Phylogenetic annotation and genomic architecture of opsin genes in Crustacea

Jorge L. Pérez-Moreno*¹, Danielle M. DeLeo*¹, Ferran Palero², Heather D. Bracken-Grissom¹

¹*Department of Biological Sciences, Florida International University – Biscayne Bay Campus, North Miami FL 33181, U.S.A.*

²*Centre d'Estudis Avançats de Blanes (CEAB-CSIC), Carrer d'Accés a la Cala Sant Francesc 14, 17300 Blanes, Spain.*

* Equally contributing authors

Corresponding author: Jorge L. Pérez-Moreno

jorge.perezmoreno@fiu.edu

+1 786 213 0026

Abstract

A major goal of evolutionary biology is to understand the role of adaptive processes on sensory systems. Visual capabilities are strongly influenced by environmental and ecological conditions, and the evolutionary advantages of vision are manifest by its complexity and ubiquity throughout Metazoa. Crustaceans occupy a vast array of habitats and ecological niches, and are thus ideal taxa to investigate the evolution of visual systems. A comparative approach is taken here for efficient identification and classification of opsin genes, photoreceptive pigment proteins involved in color vision, focusing on two crustacean model organisms (*Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex*). Transcriptomes of both species were assembled *de novo* to elucidate the diversity and function of expressed opsins within a robust phylogenetic context. For this purpose, we developed a modified version of the Phylogenetically Informed Annotation tool to filter and identify visual genes from transcriptomes in a scalable and efficient manner.

32 Additionally, reference genomes of these species were used to validate our pipeline
33 while characterizing the genomic architecture of the opsin genes. Next-generation
34 sequencing and phylogenetics provide future venues for the study of sensory systems,
35 adaptation, and evolution in model and non-model organisms.

36
37 **Keywords:** evolution; phototransduction; protein; rnaseq; transcriptomics; vision
38
39

40 **Introduction**

41

42 Opsins are photoreceptor molecules that play a crucial role in animal vision and
43 can be found across metazoans (Terakita, 2005). As membrane-associated, G-protein-
44 coupled receptors (GPCRs), opsins can function in both visual and non-visual
45 phototransduction, and in some instances as photoisomerases (Shichida & Matsuyama,
46 2009). Previous studies have classified opsins in three primary categories according to
47 the type of G-protein to which they couple namely, “ciliary” (c-opsins), “rhabdomeric” (r-
48 opsins), and RGR/Go opsins (Terakita, 2005; Feuda et al., 2014, 2016). Ciliary and
49 rhabdomeric opsins diversified prior to the protostome-deuterostome split and are found
50 in both invertebrates and vertebrates, which suggests that they co-occurred in a
51 common ancestor (Kojima et al., 1997; Shichida & Matsuyama, 2009; Hering & Mayer,
52 2014; Ramirez et al., 2016). Opsin categories can additionally be further subdivided into
53 subfamilies based on molecular phylogenetics and functional classifications (Terakita,
54 2005). These subfamilies share less than 20 percent amino acid identity (Fryxel &
55 Meyerowitz, 1991) and comprise c-opsins (visual and non-visual); tmt/encephalopsins;
56 Go- and Gs- coupled, (r-opsins) Gq-coupled/melanopsins; and photoisomerases/
57 neuropsins. Photoreceptive opsins can be of either the ciliary-type, found largely in
58 vertebrates (for exceptions see Arendt et al., 2004; Passamaneck et al., 2011; Bok et
59 al., 2017; Tsukamoto et al., 2017), or the rhabdomeric-type found in mollusks, annelids,
60 and the compound eyes of arthropods (Arendt et al., 2002; Shichida & Matsuyama,
61 2009; Gühmann et al., 2015) , with the last being the focus of the present study.

Opsins form visual pigments capable of absorbing photons when bound to a chromophore, generally a vitamin A1 derivative (11-cis retinal). These visual pigments trigger conformational changes that activate G-proteins (Nathans, 1987) and elicit phototransduction signaling cascades. Key biological processes such as the regulation of circadian clocks, phototaxis, and vision have been shown to be linked to the phototransduction cascade (e.g. Arendt et al., 2004; review Shichida & Matsuyama, 2009). The set of amino acid residues that interact with the chromophore produce an environment suitable for the absorption of light with distinct wavelengths (Imai et al., 1997; Kuwayama et al., 2002) and thus influence spectral tuning (e.g. Porter et al., 2007; Katti et al., 2010). As the absorption spectrum of the photopigment is influenced by the amino acid composition of the opsin protein, slight variations can alter its physical and chemical properties and lead to visual pigments maximally sensitive to different wavelengths of light. This in turn would allow organisms to perceive and distinguish between light of particular wavelengths. The direct association between amino acid composition of photoreceptive opsins and their spectral sensitivity make them amenable to functional classification by sequence analysis (Mirzadegan et al., 2003; Matsumoto & Ishibashi, 2016).

Three main approaches have been employed to characterize opsins from transcriptomic data: I) Sequence similarity searches via pairwise alignments (i.e. BLAST); II) Protein structure prediction through Hidden Markov Model (HMM) profile alignments; and III) Phylogenetic inference. Functional annotation by means of sequence similarity is typically based on heuristic algorithms that search for matching nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences in curated databases (e.g. BLAST; Altschul et al., 1990). Sequences are locally or globally aligned and subsequently annotated based on inferred homology with statistically significant matches (Pearson, 2013). These comparisons, however, can rapidly become computationally expensive as the number of query and/or reference sequences increases (Suzuki et al., 2012). Although similarity searches via pairwise alignments are capable of identifying homologous sequences, their shortcomings are notorious when the queries consist of protein families with low sequence similarities, as it is the case for opsins and other GPCRs (Pearson, 2013).

Hidden Markov Model (HMM) methods offer an enticing alternative to pairwise alignments at similar computational costs (Eddy, 2011; Pearson, 2013). HMM profiles can also contain relevant information regarding protein structure, which translates to more accurate identification, classification, and annotation of proteins even when overall sequence similarity is low (Krogh et al., 1994; Yoon, 2009; Pearson, 2013). However, the efficacy of HMMs is intrinsically dependent on the quality of the training data, which is a non-trivial process in the case of understudied taxa or protein families (Rasmussen & Krink, 2003; Pearson, 2013). Therefore, the use of HMMs for annotation of GPCRs is hindered when independently verified sequences are not readily available. The robustness and suitability of phylogenetic approaches for functional annotation of opsins (and other proteins) is unparalleled, as it can readily overcome many of the deficiencies of other homology-based methodologies (Engelhardt et al., 2009; Gaudet et al., 2011; Speiser et al., 2014). The placement of proteins on a phylogenetic tree not only enables a rapid assessment of homology and efficient discrimination of false-positives, but also allows for the inference of putative functions and roles within an evolutionary context (Engelhardt et al., 2009). This approach has been successful in classifying novel opsins (and other GPCRs) despite their characteristic low sequence similarities and, in the case of non-model organisms, scarce genomic resources (Porter et al., 2007, 2012; Speiser et al., 2014). The main drawbacks of phylogenetic reconstruction as an efficient functional annotation method are possible difficulties aligning distantly related sequences, its propensity to be time-consuming (obtaining adequate references, computation of trees, etc.) and the steep learning curve to master these analyses, which might result in subjectivity and misinterpretations (Crisp & Cook, 2005).

Efforts to characterize opsins from high-throughput sequencing data in non-model Crustacea have primarily focused on transcriptomes, but without genomic validation (Porter et al., 2013; Wong et al., 2015; Biscontin et al., 2016). When available, genomes can provide valuable information regarding opsin gene duplication in an organism, as well as the relative locations of those genes. Gene locations allow for intra- and interspecific comparisons (Nordström et al., 2004) and to make inferences

about the evolutionary history of opsin diversification (review Shichida & Matsuyama, 2009).

In this study we modified the Phylogenetically Informed Annotation tool's pipeline (Speiser et al., 2014) to conduct a robust and scalable phylogenetic annotation of visual opsins from transcriptomes of two crustacean model organisms, *Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex*. *Hyalella azteca* is a freshwater epibenthic amphipod, commonly used as a bioindicator species, which has one pair of pigmented compound eyes (Gonzalez & Watling, 2002). *Daphnia pulex* is a freshwater cladoceran that has a single but movable cyclopean, compound, and pigmented eye. Specifically, we made modifications for PIA to run on the command-line rather than on Galaxy's GUI and wrote wrapper scripts to facilitate the analyses. This resulted in a scalable and automated platform to annotate visual genes and pathways, while minimizing possible biases and subjectivity from manual curation. As genomes are available for both species, they were used to validate the annotations and make inferences about the genomic architecture and the opsin intron-exon gene structure within these species.

Methods

Data, Quality Control, and Transcriptome Assembly

Raw RNA sequencing data of the freshwater amphipod *Hyalella azteca* and the model branchiopod *Daphnia pulex* were downloaded from the NCBI's Sequence Read Archive (SRA). In order to facilitate *de novo* transcriptome assembly and accurate detection of complete opsin isoforms, the read files were trimmed taking into consideration factors such as length and quality of the sequencing reads, sequencing depth, and tissue type (Table 1).

Table 1. Raw data chosen for *de novo* transcriptome assembly and annotation of opsin proteins in *Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex*.

<i>Species</i>	<i>Megabytes</i>	<i>Megabases</i>	<i>Read lengths</i>	<i>Sequencing Platform</i>	<i>Tissue type</i>	<i>SRA BioProject</i>
<i>Hyalella azteca</i>	15543	33160	2x150 bp	Illumina HiSeq	Whole	PRJNA312414

Prior to the assembly process, quality of the raw sequencing reads was evaluated via FastQC (Andrews, 2010). The FastQC output was subsequently used to inform stringent quality and adaptor trimming with Trimmomatic 0.36 (parameters: “ILLUMINACLIP:TruSeq3-PE.fa:2:30:10 CROP:140 HEADCROP:20 LEADING:15 TRAILING:15 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20 MINLEN:36”; Bolger et al., 2014). Clean sequencing reads were then assembled into a *de novo* transcriptome with the Trinity pipeline (version 2.4.0; Grabherr et al., 2011; Haas et al., 2013) using default parameters, a minimum contig length of 200bp, and a *kmer* size of 23. Assembly summary statistics were calculated using Transrate 1.0.3 (Smith-Unna et al., 2016). BUSCO 3.0.2 (Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Orthologs; (Simão et al., 2015) was employed to assess the quality and completeness of the resulting transcriptomes. The latter method provides an accurate evaluation of transcriptomes in an evolutionary informed context by assessing the presence and completeness of universal single copy orthologs (Simão et al., 2015). BUSCO analyses were conducted with the Arthropoda database of orthologous groups (n= 1066) sourced from OrthoDB (Waterhouse et al., 2013).

Identification and Annotation of Crustacean Opsins

Identification and functional classification of putative opsin transcripts was achieved through the use of our modified version of the existing Phylogenetically-Informed Annotation (PIA) tool (Speiser et al., 2014). While phylogenetic confirmation of BLAST similarity hits is becoming routine in model systems, PIA allows for the identification of proteins involved in visual pathways for non-model organisms in a computationally efficient manner (Speiser et al., 2014). This informative tool places putative visual gene transcripts (e.g. opsins), previously identified via BLAST searches against a custom database, in pre-computed phylogenies of such genes. The resulting phylogenies can then be used to discriminate BLAST false-positives and/or paralogous sequences from the transcripts of interest. While PIA has been used in previous studies

to annotate genes in a phylogenetic context, it was originally designed as a workflow for the Galaxy Project (Afgan et al., 2016) and as such is dependent on a Graphical User Interface (Speiser et al., 2014). This workflow can become inefficient when conducting concurrent analyses of numerous transcriptomes. Further, curation of the phylogenetic gene trees produced by PIA for each input transcriptome is typically undertaken manually, which inevitably makes it sensitive to potential biases. Tree branch length cutoff values for a given gene (i.e. opsins) can however be determined empirically through a series of manual tree curation comparisons. The pipeline presented here is a modification to PIA's source code in which the authors wrote a wrapper script to enable its use as a command-line/automated workflow, which effectively increases its scalability allowing for the identification of visual opsins from multiple transcriptomic datasets through simple scripting. Although the pipeline was designed for analyses of visual pathways, it is possible to create custom databases and phylogenies for customized analyses of other genes/pathways. We refer the reader to the original publication of PIA for additional information regarding included genes and pathways (Speiser et al., 2014). The modified Phylogenetically Informed Annotation pipeline employed in this study, along with usage examples, will be made available at: <http://xibalbanus.github.io>

Once the transcriptome assembly was completed, our *de novo* assemblies were scanned with Biopython's *get_orfs_cds.py* script (Cock et al., 2009) to translate each transcript into its corresponding amino acid sequence. Open Reading Frames (ORFs) were then extracted via the same script to facilitate the PIA annotation process. After conclusion of PIA's main component (BLAST, MAFFT alignment, and phylogenetic placement via RAxML; Altschul et al., 1990; Stamatakis, 2014; Yamada et al., 2016), a script adapted from the Osiris Phylogenetics toolkit (*long_branch_finder.py*; Oakley et al., 2014) was used to identify transcripts that exceeded 4x the Mean Absolute Deviation of the tree's branch lengths. This simple threshold proved effective at removing spurious BLAST hits in an unbiased manner. Subsequently, the previously identified false-positives were pruned from our phytab-formatted hit-list (part of PIA's output) with the *prune_phytab_using_list.py* script, also adapted from Osiris (Oakley et

al., 2014). The resulting list of putative opsins was then converted to FASTA format and sequence redundancy was reduced by removing identical protein sequences with UCLUST (Edgar, 2010). The multiple sequence aligner MAFFT (Yamada et al., 2016) was then invoked to align our filtered putative opsins to a large opsin dataset (n= 910) compiled by the Porter Lab (University of Hawaii at Manoa), which includes representatives of the main opsin subfamilies. MAFFT alignment parameters were chosen to prioritize accuracy over speed and to allow for large unalignable regions that can be pervasive with divergent GPCRs (“*--ep 0 --genafpair --maxiterate 1000*”). Following the alignment procedure, a final phylogenetic reconstruction was undertaken with IQ-tree (Nguyen et al., 2015) for characterization and annotation of our PIA-identified putative opsins. IQ-tree compares favorably to alternatives (e.g. RAxML, FastTree, etc.) in recent benchmarks (Zhou et al., 2017), while also providing a more extensive choice of evolutionary models for phylogenetic inference. After proper consideration, IQ-tree was selected given that evolutionary model choice is important and its choice would be limited in alternative software. Choosing an appropriate model is especially relevant when inferring phylogenetic relationships in protein families with both highly conserved domains and hypervariable regions (e.g. opsins). The IQ-tree analysis was run with a LG general amino acid replacement matrix under a FreeRate model with 10 rate categories and empirical base frequencies (LG+R10+F; Le & Gascuel, 2008; Soubrier et al., 2012) as suggested by ModelFinder (Kalyaanamoorthy et al., 2017). Branch support was assessed in tripartite by Ultra-fast bootstrap approximation (UFBoot; 10,000 replicates), a Shimodaira–Hasegawa–like approximate likelihood ratio test (SH-aLRT; 10,000 replicates), and an approximate Bayes test (Guindon et al., 2010; Anisimova et al., 2011; Minh et al., 2013).

Finally, the tool HHBlits ‘HMM-HMM–based lightning-fast iterative sequence search’ (Remmert et al., 2012) was used to confirm opsin identity based on profile HMMs using Uniclust30 (Mirdita et al., 2017) as the reference database. HHBlits was chosen as it incorporates highly sensitive sequence search methods (HMMs) in a fast and more accurate manner compared to other sequence search tools like PSI-BLAST (Remmert et al., 2012).

we were able to find 990 (92.48%) complete sequences of the 1066 arthropod genes used for benchmarking. An additional 49 (4.6%) were also present as fragmented sequences, and only 27 (2.6%) were not found. Similarly, *D. pulex*'s transcriptome was found to be nearly complete with 1048 (98.4%) full-length BUSCO genes, 16 (1.5%) fragmented, and a marginal 2 (0.1%) missing. The reference genomes selected for validation were rather complete as well, with over 90% of the BUSCO genes being found complete. Interestingly, the proportion of missing BUSCOs was slightly higher for the genomic data compared to the transcriptomic data (Table 3).

Table 3. Results of transcriptome completeness assessment by Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Orthologs (BUSCO) using OrthoDB's Arthropoda database of orthologous genes.

Species	Dataset	Complete BUSCOs	Fragmented BUSCOs	Missing BUSCOs	Total BUSCOs Searched
<i>Hyalella azteca</i>	Genome	970 (91.0%)	29 (2.7%)	67 (6.3%)	1066
	Transcriptome	990 (92.8%)	49 (4.6%)	27 (2.6%)	
<i>Daphnia pulex</i>	Genome	1038 (97.3%)	9 (0.8%)	19 (1.9%)	
	Transcriptome	1048 (98.4%)	16 (1.5%)	2 (0.1%)	

Our custom version of the Phylogenetically Informed Annotation tool outputs a single FASTA file of amino acid sequences per transcriptome. This file contains the transcripts that remain after the removal of spurious BLAST hits and the merging/removal of duplicated and fragmented sequences, and should only contain those that are closely related to the gene of interest (i.e. opsins). This output can then be piped to a final step for functional annotation by phylogenetic inference. In our case, putative opsin sequences for both species were aligned to a curated dataset of different opsin types. This final step resulted in a large phylogeny (Fig. 1) where opsins are classified based on their phylogenetic position.

Table 4. Number of genes and respective isoforms, as defined by Trinity, recovered for each type of opsin in *Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex*.

Species	Short-wavelength sensitive / UV	Long-wavelength sensitive	Peropsins / Neuropsins /	Melanopsins	Opsin-like transcripts
---------	---------------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	-------------	------------------------

					Encephalopsins				(Outgroups)	
	Genes	Isoforms	Genes	Isoforms	Genes	Isoforms	Genes	Isoforms	Genes	Isoforms
<i>Hyalella azteca</i>	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1
<i>Daphnia pulex</i>	5	15	3	24	0	0	2	4	1	1

Following Trinity's definition of assembled genes/isoforms, *Hyalella azteca*'s transcriptome contained 1 SWS/UV opsin (2 isoforms), 3 LWS opsins (3 isoforms), and 1 opsin-like GPCRs (Fig. 2; Table 4) that were identified by our pipeline. On the other hand, *Daphnia pulex* transcriptome 2 different SWS opsins (4 isoforms), 6 LWS opsins (35 isoforms), 2 melanopsins (4 isoforms), and 1 opsin-like transcript that was placed within the outgroup clade (Fig. 2; Table 4).

Identity results of the HHBlits search using iterative pairwise alignments and profile HHMs are summarized in Table 5, along with the inferred classification of each putative opsin transcript based on their respective placement in the phylogeny (Figs. 12). Additionally, each sequence entry was annotated as visual or non-visual based on the sequence homology inferred by both methods (represented by a black box when both methods are in agreement; and a gray box when HHMs fail to identify them as a visual opsin; Table 5).

327 Table 5. Identification and classification of *Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex* opsins based on phylogenetic inference and HMM profile
328 alignments. Putative visual opsins are marked in black, under the “Visual” column, when both methodologies are in agreement and in gray when
329 they differ.

Species	Sequence ID	Phylogeny Clade	Visual	HHBlits w/ Uniclust30			Score	Hit ID
				Prob.	E-value	P-value		
<i>Hyalella azteca</i>	Haz_DN255_c1_g1_i1	OUTGROUP		100.0	1.2E-66	4.3E-72	483.4	A0A0P5Y4K7_9CRUS Putative Tachykinin peptides receptor 99D (Fragment) OS=Daphnia ma
	Haz_DN34101_c1_g4_i2	SWS		100.0	1.2E-77	4.3E-83	540.3	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Haz_DN34101_c1_g6_i4	SWS		100.0	1.9E-76	6.9E-82	541.7	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Haz_DN31505_c2_g2_i1	LWS		100.0	8.8E-80	3.1E-85	550.9	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Haz_DN31505_c2_g4_i1	LWS		100.0	3.8E-80	1.4E-85	555.0	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Haz_DN44548_c0_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	6.9E-72	2.5E-77	497.4	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
<i>Daphnia pulex</i>	Dpu_DN105553_c0_g1_i1	MELANOPSIN		100.0	8E-52	2.8E-57	336.2	H0UT82_CAVPO Uncharacterized protein OS=Cavia porcellus GN=GALR1 PE=3 SV=1
	Dpu_DN16067_c1_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	6.3E-74	2.2E-79	524.1	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN16472_c1_g1_i1	OUTGROUP		100.0	1.8E-73	6.2E-79	520.2	A0A0P5Y4K7_9CRUS Putative Tachykinin peptides receptor 99D (Fragment) OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN21293_c0_g1_i1	MELANOPSIN		100.0	3.4E-40	1.3E-45	291.9	A0A0P5EI05_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop2 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN21293_c0_g2_i1	MELANOPSIN		100.0	3.6E-62	1.3E-67	446.6	A0A1A6GZZ2_NEOLE Uncharacterized protein OS=Neotoma lepida GN=A6R68_00284 PE
	Dpu_DN21293_c0_g2_i2	MELANOPSIN		100.0	3.9E-38	1.4E-43	282.8	A0A0F8BMY2_LARCR Melanopsin-B OS=Larimichthys crocea GN=EH28_08950 PE=3 SV
	Dpu_DN22657_c1_g4_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	1.7E-79	6.1E-85	557.5	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN23719_c0_g2_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	1.9E-78	6.8E-84	549.4	A0A0P5RD30_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop2 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN23719_c0_g2_i2	SWS/UV		100.0	4.5E-78	1.6E-83	544.5	A0A0P5RD30_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop2 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN23719_c0_g3_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	2E-78	7.4E-84	548.4	A0A0P5RD30_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop2 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN25251_c0_g2_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	2.6E-77	9.3E-83	532.3	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25251_c0_g2_i3	SWS/UV		100.0	3.4E-78	1.2E-83	547.0	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25251_c0_g2_i4	SWS/UV		100.0	1.9E-77	6.8E-83	533.3	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25251_c0_g2_i5	SWS/UV		100.0	8.2E-77	2.9E-82	529.8	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25251_c0_g3_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	2.6E-77	9.1E-83	537.5	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25293_c2_g1_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	5.7E-48	2.2E-53	330.3	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25293_c2_g1_i3	SWS/UV		100.0	2E-78	7.1E-84	548.9	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25293_c3_g1_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	5.7E-35	2E-40	227.3	D0E2W5_CHICK Uncharacterized protein OS=Gallus gallus GN=OPNVA PE=2 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25293_c4_g1_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	1.1E-75	3.9E-81	538.2	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25293_c7_g1_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	1.4E-33	5.1E-39	219.0	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
	Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	6.3E-75	2.2E-80	517.7	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
	Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i10	LWS		100.0	3.1E-62	1.1E-67	425.5	A0A0P5KGY5_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia m
	Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i11	LWS		100.0	4.1E-76	1.4E-81	528.5	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma

Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i12	LWS		100.0	1.4E-75	4.9E-81	523.3	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i4	LWS		100.0	1E-56	3.6E-62	386.9	A0A0P5KGY5_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia m
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i5	LWS		100.0	5.3E-82	1.8E-87	558.9	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i6	LWS		100.0	8E-77	2.8E-82	534.7	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i7	LWS		100.0	2E-76	6.8E-82	529.2	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i8	LWS		100.0	1.1E-80	3.7E-86	552.3	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g1_i9	LWS		100.0	4E-77	1.4E-82	533.7	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i1	LWS		100.0	4.5E-76	1.6E-81	528.0	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i11	LWS		99.9	8.6E-29	3.3E-34	200.2	E9FX22_DAPPU Octopamine receptor beta-2-like protein OS=Daphnia pulex GN=DAPPUD
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i2	LWS		100.0	1.7E-75	6E-81	524.9	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i3	LWS		100.0	1.2E-75	4.2E-81	525.7	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i5	LWS		100.0	4.4E-76	1.5E-81	529.3	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i6	LWS		100.0	4.2E-77	1.4E-82	535.1	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i8	LWS		100.0	9.3E-76	3.2E-81	523.9	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25377_c0_g2_i9	LWS		100.0	4.3E-76	1.5E-81	528.5	A0A0P5USN7_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia ma
Dpu_DN25506_c1_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	8.9E-35	3.2E-40	222.0	E6ZHB1_DICLA Beta-1 adrenergic receptor OS=Dicentrarchus labrax GN=ADRB1 PE=3 SV
Dpu_DN25506_c1_g1_i2	LWS		100.0	1.1E-34	3.9E-40	221.4	E6ZHB1_DICLA Beta-1 adrenergic receptor OS=Dicentrarchus labrax GN=ADRB1 PE=3 SV
Dpu_DN25506_c3_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	4.3E-80	1.4E-85	521.3	A0A0P4XHY0_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia m
Dpu_DN25506_c3_g1_i3	LWS		100.0	1.1E-60	4E-66	401.9	A0A0P5KGY5_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop1 OS=Daphnia m
Dpu_DN25506_c4_g1_i1	LWS		100.0	2.3E-48	8.2E-54	312.8	OPSL_LIMPO Lateral eye opsin OS=Limulus polyphemus PE=1 SV=1
Dpu_DN27815_c0_g1_i1	SWS/UV		100.0	9.5E-71	3.4E-76	496.1	A0A0P5RD30_9CRUS Class a rhodopsin g-protein coupled receptor gprop2 OS=Daphnia ma

330

331

successfully identify and filter opsins from the *de novo* transcriptomes in a fully automated manner with minimal manual curation. This automation is made possible mainly by the modifications and wrapper scripts that converted PIA from a Galaxy workflow to a command-line one, which effectively increases the scalability of the pipeline allowing for the identification of opsins (and other genes) from multiple transcriptomic datasets through simple scripting. Theoretically, this would allow for the annotation of dozens if not hundreds of transcriptomes at a time without the need of the excessive time-costs that a graphical user interface and manual curation of hundreds of phylogenetic trees would imply. Further improvements are certainly possible, particularly in terms of parallelization for its use in High Performance Computing environments for even greater computing speeds. Nevertheless, the current pipeline is dependent on its individual components and would thus require those to be made compatible with parallelization.

The initial hits recovered by a BLAST search using the original PIA opsin dataset recovered 11 putative opsin isoforms for *H. azteca* and 51 for *D. pulex*. Our pipeline removed 54.5% and 23.5% of those as spurious hits (Table 4) based on the chosen branch length thresholds. These thresholds can easily be adjusted for increased/decreased conservativeness if deemed necessary, which should be assessed on a gene-to-gene basis. The final phylogenetic inference took a step further by classifying these opsins in statistically supported functional clades (Figs. 1-2), which allowed for the determination of their putative photoreceptive roles. Both *H. azteca* and *D. pulex* transcriptomes were generated from whole organism RNA extractions. As opsins are known to function in various cells and tissues of arthropods, as well as the retina (e.g. Lampel et al., 2005; Tong et al., 2009), it is likely that the opsin groups identified here are expressed across several tissue types. Non-visual opsins can be readily identified via phylogenetic inference provided that appropriate reference sequences are included in the multiple sequence alignments (for example, Fig. 3). HMM alignments were also used to confirm protein identities as well as to compare with the results of the phylogenetic annotation. HHMs were able to pair most putative visual opsins to the lateral compound eye opsins of arthropods for both species and, in the

case of *D. pulex*, specifically to *Daphnia* class A rhodopsins. While there were a few discrepancies among annotation methods with regard to visual opsins (r-opsins) and melanopsins, this could be explained by their common origin (Porter et al., 2012). Melanopsins are very similar to the r-opsins found in invertebrates (Provencio et al., 1998, 2000) and can couple to similar signaling cascades (Isoldi et al., 2005; Panda et al., 2005; Qiu et al., 2005), likely contributing to the observed contradictory results depending on the methods. In fact, the similarities between these opsin types are evident in our phylogenetic trees (Figs. 1 & 2), showing a well-supported clade of arthropod UV opsins nested within the melanopsin clade. Partial sequences or existing database errors could also be a contributing factor to which BLAST and HMM approaches are more sensitive. Even though the HMM searches were not able to determine the functional classification of the opsins in terms of spectral sensitivity, they were confirmed as visual opsins (Table 5). Our results further support the notion that integrated annotation methods are advantageous and recommended to confirm the robustness of findings and annotations.

Opsin repertoire and spectral sensitivities

There are several subgroups of rhabdomeric visual opsins responsible for vision in crustaceans, each with characteristic absorption spectra when bound to a chromophore (Kashiyama et al., 2009; Henze & Oakley, 2015). The number and type of opsins found throughout Crustacea can range greatly, partially owing to differences in methodologies- with no present homologs found in freshwater *Bathynellacea* (Kim et al., 2017), one or two SWS visual opsins found in species of deep-sea shrimp (Wong et al., 2015), and brachyuran crabs (Sakamoto et al., 1996), and as many as 33 identified in stomatopods (Porter et al., 2009, 2013). The number of opsins and corresponding spectral sensitivity of an organism appears to correlate with its life-history, habitat, and the ecological niche it may occupy (Marshall et al., 2015; Stieb et al., 2017). This study represents the first transcriptomic exploration of *H. azteca*'s opsin repertoire, which revealed several putative visual opsins (Fig. 2; Table 4). *Hyaella azteca* is a freshwater epibenthic amphipod commonly used as a bioindicator species. Though further

evidence is required to make inferences regarding the expression and functionality of these putative opsins, the ability to differentiate between short and long wavelengths would allow *H. azteca* to discern between direct and reflected light from the benthos. Direct sunlight (or moonlight) tends to be abundant in short-wavelengths (<450nm) whereas reflected light from sources like leaves and sediment tends to be shifted towards longer (>450nm) wavelengths (Menzel, 1979). Our analyses revealed four distinct opsin genes (one SWS/UV and three LWS) expressed in its transcriptome, suggest that *H. azteca* may be capable of discriminating between the aforementioned light sources. The authors hypothesize that if *H. azteca* does possess functional SWS and LWS visual opsins, this distinction could serve as an important environmental cue influencing their response to a variety of abiotic and biotic factors (e.g. refugia, vegetation, predators, prey). However, the authors note additional studies incorporating electroretinographic analyses are needed to confirm whether *H. azteca* can indeed discriminate between different wavelengths of light as the transcriptomic data suggests. Fewer opsins were found to be expressed in *H. azteca* compared to *D. pulex*, which is not surprising given the expansive opsin repertoire previously described for *Daphnia* (Colbourne et al., 2011; Brandon et al., 2017). *Daphnia* has both a simple and compound eyes, which may contribute to the relatively large number of opsin isoforms expressed. Differences have been found in the number and type of opsin genes expressed among eye forms within the ostracod *Skogsberia leneri* (Oakley & Huber, 2004) and similarly hypothesized for *Daphnia* (Brandon et al., 2017).

The subset of identified rhabdomeric opsins expressed in the *D. pulex* transcriptome allows for comparisons to prior studies characterizing the range of opsin types found in the *D. pulex* genome (Colbourne et al., 2011; Brandon et al., 2015). Colbourne et al. (2011) reported 25 medium- (MWS) and long-wavelength sensitive (LWS) opsin genes as present in the *D. pulex* genome, but only 3 LWS opsin genes (and 24 isoforms) were identified in our analyses. While it is possible that the additional opsin classes identified in previous genomic investigations were not expressed in the current *D. pulex* dataset, it is also possible these discrepancies are due to differences in classification schemes across Arthropoda, with 'blue-green' wavelengths currently

grouped under SWS. An alternative explanation is that separate genes are being considered isoforms of each other by Trinity during assembly process. Considering the large number of “isoforms” and low number of “genes” identified in the *D. pulex* transcriptome, in contrast with previous genomic investigations (i.e. Brandon et al., 2017), this is likely a contributing factor to this observed discrepancy.

Genomic architecture and opsin gene duplications

Gene duplications play a fundamental role in genome evolution (Ohno, 1970; Kondrashov et al., 2002), with replicates occasionally evolving new biological functions (Zhang, 2003; Pegueroles et al., 2013). Some of these genome duplications are considered as pseudogenes, loci whose nucleotide sequences are similar to a normal gene but that do not produce a functional product when translated. The “unprocessed” pseudogenes, have all the normal parts of a protein-coding gene, but generally are non-functional due to coding errors (Lynch & Force, 1999). The so-called “processed” pseudogenes or retrogenes lack the non-coding introns present in the original gene, and are thought to arise from mRNA reinserted into the genome by reverse transcription (Betrán & Long, 2002). Some retrogenes have been found to be actively transcribed and the RNA product can be further processed to give two different molecules of RNA of smaller size that form elaborate secondary structures. These RNA regulatory molecules can control a variety of key genes involved in the regulation of the cell cycle and in cell growth (Tutar, 2012; Wen et al., 2012). Intron-less opsin genes, such as the LWS opsins our analyses identified in *H. azteca* (Fig. 3), have evolved in various metazoans (including crustaceans) and are thought to be functional photoproteins (Morris et al., 1993; Fitzgibbon et al., 1995; Porter et al., 2007; Liegertová et al., 2015), though it has been postulated that the expression of retrotransposed opsins is a form of transcriptional noise and a byproduct of transcriptional activity in the new genomic region (Xu et al., 2016). Opsin diversification and photopigment evolution seems to have been driven by duplicated opsin genes (e.g. Frentiu et al., 2007; Briscoe et al., 2010), as is the case of both ocular and extraocular cnidarian photoreceptors (Liegertová et al., 2015). Likewise, a functional LWS retrogene was recently found in the

arthropod *Helicoverpa armigera*, though expression was believed to be under temporal compartmentalization and primarily expressed in larval stages (Xu et al., 2016). Our results provide further evidence supporting the importance of retrogenes in the evolution of the opsins gene family.

Concluding remarks

Our results support the use of integrative phylogenetic annotation rather than just similarity-based approaches. This is an often overlooked but especially important consideration for the study of protein families (e.g. GPCRs) known for having large numbers of isoforms, multiple duplication events, low sequence similarities, and various combinations of highly conserved domains with hypervariable regions. Phylogenetic approaches are not only able to robustly evaluate homology in an evolutionary context, but they can also provide valuable functional information based on recovered branching patterns. In the case of opsins, this functional information can be insightful from a variety perspectives, and aid in the formulation and testing of organismal, ecological, and evolutionary hypotheses. Many of these will be put to the test in the present and forthcoming genomic era, for which efficient and scalable methodologies and pipelines will be paramount.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Megan Porter for access to her compilation of reference opsin data, as well as Daniel Speiser and Todd Oakley for allowing us to modify the original PIA tool. JPM was supported by the Philip M. Smith Graduate Research Grant for Cave and Karst Research from the Cave Research Foundation and The Crustacean Society Scholarship in Graduate Studies. This work was partially funded by two grants awarded from the National Science Foundation: Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (#1701835) awarded to JPM and HBG and Division of Environmental Biology Bioluminescence and Vision grant (DEB-1556059) awarded to HBG. FP acknowledges

project CHALLENGEN (CTM2013-48163) of the Spanish Government and a post-doctoral contract funded by the Beatriu de Pinós Programme of the Generalitat de Catalunya (2014-BPB-00038). The authors would like to acknowledge the Instructional & Research Computing Center (IRCC) at Florida International University for providing High Performance Computing resources that have contributed to the research results reported within this article. This is contribution #xx of the Marine Education and Research Center of the Institute for Water and the Environment at Florida International University.

References

- Afgan, E., D. Baker, M. van den Beek, D. Blankenberg, D. Bouvier, M. Čech, J. Chilton, D. Clements, N. Coraor, C. Eberhard, B. Grüning, A. Guerler, J. Hillman-Jackson, G. Von Kuster, E. Rasche, N. Soranzo, N. Turaga, J. Taylor, A. Nekrutenko, & J. Goecks, 2016. The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2016 update. *Nucleic Acids Research* 44: W3–W10.
- Altschul, S. F., W. Gish, W. Miller, E. W. Myers, & D. J. Lipman, 1990. Basic local alignment search tool. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 215: 403–410.
- Andrews, S., 2010. FastQC A Quality Control tool for High Throughput Sequence Data. <http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/>
- Anisimova, M., M. Gil, J.-F. Dufayard, C. Dessimoz, & O. Gascuel, 2011. Survey of Branch Support Methods Demonstrates Accuracy, Power, and Robustness of Fast Likelihood-based Approximation Schemes. *Systematic Biology* 60: 685–699.
- Arendt, D., K. Tessmar, M.-I. M. de Campos-Baptista, A. Dorresteyn, & J. Wittbrodt, 2002. Development of pigment-cup eyes in the polychaete *Platynereis dumerilii* and evolutionary conservation of larval eyes in Bilateria. *Development* 129: 1143–1154.
- Arendt, D., K. Tessmar-Raible, H. Snyder, A. W. Dorresteyn, & J. Wittbrodt, 2004. Ciliary photoreceptors with a vertebrate-type opsin in an invertebrate brain. *Science* 306: 869–871.
- Betrán, E., & M. Long, 2002. Expansion of genome coding regions by acquisition of new genes. *Genetica* 115: 65–80.

551 Biscontin, A., E. Frigato, G. Sales, G. M. Mazzotta, M. Teschke, C. De Pittà, S. Jarman,
552 B. Meyer, R. Costa, & C. Bertolucci, 2016. The opsin repertoire of the Antarctic
553 krill *Euphausia superba*. *Marine Genomics* 29: 61–68.

554 Bok, M. J., M. L. Porter, & D.-E. Nilsson, 2017. Phototransduction in fan worm radiolar
555 eyes. *Current Biology* 27: R681–R701.

556 Bolger, A. M., M. Lohse, & B. Usadel, 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
557 sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 30: 2114–2120.

558 Brandon, C. S., M. J. Greenwold, & J. L. Dudycha, 2017. Ancient and Recent
559 Duplications Support Functional Diversity of *Daphnia* Opsins. *Journal of*
560 *Molecular Evolution* 84: 12–28.

561 Briscoe, A. D., S. M. Bybee, G. D. Bernard, F. Yuan, M. P. Sison-Mangus, R. D. Reed,
562 A. D. Warren, J. Llorente-Bousquets, & C.-C. Chiao, 2010. Positive selection of a
563 duplicated UV-sensitive visual pigment coincides with wing pigment evolution in
564 *Heliconius* butterflies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:
565 3628–3633.

566 Cock, P. J. A., T. Antao, J. T. Chang, B. A. Chapman, C. J. Cox, A. Dalke, I. Friedberg,
567 T. Hamelryck, F. Kauff, B. Wilczynski, & M. J. L. de Hoon, 2009. Biopython:
568 freely available Python tools for computational molecular biology and
569 bioinformatics. *Bioinformatics* 25: 1422–1423.

570 Colbourne, J. K., M. E. Pfrender, D. Gilbert, W. K. Thomas, A. Tucker, T. H. Oakley, S.
571 Tokishita, A. Aerts, G. J. Arnold, M. K. Basu, D. J. Bauer, C. E. Caceres, L.
572 Carmel, C. Casola, J.-H. Choi, J. C. Detter, Q. Dong, S. Dusheyko, B. D. Eads,
573 T. Frohlich, K. A. Geiler-Samerotte, D. Gerlach, P. Hatcher, S. Jogdeo, J.
574 Krijgsveld, E. V. Kriventseva, D. Kultz, C. Laforsch, E. Lindquist, J. Lopez, J. R.
575 Manak, J. Muller, J. Pangilinan, R. P. Patwardhan, S. Pitluck, E. J. Pritham, A.
576 Rechtsteiner, M. Rho, I. B. Rogozin, O. Sakarya, A. Salamov, S. Schaack, H.
577 Shapiro, Y. Shiga, C. Skalitzy, Z. Smith, A. Souvorov, W. Sung, Z. Tang, D.
578 Tsuchiya, H. Tu, H. Vos, M. Wang, Y. I. Wolf, H. Yamagata, T. Yamada, Y. Ye, J.
579 R. Shaw, J. Andrews, T. J. Crease, H. Tang, S. M. Lucas, H. M. Robertson, P.
580 Bork, E. V. Koonin, E. M. Zdobnov, I. V. Grigoriev, M. Lynch, & J. L. Boore, 2011.
581 The ecoresponsive genome of *Daphnia pulex*. *Science* 331: 555–561.

582 Crisp, M., & L. Cook, 2005. Do early branching lineages signify ancestral traits? *Trends*
583 *in Ecology & Evolution* 20: 122–128.

584 Eddy, S. R., 2011. Accelerated Profile HMM Searches. *PLoS computational biology* 7:
585 e1002195–e1002195.

586 Edgar, R. C., 2010. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.
587 *Bioinformatics* 26: 2460–2461.

Engelhardt, B. E., M. I. Jordan, S. T. Repo, & S. E. Brenner, 2009. Phylogenetic
molecular function annotation. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 180:
012024.

Feuda, R., O. Rota-Stabelli, T. H. Oakley, D. Pisani, 2014. The Comb Jelly Opsins and
the Origins of Animal Phototransduction. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 6: 1964–
1971. Feuda, R., F. Marlétaz, M. A. Bentley, P. W.H. Holland, 2016. Conservation,
Duplication, and Divergence of Five Opsin Genes in Insect Evolution. *Genome Biology
and Evolution* 8:579–587.

Fitzgibbon, J., A. Hope, S. J. Slobodyanyuk, J. Bellingham, J. K. Bowmaker, & D. M.
Hunt, 1995. The rhodopsin-encoding gene of bony fish lacks introns. *Gene* 164:
273–277.

Freese, N. H., D. C. Norris, & A. E. Loraine, 2016. Integrated genome browser: visual
analytics platform for genomics. *Bioinformatics* 32: 2089–2095.

Frentiu, F. D., G. D. Bernard, M. P. Sison-Mangus, A. Van Zandt Brower, & A. D.
Briscoe, 2007. Gene Duplication Is an Evolutionary Mechanism for Expanding
Spectral Diversity in the Long-Wavelength Photopigments of Butterflies.
Molecular Biology and Evolution 24: 2016–2028.

Fryxel, K. J., & E. M. Meyerowitz, 1991. The evolution fo rhodopsins and
neurotransmitter receptors. *Journal of Molecular Evolution* 33: 367–378.

Gaudet, P., M. S. Livstone, S. E. Lewis, & P. D. Thomas, 2011. Phylogenetic-based
propagation of functional annotations within the Gene Ontology consortium.
Briefings in Bioinformatics 12: 449–462.

Gonzalez, E. R., L. Watling, 2002. Redescription of *Hyaella azteca* from Its type
locality, Vera Cruz, Mexico (Amphipoda: Hyaellidae). *Journal of Crustacean
Biology* 22: 173–183. Grabherr, M. G., B. J. Haas, M. Yassour, J. Z. Levin, D. a
Thompson, I. Amit, X. Adiconis, L. Fan, R. Raychowdhury, Q. Zeng, Z. Chen, E.
Mauceli, N. Hacohen, A. Gnirke, N. Rhind, F. di Palma, B. W. Birren, C.
Nusbaum, K. Lindblad-Toh, N. Friedman, & A. Regev, 2011. Full-length
transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. *Nature
Biotechnology* 29: 644–652.

Gühmann, M., H. Jia, N. Randel, C. Verasztó, L. A. Bezares-Calderón, N. K. Michiels,
S. Yokoyama, & G. Jékely, 2015. Spectral Tuning of Phototaxis by a Go-Op sin in
the Rhabdomic Eyes of *Platynereis*. *Current Biology* 25: 2265–2271.

Guindon, S., J.-F. Dufayard, V. Lefort, M. Anisimova, W. Hordijk, & O. Gascuel, 2010.
New Algorithms and Methods to Estimate Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies:
Assessing the Performance of PhyML 3.0. *Systematic Biology* 59: 307–321.

Haas, B. J., A. Papanicolaou, M. Yassour, M. Grabherr, P. D. Blood, J. Bowden, M. B.
Couger, D. Eccles, B. Li, M. Lieber, M. D. Macmanes, M. Ott, J. Orvis, N. Pochet,

626 F. Strozzi, N. Weeks, R. Westerman, T. William, C. N. Dewey, R. Henschel, R.
627 D. Leduc, N. Friedman, & A. Regev, 2013. *De novo* transcript sequence
628 reconstruction from RNA-seq using the Trinity platform for reference generation
629 and analysis. *Nature Protocols* 8: 1494–1512.

630 Henze, M. J., & T. H. Oakley, 2015. The Dynamic Evolutionary History of
631 Pancrustacean Eyes and Opsins. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 55: 830–
632 842.

633 Hering, L., & G. Mayer, 2014. Analysis of the Opsin Repertoire in the Tardigrade
634 *Hypsibius dujardini* Provides Insights into the Evolution of Opsin Genes in
635 Panarthropoda. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 6: 2380–2391.

636 Imai, H., D. Kojima, T. Oura, S. Tachibanaki, A. Terakita, & Y. Shichida, 1997. Single
637 amino acid residue as a functional determinant of rod and cone visual pigments.
638 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 94: 2322–2326.

639 Isoldi, M. C., M. D. Rollag, A. M. de Lauro Castrucci, & I. Provencio, 2005. Rhabdomeric
640 phototransduction initiated by the vertebrate photopigment melanopsin.
641 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102: 1217–1221.

642 Kalyaanamoorthy, S., B. Q. Minh, T. K. F. Wong, A. von Haeseler, & L. S. Jermini,
643 2017. ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates.
644 *Nature Methods* 14: 587–589.

645 Kashiyama, K., T. Seki, H. Numata, & S. G. Goto, 2009. Molecular Characterization of
646 Visual Pigments in Branchiopoda and the Evolution of Opsins in Arthropoda.
647 *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 26: 299–311.

648 Katti, C., K. Kempler, M. L. Porter, A. Legg, R. Gonzalez, E. Garcia-Rivera, D. Dugger,
649 & B.-A. Battelle, 2010. Opsin co-expression in *Limulus* photoreceptors:
650 differential regulation by light and a circadian clock. *Journal of Experimental*
651 *Biology* 213: 2589–2601.

652 Kim, D., B. Langmead, & S. L. Salzberg, 2010. HISAT: a fast spliced aligner with low
653 memory requirements. *Nature Methods* 12: 357–360.

654 Kim, B.-M., S. Kang, D.-H. Ahn, J.-H. Kim, I. Ahn, C.-W. Lee, J.-L. Cho, G.-S. Min, & H.
655 Park, 2017. First insights into the subterranean crustacean *Bathynellacea*
656 *transcriptome*: transcriptionally reduced opsin repertoire and evidence of
657 conserved homeostasis regulatory mechanisms. *PloS One* 12: e0170424.

658 Kojima, D., A. Terakita, T. Ishikawa, Y. Tsukahara, A. Maeda, & Y. Shichida, 1997. A
659 novel Go-mediated phototransduction cascade in scallop visual cells. *Journal of*
660 *Biological Chemistry* 272: 22979–22982.

661 Kondrashov, F. A., I. B. Rogozin, Y. I. Wolf, & E. V. Koonin, 2002. Selection in the
662 evolution of gene duplications. *Genome Biology* 3: research0008–1.

663 Krogh, A., M. Brown, I. S. Mian, K. Sjolander, & D. Haussler, 1994. Hidden Markov
664 Models in Computational Biology. *Molecular Biology* 235: 1501–1531.

665 Kuwayama, S., H. Imai, T. Hirano, A. Terakita, & Y. Shichida, 2002. Conserved Proline
666 Residue at Position 189 in Cone Visual Pigments as a Determinant of Molecular
667 Properties Different from Rhodopsins . *Biochemistry* 41: 15245–15252.

668 Lampel, J., A. D. Briscoe, & L. T. Wasserthal, 2005. Expression of UV-, blue-, long-
669 wavelength-sensitive opsins and melatonin in extraretinal photoreceptors of the
670 optic lobes of hawkmoths. *Cell and Tissue Research* 321: 443–458.

671 Le, S. Q., & O. Gascuel, 2008. An Improved General Amino Acid Replacement Matrix.
672 *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 25: 1307–1320.

673 Liegertová, M., J. Pergner, I. Kozmíková, P. Fabian, A. R. Pombinho, H. Strnad, J.
674 Pačes, Č. Vlček, P. Bartůňek, & Z. Kozmik, 2015. Cubozoan genome illuminates
675 functional diversification of opsins and photoreceptor evolution. *Scientific Reports*
676 5: 11885.

677 Lynch, M., & A. Force, 1999. The Probability of Duplicate Gene Preservation by
678 Subfunctionalization. *Genetics* 154: 459–473.

679 Marshall, J., K. L. Carleton, & T. Cronin, 2015. Colour vision in marine organisms.
680 *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 34: 86–94.

681 Matsumoto, T., & Y. Ishibashi, 2016. Sequence analysis and expression patterns of
682 opsin genes in the longtooth grouper *Epinephelus bruneus*. *Fisheries Science*
683 82: 17–27.

684 Menzel, R., 1979. Spectral Sensitivity and Color Vision in Invertebrates In Autrum, H.
685 (ed), *Comparative Physiology and Evolution of Vision in Invertebrates*. Springer
686 Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg: 503–580.

687 Minh, B. Q., M. A. T. Nguyen, & A. von Haeseler, 2013. Ultrafast Approximation for
688 Phylogenetic Bootstrap. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 30: 1188–1195.

689 Mirdita, M., L. von den Driesch, C. Galiez, M. J. Martin, J. Söding, & M. Steinegger,
690 2017. Uniclust databases of clustered and deeply annotated protein sequences
691 and alignments. *Nucleic Acids Research* 45: D170–D176.

692 Mirzadegan, T., G. Benkö, S. Filipek, & K. Palczewski, 2003. Sequence Analyses of G-
693 Protein-Coupled Receptors: Similarities to Rhodopsin. *Biochemistry* 42: 2759–
694 2767.

695 Morris, A., J. K. Bowmaker, & D. M. Hunt, 1993. The molecular basis of a spectral shift
696 in the rhodopsins of two species of squid from different photic environments.
697 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 254: 233–240.

698 Nathans, J., 1987. Molecular biology of visual pigments. *Annual review of neuroscience*
699 10: 163–194.

700 Nguyen, L.-T., H. A. Schmidt, A. von Haeseler, & B. Q. Minh, 2015. IQ-TREE: A Fast
701 and Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood
702 Phylogenies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 32: 268–274.

703 Nordström, K., T. A. Larsson, & D. Larhammar, 2004. Extensive duplications of
704 phototransduction genes in early vertebrate evolution correlate with block
705 (chromosome) duplications. *Genomics* 83: 852–872.

706 Oakley, T. H., M. A. Alexandrou, R. Ngo, M. S. Pankey, C. K. Churchill, W. Chen, & K.
707 B. Lopker, 2014. Osiris: accessible and reproducible phylogenetic and
708 phylogenomic analyses within the Galaxy workflow management system. *BMC*
709 *Bioinformatics* 15: 230.

710 Oakley, T. H., & D. R. Huber, 2004. Differential Expression of Duplicated Opsin Genes
711 in Two EyeTypes of Ostracod Crustaceans. *Journal of Molecular Evolution* 59:
712 239–249.

713 Ohno, S., 1970. *Evolution by gene duplication*. George Allen and Unwin, London.

714 Panda, S., S. K. Nayak, B. Campo, J. R. Walker, J. B. Hogenesch, & T. Jegla, 2005.
715 Illumination of the Melanopsin Signaling Pathway. *Science* 307: 600–604.

716 Passamaneck, Y. J., N. Furchheim, A. Hejnlol, M. Q. Martindale, & C. Lüter, 2011.
717 Ciliary photoreceptors in the cerebral eyes of a protostome larva. *EvoDevo* 2: 6.

718 Pearson, W. R., 2013. An Introduction to Sequence Similarity (“Homology”) Searching
719 In Baxevanis, A. D., G. A. Petsko, L. D. Stein, & G. D. Stormo (eds), *Current*
720 *Protocols in Bioinformatics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA.

721 Pegueroles, C., S. Laurie, & M. M. Albà, 2013. Accelerated Evolution after Gene
722 Duplication: A Time-Dependent Process Affecting Just One Copy. *Molecular*
723 *Biology and Evolution* 30: 1830–1842.

724 Porter, M. L., J. R. Blasic, M. J. Bok, E. G. Cameron, T. Pringle, T. W. Cronin, & P. R.
725 Robinson, 2012. Shedding new light on opsin evolution. *Proceedings of the*
726 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279: 3–14.

727 Porter, M. L., M. J. Bok, P. R. Robinson, & T. W. Cronin, 2009. Molecular diversity of
728 visual pigments in Stomatopoda (Crustacea). *Visual Neuroscience* 26: 255–265.

729 Porter, M. L., T. W. Cronin, D. A. McClellan, & K. A. Crandall, 2007. Molecular
730 Characterization of Crustacean Visual Pigments and the Evolution of
731 Pancrustacean Opsins. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 24: 253–268.

732 Porter, M. L., D. I. Speiser, A. K. Zaharoff, R. L. Caldwell, T. W. Cronin, & T. H. Oakley,
733 2013. The Evolution of Complexity in the Visual Systems of Stomatopods:
734 Insights from Transcriptomics. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 53: 39–49.

735 Provencio, I., G. Jiang, W. J. De Grip, W. PÄR HAYES, & M. D. Rollag, 1998.
736 Melanopsin: An opsin in melanophores, brain, and eye. *Proceedings of the*
737 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 95: 340–345.

738 Provencio, I., I. R. Rodriguez, G. Jiang, W. P. Hayes, E. F. Moreira, & M. D. Rollag,
739 2000. A novel human opsin in the inner retina. *Journal of Neuroscience* 20: 600–
740 605.

741 Qiu, X., T. Kumbalasiri, S. M. Carlson, K. Y. Wong, V. Krishna, I. Provencio, & D. M.
742 Berson, 2005. Induction of photosensitivity by heterologous expression of
743 melanopsin. *Nature* 433: 745–749.

744 Ramirez, M. D, A. N. Pairett, M. S. Pankey, J. M. Serb, D. I. Speiser, A. J. Swafford, T.
745 H. Oakley, 2016. The Last Common Ancestor of Most Bilaterian Animals Possessed at
746 Least Nine Opsins. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 8: 3640–3652.

747 Rasmussen, T. K., & T. Krink, 2003. Improved Hidden Markov Model training for
748 multiple sequence alignment by a particle swarm optimization—evolutionary
749 algorithm hybrid. *Biosystems* 72: 5–17.

750 Remmert, M., A. Biegert, A. Hauser, & J. Söding, 2012. HHblits: lightning-fast iterative
751 protein sequence searching by HMM-HMM alignment. *Nature Methods* 9: 173–
752 175.

753 Sakamoto, K., O. Hisatomi, F. Tokunaga, & E. Eguchi, 1996. Two opsins from the
754 compound eye of the crab *Hemigrapsus sanguineus*. *Journal of Experimental*
755 *Biology* 199: 441–450.

756 Shichida, Y., & T. Matsuyama, 2009. Evolution of opsins and phototransduction.
757 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 364:
758 2881–2895.

759 Simão, F. A., R. M. Waterhouse, P. Ioannidis, E. V. Kriventseva, & E. M. Zdobnov,
760 2015. BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with
761 single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics* 31: 3210–3212.

762 Sjölander, K., 2004. Phylogenomic inference of protein molecular function: advances
763 and challenges. *Bioinformatics* 20: 170–179.

764 Smith-Unna, R., C. Boursnell, R. Patro, J. M. Hibberd, & S. Kelly, 2016. TransRate:
765 reference-free quality assessment of de novo transcriptome assemblies.
766 *Genome Research* 26: 1134–1144.

767 Soubrier, J., M. Steel, M. S. Y. Lee, C. Der Sarkissian, S. Guindon, S. Y. W. Ho, & A.
768 Cooper, 2012. The Influence of Rate Heterogeneity among Sites on the Time
769 Dependence of Molecular Rates. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29: 3345–
770 3358.

771 Speiser, D. I., M. Pankey, A. K. Zaharoff, B. a Battelle, H. D. Bracken-Grissom, J. W.
772 Breinholt, S. M. Bybee, T. W. Cronin, A. Garm, A. R. Lindgren, N. H. Patel, M. L.
773 Porter, M. E. Protas, A. S. Rivera, J. M. Serb, K. S. Zigler, K. a Crandall, & T. H.
774 Oakley, 2014. Using phylogenetically-informed annotation (PIA) to search for
775 light-interacting genes in transcriptomes from non-model organisms. *BMC*
776 *Bioinformatics* 15: 350–350.

777 Stamatakis, A., 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-
778 analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30: 1312–1313.

779 Stieb, S. M., F. Cortesi, L. Sueess, K. L. Carleton, W. Salzburger, & N. J. Marshall,
780 2017. Why UV vision and red vision are important for damselfish
781 (Pomacentridae): structural and expression variation in opsin genes. *Molecular*
782 *Ecology* 26: 1323–1342.

783 Suzuki, S., T. Ishida, K. Kurokawa, & Y. Akiyama, 2012. GHOSTM: A GPU-Accelerated
784 Homology Search Tool for Metagenomics. *PLoS ONE* 7: e36060.

785 Terakita, A., 2005. The opsins. *Genome biology* 6: 213.

786 Tong, D., N. S. Rozas, T. H. Oakley, J. Mitchell, N. J. Colley, & M. J. McFall-Ngai, 2009.
787 Evidence for light perception in a bioluminescent organ. *Proceedings of the*
788 *National Academy of Sciences* 106: 9836–9841.

789 Tsukamoto, H., I.-S. Chen, Y. Kubo, & Y. Furutani, 2017. A ciliary opsin in the brain of a
790 marine annelid zooplankton is ultraviolet-sensitive, and the sensitivity is tuned by
791 a single amino acid residue. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 292: 12971–12980.

792 Tutar, Y., 2012. Pseudogenes. *Comparative and Functional Genomics* 2012: 1–4.

793 Waterhouse, R. M., F. Tegenfeldt, J. Li, E. M. Zdobnov, & E. V. Kriventseva, 2013.
794 OrthoDB: a hierarchical catalog of animal, fungal and bacterial orthologs. *Nucleic*
795 *Acids Research* 41: D358–D365.

796 Wen, Y.-Z., L.-L. Zheng, L.-H. Qu, F. J. Ayala, & Z.-R. Lun, 2012. Pseudogenes are not
797 pseudo any more. *RNA Biology* 9: 27–32.

798 Wong, J. M., J. L. Pérez-Moreno, T.-Y. Chan, T. M. Frank, & H. D. Bracken-Grissom,
799 2015. Phylogenetic and transcriptomic analyses reveal the evolution of
800 bioluminescence and light detection in marine deep-sea shrimps of the family
801 Oplophoridae (Crustacea: Decapoda). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*
802 83: 278–292.

803 Xu, P., R. Feuda, B. Lu, H. Xiao, R. I. Graham, & K. Wu, 2016. Functional opsin
804 retrogene in nocturnal moth. *Mobile DNA* 7: 18.

805 Yamada, K. D., K. Tomii, & K. Katoh, 2016. Application of the MAFFT sequence
806 alignment program to large data—reexamination of the usefulness of chained
807 guide trees. *Bioinformatics* 32: 3246–3251.

808 Yoon, B.-J., 2009. Hidden Markov models and their applications in biological sequence
809 analysis. *Current genomics* 10: 402–415.

810 Zhang, J., 2003. Evolution by gene duplication: an update. *Trends in Ecology &*
811 *Evolution* 18: 292–298.

812 Zhou, X., X.-X. Shen, C. T. Hittinger, & A. Rokas, 2017. Evaluating Fast Maximum
813 Likelihood-Based Phylogenetic Programs Using Empirical Phylogenomic Data
814 Sets. *bioRxiv* 142323.

815

Figure 1. Maximum-Likelihood phylogeny of opsins estimated using putative opsin proteins identified by our annotation pipeline from the *de novo* transcriptome assemblies of *Hyalella azteca* and *Daphnia pulex*, along with a dataset of reference opsin sequences. Clades are annotated with opsin types contained therein and, in the case of visual opsins, with their inferred spectral sensitivities.

Figure 2. Expanded view of the melanopsin, Arthropod LWS, and Arthropod SWS/UV clades. Large non-crustacean clades have been collapsed for readability. Support values correspond to SH-aLRT/aBayes/UFBoot., and are not shown when bootstrap support < 75.

Hyaella azteca

- 1
- 2 Figure 3. Intron-Exon gene structure patterns of representative *Hyaella azteca* SWS/UV and LWS opsins. A SAM alignment file with all of the mapped
- 3 transcripts is provided in the figshare repository: <http://figshare.com/xxxxx>.

4 Figure 4. Intron-Exon gene structure patterns of representative *Daphnia pulex* opsins SWS/UV and LWS opsins, which are arranged in the genome in distinct
5 patterns according to opsin type. A SAM alignment file with all of the mapped transcripts is provided in the figshare repository: <http://figshare.com/xxxxx>.