

An RNA-centered view of eukaryotic cells

Emmanuel Tannenbaum*

Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

We conjecture that RNA comprises the living component of eukaryotic cells. That is, we claim that eukaryotic cells may be regarded as RNA “communities” which constructed DNA, proteins, cell membranes, and various other organelles and structures as a collective survival strategy. While recent evidence points to introns and intergenic sequences (non-protein coding regions) coding for a vast, RNA-based, genetic regulatory network, we believe that this “regulatory” network is more properly viewed as a rich and largely unexplored biochemical network of RNA interactions, much of which exists for its own sake. Periodically, various subgroups of RNAs write themselves into DNA via reverse transcriptase, permanently recording themselves into the genome. Those RNA biochemical “experiments” which confer a reproductive advantage to the cell will be preserved via natural selection, while most will eventually be spliced out or lost due to genetic drift. We present biological data which is consistent with our hypothesis, and discuss tests which could be used to disprove the validity of our model. We argue that the RNA-community view of eukaryotic cells also points to the general structure of the appropriate evolutionary dynamics equations necessary for qualitative and quantitative models of macroevolutionary dynamics, and provides a window into the nature of the earliest biochemical systems which gave rise to terrestrial life.

Keywords: RNA, introns, reverse transcriptase, retrotransposons, transposition, macroevolution, quasispecies, hypercycles, RNA-mediated DNA evolution

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most striking differences between prokaryotic and eukaryotic organisms is in the organization of their respective genomes. Prokaryotic genomes are relatively simple, in that a given DNA base-pair can generally be assigned as part of a codon for an amino acid [2]. A considerably smaller fraction of the genome codes for a handful of RNAs which are generally involved in protein synthesis [2].

Eukaryotic genomes, by contrast, are much more complex. In general, the base-pair DNA sequence of a eukaryotic gene cannot be directly translated into the corresponding polypeptide for which it codes. The reason for this is that eukaryotic genes are usually interrupted by noncoding regions known as *introns*, which need to be spliced from the transcribed mRNA before it is carried to a ribosome for translation [2]. Furthermore, the genes themselves are often separated by large non-protein-coding regions of the genome, known as *intergenic sequences* [2].

In the simpler eukaryotes, such as *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Baker’s yeast), the fraction of non-protein-coding DNA is a relatively small fraction of the genome, similar in this regard to prokaryotes [2]. Evidently, the relatively high replication rates of such organisms drives the removal of most non-essential components of the genome. However, in more complex, slower replicating organisms, the fraction of non-coding regions (introns and intergenic sequences) is quite high. For example, in humans, it is estimated that only 1.1 – 1.4% of the genome actually codes for proteins [2]. It is estimated that introns con-

stitute approximately 24% of the human genome, while the remaining 75% consists of intergenic sequences. For a time, it was not known whether the 99% of the so-called non-coding regions of the genome is simply “junk” DNA, or whether it is involved in some unknown regulatory function [2].

Recent evidence, however, suggests that much of the intronic DNA in eukaryotic genomes does in fact play a regulatory function [1, 2, 3, 4]. That is, it is believed that the bulk of the DNA codes for a collection of RNAs that are never translated into proteins, but rather are part of a massive regulatory network involving DNA-RNA, RNA-RNA, DNA-Protein, and RNA-Protein interactions [1, 2, 3, 4]. It is believed this massive regulatory network is responsible for the variety and complexity of terrestrial life [3, 4].

It has therefore become apparent that a proper understanding of RNA biochemistry is crucial for understanding the functioning of living cells. Indeed, RNA is generally regarded as the basis for early terrestrial life, a conjecture known as the *RNA World* hypothesis [5, 6, 7, 8].

Like DNA, RNA is capable of Watson-Crick base-pairing, and therefore is able to store and transmit genetic information. Unlike DNA, RNA is capable of catalyzing chemical reactions (some introns, for example, are self-splicing) [2], which has led to searches for RNA that is even capable of catalyzing its own replication. In addition, the ribosome, which is responsible for making protein from RNA, is apparently a *ribozyme* [2, 9, 10], that is, an enzyme composed of RNA (the spliceosome in the cell nucleus, responsible for intron splicing, also appears to be a ribozyme [2]).

The difficulty with the RNA-first theory is that, in contrast to proteins, RNA tends to be chemically unstable, since it is capable of catalyzing its own hydrolysis [2]. It is believed that DNA evolved because it is considerably

*Electronic address: etannenb@fas.harvard.edu

more stable, and therefore a better molecule for storing genetic information [2].

This difficulty has been the subject of some theoretical treatment. In particular, Eigen and Schuster developed a mathematical theory for describing a network of RNAs which mutually catalyze each others' replication [12, 13, 14, 15]. These hypothetical RNA networks are termed *hypercycles*, and have been shown to lead to stably evolving systems.

The hypercycle concept suggests that early life on Earth evolved from a network of replicating RNAs, which eventually constructed proteins (which then took over as catalysts) and DNA (which later took over as the storage molecule of genetic information).

In what follows, we present and develop the following intriguing hypothesis: What if the hypercycles never disappeared? That is, what if the massive RNA regulatory network inside eukaryotic cells is in fact the modern day version of the early "hypercycles"? In this view, the eukaryotic cell is not best seen as an extraordinarily complex, highly regulated biochemical machine, but rather as an RNA "community" which built DNA, proteins, and various other cellular components as a collective survival strategy. The eukaryotic cell should then be regarded as a vast superstructure built by the RNAs, whose closest analogy would be an organized society such as a city-state or country.

In the following section, we present what the implications of such an RNA-centered model would be, and what the available biochemical evidence is to suggest that the picture we present might be correct. We continue by presenting a general framework for modeling the evolutionary dynamics of eukaryotic systems. Finally, we conclude with some speculations as to the nature of the earliest RNAs which gave rise to terrestrial life, and also briefly discuss aspects of prokaryotic and eukaryotic evolution.

Before continuing, we should emphasize that, while we believe this paper presents a fresh perspective on eukaryotic evolution, the idea that terrestrial life evolved from RNA is by no means new (as noted previously). Furthermore, the specific "RNA-mediated" evolution concept which we will later describe has been previously discussed [11].

II. IMPLICATIONS OF THE RNA-CENTERED MODEL

In this section, we pursue the analogy between a eukaryotic cell and a structured community to infer the basic nature of the evolutionary dynamics of eukaryotic cells. We state which inferences seem to be supported by current biological data, and which are not. The inferences which are not supported provide concrete, falsifiable hypotheses that could serve as benchmarks for testing our model.

To begin, we may note that in a society, the general mechanism by which technological advances are made is

via innovations developed in relatively small subgroups of the population. If these innovations are useful to the society (as dictated, by say, the laws of supply and demand), then they can be imitated, spread, and standardized. However, in order for the activities of a given subpopulation to become permanent, generally these activities must be recorded.

The RNA-community model for a eukaryotic cell suggests that much of the RNA in a cell exists for its own sake (in [11], the RNA-community is called the *ribotype* of the cell). That is, the RNA may be regarded as taking part in a vast and largely unexplored network of biochemical reactions, with RNAs catalyzing each others' replication, mutation, splicing, and so forth. While these various RNAs may make some contribution to the fitness of the cell (just as in every society, people tend to have some sort of job), it is likely that most RNAs contribute minimally and highly indirectly to cell survival. Thus, it is probable that the cell could survive without much of its RNA biochemical network.

Periodically, individual RNAs or small subgroups will write themselves into the DNA genome. Many of these recordings will make no contribution to the survival probability of the cell. Eventually, these "junk" recordings may be lost, though not before a steady-state is reached where a considerable amount of "junk" recordings have been accumulated (it is energetically too costly for the cell to monitor the accumulation of "junk" DNA to the extent that it constitutes only a negligible fraction of the genome).

However, a certain fraction of the RNA recordings will confer a fitness advantage to the cell, and, depending on the environmental conditions, the fitness advantage can be significant. In these cases, the recordings will be preserved via natural selection, and will become permanent components of the genome. Because of the considerable amount of RNA experimentation that likely occurs in eukaryotic cells, we postulate that the rate of this "RNA-mediated" DNA evolution is much faster than what would be calculated using more simplistic point-mutation models, or even models incorporating DNA recombination (an illustration of the evolutionary dynamics model being described here is provided in Figure 1).

There are a number of implications that this model makes, which we will study in turn. These implications and the evidence supporting them are summarized in Table 1.

To begin, we note that while RNA is known to be capable of catalysis, thus far the only known mechanism which exists for transmitting RNA to a DNA genome is via an enzyme known as reverse transcriptase (since some introns are known to be self-splicing, however, it is possible that there are RNAs which can reverse transcribe and insert themselves into a DNA genome without the aid of protein catalysts). Reverse transcriptase occurs in a class of viruses known as retroviruses, to which HIV belongs. Retroviruses carry a single-stranded RNA genome and a reverse transcriptase, which synthesizes a double-




FIG. 1: Illustration of the RNA-centered view of evolutionary dynamics. The bulk of the RNA in a eukaryotic cell is postulated to exist as part of a vast and largely unexplored network of biochemical interactions. A relatively small component is directly involved with protein synthesis. The RNA periodically records itself into the DNA genome.

stranded DNA molecule from the RNA template. The DNA molecule then incorporates itself into the genome, and proceeds to direct the synthesis of new virus particles.

Thus, for our model to be plausible, reverse transcriptase must be active in eukaryotic cells. There is evidence that this is indeed the case.

First of all, one of the mechanisms of aging in eukaryotic cells is due to a shortening of their chromosomes after each replication cycle [2]. When the chromosomes reach a critical minimum length, the cell ceases dividing [2]. To prevent harming the integrity of important regions of the eukaryotic genomes, eukaryotic chromosomes are capped by repeating nucleotide sequences known as telomeres [2]. An enzyme known as telomerase restores the telomeres after each cell division cycle, thereby preventing chromosome shortening and cell aging (in multicellular organisms, telomerase is largely inactivated, except in stem cells, reproductive cells, and in cancer cells).

It is interesting to note that telomerase is nothing more than a reverse transcriptase which carries its own RNA template [2].

Second, it is also interesting to note that the Class II introns, which are believed to be the ancestors of all modern introns [16], code for proteins resembling reverse transcriptases [2, 17]. Specifically, the Class II introns code for enzymes known as *maturases*, which have both strand cleaving and reverse transcription functions [2, 18], thereby facilitating intron movement into various portions of the genome.

The next set of supporting evidence for our model comes from a common mechanism for genetic change in both prokaryotes and eukaryotes, known as transposition [2]. Transposition refers to the duplication and movement of various gene sequences from one portion of a genome to another, or even between genomes [2]. In bacteria, transposition is believed to be the major culprit causing the emergence and rapid spread of antibiotic-resistant strains [2, 19]. In general, transposition is widely regarded as the primary mechanism for large-scale remodeling of the genome, and is therefore believed to be the “engine” driving macroevolutionary change [2].

Some transposons integrate into a host cell genome directly. However others, the retrotransposons, integrate into the host cell via an RNA intermediate [2] (thus the Class II introns may be viewed as retrotransposons). That is, a retrotransposon is a DNA sequence which is first transcribed to RNA, and then reverse transcribed into another portion of the genome. Retrotransposons are believed to be the primary source of transposition in eukaryotes [2].

According to the RNA-community model, retrotransposons are nothing more than members of the RNA “community” periodically writing themselves into the DNA genome. Again, since most of this experimentation confers no fitness advantage to the cell, much of the transposed DNA is “junk” DNA. As an illustration, the most common retrotransposon in yeast is the Ty1 transposon, which has approximately 35 copies comprising $\approx 13\%$ of the yeast genome [2].

If DNA was indeed built by RNA as a mechanism for more permanent information storage, then it should follow that the enzyme for “reading” the DNA (transcription), and the enzyme for “writing” to the DNA (reverse transcription), should have appeared around the same time. While this has not been definitively established, there is evidence hinting that this is indeed the case [20, 21].

Finally, there is speculation that retroviruses are the source of retrotransposons (and DNA viruses are the source of transposons) [2]. That is, retrotransposons are mainly derived from retroviral RNA which was reverse transcribed into the genome. The viral genome lost the ability to direct the synthesis of new viral particles or even to make protein, and so remained in the genome as a mobile yet harmless genetic element.

The RNA-community model holds the opposite view. That is, this model argues that since DNA was built by retrotransposons, then retrotransposons existed before retroviruses. Retroviruses are protein-coding retrotransposons which carry their own reverse transcriptase in order to successfully replicate in host cells. One scenario is that retroviruses evolved from virulent retrotransposons, which in turn may have evolved from “cancerous” retrotransposons that replicated uncontrollably in the first emerging RNA biochemical networks.

The question of whether retroviruses or retrotransposons appeared first is an open one [2]. Nevertheless,

there is some evidence consistent with our prediction.

III. AN INITIAL MATHEMATICAL MODEL

We can construct an initial mathematical model describing RNA-mediated DNA evolution. For simplicity, we will model all molecules, DNA and RNA, as single-stranded, conservatively replicating units. In recent work [23], it has been shown that a proper mathematical modeling of certain aspects of DNA evolutionary dynamics requires the explicit incorporation of the semi-conservative nature of DNA replication. Thus, for the purposes of developing an initial model, we are making one of a number of simplifications which will need to be relaxed later.

We begin by assuming that the genome of a particular cell consists of N genes, given by the sequences $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N$. At any given time t , the full genome may be written as $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N$. For simplicity, we may assume that all genes and individual RNAs have identical length L (when studying phenomena such as the error catastrophe, the sequence length is generally taken to be infinite).

We assume that RNA is continually produced via transcription, which we take to occur at a constant rate κ_T (so that the more genes in the genome, the lower the per gene transcription rate). Transcription is not error-free, so that gene sequence σ_n is transcribed to some σ with probability $p_T(\sigma_n, \sigma)$.

The individual RNAs eventually decay (due, for example, to self-hydrolysis), so we assume that the RNA population has a first-order decay constant given by κ_D . If $n_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA}$ denotes the number of RNAs with sequence σ , in a cell with genome $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N$, at some time t , then we have,

$$\frac{dn_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA}}{dt} = \kappa_T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N p_T(\sigma_n, \sigma) - \kappa_D n_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA} \quad (1)$$

This equation implicitly assumes that reverse transcription is much slower than transcription, and so has a negligible effect on the RNA population (this assumption is likely correct, since transposition is known to be tightly regulated [2]).

It is important to note that we are also ignoring what is likely a complex web of inter-RNA interactions. Thus, as a first approximation, we are neglecting additional terms in our expression for $dn_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA}/dt$.

We can also make a quasi-steady-state approximation, to obtain,

$$n_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA} = \frac{\kappa_T}{\kappa_D} \langle p_T(\sigma_n, \sigma) \rangle_N \quad (2)$$

where $\langle p_T(\sigma_n, \sigma) \rangle_N \equiv (1/N) \sum_{n=1}^N p(\sigma_n, \sigma)$.

The evolution of the DNA genome is influenced by the presence of the RNA ‘‘cloud’’ (ribotype) in the cell. We assume that reverse transcription from the RNA ‘‘cloud’’

PREDICTION	EVIDENCE/TESTS
Reverse transcriptase is active in eukaryotic cells.	Telomerase is a reverse transcriptase [2]. Class II introns appear to code for proteins resembling reverse transcriptases [2, 16, 17, 18]. These proteins are responsible for reverse transcribing the introns into various portions of the genome [2, 18].
Reverse transcriptase and DNA-directed RNA polymerase evolved at the same time.	There is evidence that <i>RNA-directed</i> RNA polymerase and reverse transcriptase evolved from a common ancestor [20]. Genetic analysis of certain microsporidia indicates that they are one of the deepest branching lineages of the eukaryotic line of descent. BLAST analysis revealed a number of gene sequences with high levels of sequence similarity, including a reverse transcriptase and a DNA-dependent RNA polymerase [21] (microsporidia are cells that can only replicate inside a host cytoplasm).
Retroviruses evolved from retrotransposons.	There is some evidence supporting this hypothesis [22].
RNA molecules periodically write themselves into the DNA genome.	Transposition is believed to be primarily responsible for global genetic remodeling [2]. Retrotransposition appears to be the dominant transposition mechanism in eukaryotes [2]. In <i>S. cerevisiae</i> , the Ty1 retrotransposon exists in many duplicate copies, accounting for $\approx 13\%$ of the yeast genome.
Much of the RNA in eukaryotic cells is involved in complex networks of various biochemical interactions (splicing, replication, and so forth) with little to no contribution to the overall fitness of the cell. Indeed, the cell could survive without much of this RNA machinery.	In addition to mRNA, and tRNA, there is rRNA (ribosomal RNA), sRNA (from the spliceosome), snoRNA (small nucleolar RNA), and iRNA (interference RNA) [2]. It appears that the number of different types of RNA in the cell is steadily growing. It should be noted that prokaryotes successfully eliminated much of the RNA biochemistry, and have since come to constitute the vast majority of the biomass on Earth. Thus, it is certainly possible that much of the RNA present in many eukaryotic cells serves little to no useful functions. Admittedly, however, this hypothesis is largely speculative.

TABLE I: Summary of the predictions made by the RNA-community model of eukaryotic cells, and the evidence in support of it.




FIG. 2: A simplified model of RNA-mediated DNA evolution. An RNA population is maintained via transcription, while RNAs periodically reverse transcribe themselves into the genome. Periodic splicing ensures that the genome does not become prohibitively long.

happens at a rate dictated by a per strand first-order growth rate constant κ_{RT} . We also assume that there exists a first-order splicing rate constant κ_S . For simplicity, we assume that reverse transcription and splicing both occur at one side (the “end”) of the genome (this is another assumption that will need to be relaxed).

The final component of the evolutionary dynamics is mutation of the DNA genome itself. In the simplified version of our model, we assume that direct (non-RNA mediated) changes to the DNA genome occur only via point mutations during the replication cycle of the organism. Thus, we are purposely neglecting recombination, as well as the effect of DNA damage due to radiation, mutagens, metabolic free radicals.

With each genome $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N$ is associated a first-order growth rate constant, or fitness, denoted $\kappa_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N}$. Replication is not error-free, so that during replication, there is a probability that the parent genome $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N$ makes the daughter genome $\sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_N$. We denote this probability by $p_m(\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N, \sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_N)$. Thus, if $n_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N}^{DNA}$ denotes the number of cells with DNA genome $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N$ at some time t , then we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dn_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N}^{DNA}}{dt} = & \sum_{\sigma'_1} \dots \sum_{\sigma'_N} \kappa_{\sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_N} p_m(\sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_N, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N) n_{\sigma'_1 \dots \sigma'_N}^{DNA} \\ & + \kappa_{RT} (n_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{N-1}}^{DNA} \sum_{\sigma} p_{RT}(\sigma, \sigma_N) n_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{N-1})}^{RNA} - n_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N}^{DNA} \sum_{\sigma} n_{(\sigma, \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N)}^{RNA}) \\ & + \kappa_S (\sum_{\sigma} n_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N \sigma}^{DNA} - n_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N}^{DNA}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This model also assumes that reverse transcription is not error free, so that an RNA sequence σ is reverse transcribed as a DNA sequence σ_N with probability $p_{RT}(\sigma, \sigma_N)$.

It is possible to convert the above system of ordinary differential equations into an equivalent quasispecies formalism involving population fractions. We can then proceed to study equilibrium states of the model, and compute the distribution of genome lengths and error catastrophe. We can also study the behavior of the model for dynamic fitness landscapes, and compare adaptation rates for RNA-mediated evolution with adaptation rates for point-mutation evolution [24].

The analogy to the single-fitness-peak model for the original quasispecies dynamics may be constructed as follows: We begin by assuming that the first n genes of the genome are responsible for the viability of the organism. For each σ_i among these first n genes, there is a “mas-

ter” sequence $\sigma_{i,0}$, so that the organism has a first-order growth rate constant of $k > 1$ if and only if the genome is given by $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N = \sigma_{1,0} \dots \sigma_{n,0} \sigma'_{n+1} \dots \sigma'_N$. Otherwise, if $n < N$, then the first-order growth rate constant is 0 (the cell is “dead”), while if $n \geq N$, the first-order growth rate constant is 1 (the cell has damaged genes, but can still carry on basic metabolic functions. We should also point out that in this model, the viability genes have to appear in a specific region of the genome. This is an assumption that can be relaxed as well).

Furthermore, we assume that additional genes beyond what is required for viability will generally slow down the growth rate of the cell, since they lead to longer daughter genome synthesis times. Thus, if the time between the end of the last replication cycle to the start of the next replication cycle is τ_{Δ} , and the per gene replication time is τ_r , then the total length of the cell cycle is $\tau = \tau_{\Delta} + N\tau_r$. For n genes, this gives a base cell cycle time length

of $\tau_{min} = \tau_{\Delta} + n\tau_r$. The first-order growth rate constant is then,

$$\kappa_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_N} = \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{\kappa_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}}{1 + (N - n)\kappa_{\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_n}\tau_r} \quad (4)$$

For equilibrium studies, the balance between the fitness cost of splicing an essential gene and adding nonessential genes to the genome leads to an equilibrium genome length for the population, and an optimal value of κ_S for maximizing the fitness. In rapidly changing environments, the system should exhibit sharp increases in the genome length, which then restores to equilibrium values once the stress is removed.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

A. Prokaryotic evolution

The RNA-centered view of eukaryotic cells fits well with what is currently known about the relationship between prokaryotes and eukaryotes. It had been conjectured for many years that prokaryotes are simpler than eukaryotes, and that eukaryotes must have therefore evolved from them [2]. However, genetic analyses of archaeobacteria, eukaryotes, and prokaryotes have revealed that the genomic organization of archaeobacteria is closer to that of eukaryotes than prokaryotes [2, 25]. This suggests that eukaryotes are more massive, yet more primitive forms of life than prokaryotes. The current view is that prokaryotes and archaeobacteria diverged from an earlier life form, after which the eukaryotes diverged from the archaeobacteria [2].

Prokaryotes eliminated much of the RNA biochemistry in primitive cells. Because proteins are generally better catalysts than RNA molecules, and because DNA is a more stable molecule for storing genetic information, prokaryotes may be viewed less as a “community” and more as a biochemical machine operating with components optimized for their various functions. The RNA still plays an important role (by conveying information from DNA to protein and serving in some catalytic roles as well), however the role is considerably diminished as compared to eukaryotic cells.

B. A plausible origin of life scenario?

If we again anthropomorphize the hypothetical RNA biochemical network inside eukaryotic cells, then, by analogy with societies, we may be able to infer the identity of the first biomolecules which gave rise to terrestrial life.

Since more primitive societies generally have far less specializations than exists in modern technological societies, we may imagine that the source of terrestrial life was likely one or a few RNA molecules, capable of

performing essentially all the functions that the various RNAs, DNA, and proteins perform in modern cells. That is, the primitive RNAs giving rise to terrestrial life should have had the ability to catalyze their own replication, to self-splice and recombine, possibly to insert themselves into other RNA sequences, and perhaps also to catalyze a number of other reactions. As with primitive societies, such “multifunctional” RNAs were probably far less efficient at any given task than a highly specialized RNA present in modern day cells.

Whether such “multifunctional” RNAs are still present in modern eukaryotic cells is an open question. If such RNAs do not exist in modern eukaryotic cells, then it may be possible, via bioinformatic analysis of present-day eukaryotic RNA, to infer the nucleotide sequence of such RNAs. As discussed earlier, because many free-living eukaryotes have eliminated much of their non-coding DNA, it may be necessary to study the RNA biochemistry of eukaryotic cells from more complex organisms for a proper analysis (because they are from an older lineage, the archaeobacteria may also be a useful source of genomic data).

C. Modeling macroevolutionary dynamics

The quasispecies model of evolutionary dynamics was originally introduced to qualitatively model aspects of RNA molecular evolution [26]. Among the systems to which it has also been applied, the quasispecies concept was used to develop an evolutionary dynamics model for immune response to viral pathogens [27]. By assuming that the antibody-generating regions of B-cells had evolved mutation rates which are optimal for destroying the virus, Kamp and Bornholdt obtained B-cell hyper-somatic mutation rates which agree well with the values measured [27].

Thus, if the proper details are included, it is possible to quantitatively model aspects of evolutionary dynamics. With the framework for constructing the evolutionary dynamics equations relevant to macroevolutionary change, we hope to obtain correct order-of-magnitude estimates of time scales for various macroevolutionary changes (such as the rise of multicellular life from single-celled life).

While we believe that certain aspects of macroevolutionary dynamics can be quantitatively modelled (e.g. time scales), we believe that prediction of specific evolutionary pathways will be much more difficult. The reason for this is that because macroevolutionary dynamics is driven by a rich RNA biochemistry, the dynamics is likely to exhibit strongly chaotic and therefore irreproducible behavior. Thus, approaches based on mathematical economics and game theory will likely be as useful for understanding eukaryotic systems as the pathway-oriented Systems Biology approach.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Institutes of Health. The author would like to thank Profs.

Allen Tannenbaum, Rina Tannenbaum, Loren Williams (Georgia Institute of Technology), and Prof. Eugene Shakhnovich (Harvard) for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] B. Lewin, *Genes VIII* (Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2004).
- [2] D. Voet and J.G Voet, *Biochemistry: 3rd edition* (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2004).
- [3] J.S. Mattick, *Scientific American* **October**, 60 (2004).
- [4] C. Dennis, *Nature* **418**, 122 (2002).
- [5] W. Gilbert, *Nature* **319**, 618 (1986).
- [6] G.F. Joyce, *Nature* **418**, 214 (2002).
- [7] L.E. Orgel, *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **23**, 491 (1998).
- [8] I.A. Chen, R.W. Roberts, and J.W. Szostak, *Science* **305**, 1474 (2004).
- [9] N. Ban, P. Nissen, J. Hansen, P.B. Moore and T.A. Steitz, *Science* **289**, 905 (2000).
- [10] A. Yonath, *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* **31**, 257 (2002).
- [11] A. Herbert and A. Rich, *Nat. Gen.* **21**, 265 (1999).
- [12] M. Eigen and P. Schuster, *Naturwissenschaften* **64**, 541 (1977).
- [13] M. Eigen and P. Schuster, *Naturwissenschaften* **65**, 7 (1978).
- [14] M. Eigen and P. Schuster, *Naturwissenschaften* **65**, 341 (1978).
- [15] M. Eigen, W.C. Gardiner, and P. Schuster, *J. Theor. Biol.* **85**, 407 (1980).
- [16] F. Michel and J.L. Ferat, *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **64**, 435 (1995).
- [17] G. Mohr and A.M. Lambowitz, *Nucl. Acids Res.* **31**, 647 (2002).
- [18] H. Wank, J. SanFilippo, R.N. Singh, M. Matsuura and A.M. Lambowitz, *Mol. Cell* **4**, 239 (1999).
- [19] C.G. Marshall, G. Broadhead, B.K. Leskiw, and G.D. Wright, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 6480 (1997).
- [20] Y. Xiong, and T.H. Eickbush, *EMBO J.* **9**, 3353 (1990).
- [21] G. Hinkle, H.G. Morrison, and M.L. Sogin, *Biol. Bull.* **193**, 250 (1997).
- [22] H. Malik, S. Henikoff, and T.H. Eickbush, *Genome Res.* **10**, 1307 (2000).
- [23] E. Tannenbaum, E.J. Deeds, and E.I. Shakhnovich, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 061916 (2004).
- [24] M. Nilsson and N. Snoad, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 191 (2000).
- [25] C.R. Woese and N.R. Pace, Probing RNA structure, function, and history by comparative analysis, *in* Gesteland, R.F. and Atkins, J.F. (Eds.), *The RNA World*, pp. 91-117, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory (1993).
- [26] M. Eigen, *Naturwissenschaften* **58**, 465 (1971).
- [27] C. Kamp and S. Bornholdt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 068104 (2002).