are shown in red. Coverage changes are consistent with 6 fold copy number variation, and coverage depth is variable across the region, consistent with multiple independent breakpoints indicated by the paired end read information.




Figure 7: Genomic coverage with lowess smoothed regression line at the site of a rearrangement at the *Fank1* locus and on the translocated segment of the Y in the Altai Neanderthal. Locations of abnormally mapping read pairs that indicate junctions of rearrangements are shown in red.




Figure 8: Heterozygosity for 1 kb windows surrounding the duplicated first exon of *Fank1*. Boundaries of the duplication inferred from coverage data and abnormally mapping read pairs is shown in red. Heterozygosity for the region is abnormally high, a signature of paralogs accumulating mutations and diverging over time. Heterozygosity is highest in the regions with higher copy number status and return to normal levels outside the duplicated region in *Fank1*.




Figure 9: Putative origins of a newly transcribed sequence due to translocation at the *Fank1* locus. A chromosomal rearrangement moved a region of the Y to the region adjacent to the first exon of *Fank1*. Paired end reads in RNA-seq data from testis of a modern human indicate fusion transcripts uniting the first exon of *Fank1* and an unannotated region that matches with the Y. The translocation is present in all modern humans surveyed and in the Neanderthal and Denisovan genome sequences. Downstream exons of *Fank1* outside the region with the rearrangement are still transcribed in the testes.




Figure 10: Structure of copy number variation for the *Fank1* locus in Neanderthal. Breakpoints indicated by abnormally mapping read-pairs are labeled. Duplication of the rearranged segment at the *Fank1* locus resulted in roughly 6-fold copy number variation for the first exon of *Fank1* and a newly transcribed exon derived from a segment formerly located on the Y. Exact order of copies with specific breakpoints within the 6X cassette is not known, though independent breakpoints are indicated in the paired-end read mapping and coverage data. The Denisovan genome sequence data shows a similar 6-fold expansion of the region, however only some of the copies share precise breakpoints.




Figure 11: Genomic coverage depth for the translocated segment of the chromosome 10 for 10 modern human genomes. Modern humans show increased coverage consistent with multiple copies for the region.




Figure 12: Genomic coverage depth for the translocated segment of the Y in 10 modern human genomes. Modern humans show increased coverage consistent with multiple copies for the region.




Figure 13: Segregation of rearrangement products produces incompatible chromosomes. Chromosomal rearrangements A' and B', formed through reciprocal exchange of DNA across non-homologous chromosomes, undergo independent assortment during meiosis I. If segregation of chromosomes is random, gametes have only a 50% chance of inheriting only one rearranged chromosome. Gametes will lack DNA captured by one rearrangement, but will contain additional copies of the complementary rearrangement segment. If the rearrangement captures essential genes or regulatory factors necessary for development, parents with incompatible chromosomal rearrangements will have reduced fertility, and loss of non-essential genes can reduce offspring fitness. Thus, even chromosomal rearrangements that do not have any other molecular or phenotypic effects when homozygous can reduce fitness in hemizygotes.