Published in final edited form as:

Trends Genet. 2012 May ; 28(5): 213–220. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2012.02.007.

Causes and consequences of the evolution of reproductive mode in *Caenorhabditis* nematodes

Cristel G. Thomas*, Gavin C. Woodruff, and Eric S. Haag#

Department of Biology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 USA

Abstract

Reproduction is directly connected to the suite of developmental and physiological mechanisms that enable it, but *how* it occurs also has consequences for the genetics, ecology, and longer-term evolutionary potential of a lineage. In the nematode *C. elegans*, anatomically female XX worms can self-fertilize their eggs. This ability evolved recently and in multiple *Caenorhabditis* lineages from male-female ancestors, providing a model for examining both the developmental causes and longer-term consequences of a novel, convergently evolved reproductive mode. Here we review recent work that implicates translation control in the evolution of XX spermatogenesis, with different selfing lineages possessing both reproducible and idiosyncratic features. We also discuss the consequences of selfing, which leads to a rapid loss of variation and relaxation of natural and sexual selection on mating-related traits, and may ultimately put selfing lineages at a higher risk of extinction.

Keywords

C. elegans; *C. briggsae*; hermaphrodite; self-fertility; germ line; convergent evolution

Developmental causes and organismal consequences of reproductive mode

Since its rebirth roughly 30 years ago^{2,3}, a major goal of evolutionary developmental biology (EDB here, but often referred to as ‘evo-devo’) has been the discovery of the empirical developmental and genetic details of how anatomical novelty arises. This is difficult work, and convincing connections between the evolution of DNA sequence and morphology have only been forged in the last decade. With the first apparent victories now won, general principles are being inferred^{7–9}. Much of recent work on animal EDB has been focused on somatic traits, but germ cells also evolve, and merit study for several reasons. First, changes in germ cell properties often underlie many fascinating adaptations¹¹. These include abrupt shifts in reproductive mode, such as loss of a feeding larva¹⁵ or changes in breeding systems¹⁷. Second, germ cell development is unusually dependent upon post-transcriptional gene regulation^{18,19}, in contrast to the transcriptional and coding changes that

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Correspondence: Eric S. Haag, Department of Biology, Building 144, University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742 USA, ehaag@umd.edu, fax: 1-301-314-9358.

*Present address: Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology University of Toronto, 25 Willcocks St. Toronto, ON, M5S 3B2 Canada

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

have been repeatedly implicated in the evolution of somatic traits⁹. These shifts also have large and immediate impacts on transmission genetics, effective population size, ecology, and macro-evolutionary potential. As a result, research models developed for investigating the EDB of reproductive evolution can also be used to study its influence on other biological processes.

Caenorhabditis nematodes are well suited for investigating the causes and consequences of reproductive mode shifts because *C. elegans* is an intensely studied model organism, and its androdioecious mating system (males and self-fertile hermaphrodites; see Glossary Box) evolved recently from gonochoristic (male and female) ancestors²⁶. Androdioecy has evolved at least three times in the genus (Figure 1), and in each case the overt anatomical modifications required for evolution of self-fertility were confined to the germ line. Therefore, *Caenorhabditis* can serve as a tractable model for how germ-line adaptation works and for addressing repeatability in adaptive evolution. In addition, the advanced state of *Caenorhabditis* genomics^{33,34} supports investigation of the role sexual mode plays in shaping genome content and variation. Below, we describe recent advances in both of these areas. First, we summarize recent studies that point to an important role for the control of mRNA translation in the evolution of XX spermatogenesis. Then we address other new work that highlights the major behavioral and genomic consequences of the evolution of self-fertility in *Caenorhabditis*.

Developmental causes of self-fertility in *Caenorhabditis*

Caenorhabditis employs genetic sex determination; males have a single X chromosome and the XX sex is either female or hermaphroditic, depending upon the species. Hermaphrodite spermatocytes differentiate in a typically female somatic gonad and maintain their XX karyotype. A compelling developmental biology question, therefore, is how limited spermatogenesis is achieved in any one hermaphrodite species. From the standpoint of EDB, however, answering this question immediately leads to several others: Which aspects of the mechanisms required for limited XX spermatogenesis first evolved in hermaphroditic lineages? Which of these mechanisms are ancestral? Are those changes that are associated with self-fertility similar or different in convergent species? These questions have stimulated comparative studies of germline sex determination in *Caenorhabditis*.

Of the many *C. elegans* mutations with germline-specific sex determining phenotypes (see Box 1), only those that affect hermaphrodites are of particular interest here. The characterization of these mutants revealed a major role for translational regulation in germline sex determination. The feminizing *tra-2(gf)* and masculinizing *fem-3(gf)* alleles alter small regulatory elements in the 3' untranslated region (UTR) of each gene, the Direct Repeat Element (DRE)³² and Point Mutation Element (PME)²⁹, respectively. The loss-of-function phenotypes of the RNA-binding proteins that recognize these elements (GLD-1 for *tra-2*³⁵, FBF for *fem-3*⁴⁰) are consistent with their repressive function. The F-box protein FOG-2 has been indirectly implicated in mRNA regulation, as it complexes specifically with GLD-1⁴¹. These factors define a set of elements that are necessary for limited hermaphrodite spermatogenesis in *C. elegans*, and thus are prime subjects for comparative studies.

The global sex determination pathway of *C. elegans* is conserved across at least the *Elegans* group of *Caenorhabditis*, as are sperm-promoting factors acting downstream of *tra-1*⁴². An exception, however, is *fog-2*, a recently duplicated gene specific to *C. elegans*⁴³. FOG-2 is unique among its closest *C. elegans* paralogs in affecting sex determination, and also in possessing a GLD-1-binding domain in its divergent C-terminus⁴³. Presumably FOG-2 is involved in the post-transcriptional regulation of *tra-2* mRNA. Thus, *fog-2* is a new gene with a new function, and it is a strong candidate for a key step in the gain of XX

spermatogenesis in the *C. elegans* lineage. Interestingly, the *C. briggsae*-specific F-box gene *she-1* is also necessary for hermaphrodite spermatogenesis at elevated temperatures⁴⁴. In contrast to FOG-2, however, SHE-1 does not interact with *C. briggsae* GLD-1. Thus, although *fog-2* and *she-1* are both implicated in hermaphrodite spermatogenesis, they probably exert their roles through different mechanisms. Characterization of these mechanisms is an important area for future research.

Functional evolution of RNA-binding proteins and translational control

As noted above, *C. elegans* hermaphrodite germline sex determination requires the translational control of *tra-2* and *fem-3* expression. Early comparative studies suggested that the 3' UTR elements required for these controls were conserved, even in species that were gonochoristic^{45–47}. More recent work has focused on the evolution of the trans-acting RNA-binding proteins that recognize these elements. As a result, an evolutionary picture of the translational control networks that regulate germline sex determination is emerging, one that suggests both quantitative and qualitative changes matter for producing novel phenotypes.

Besides promoting XX spermatogenesis, *C. elegans* *gld-1* is also necessary for germline tumor suppression, oocyte maturation and meiotic progression^{28,48}. It has recently been shown that *gld-1* plays these latter roles in females of gonochoristic species (e.g. *C. japonica*, *C. brenneri*, *C. remanei*) as well, but it has no discernible impact on sex determination⁴⁹. This suggests the ancestral role of *gld-1* was to regulate oogenesis, and that it was been coopted into sex determination recently. Remarkably, *C. briggsae* *gld-1* has also acquired a role in hermaphrodite sexual patterning, but as a limiter of sperm production^{43,49}. Thus, *gld-1* has been coopted into hermaphrodite sex determination at least twice, which suggests some reproducibility in evolution. However, it functions in opposite manners in two species, which indicates an important role for chance or the influence of initial conditions in incipient hermaphroditic lineages.

How can *Ce-gld-1* and *Cbr-gld-1* have opposite effects on germline sex? Cross-species rescue experiments rule out the possibility that *gld-1* itself is the locus of functional evolution⁴⁹. One clue is that *Ce*-GLD-1 associates strongly with *tra-2* mRNA *in vivo*, as expected, but *Cbr*-GLD-1 does not⁴⁹. Furthermore, the *Cbr-tra-2* transcript lacks DREs⁴⁹ and has fewer GLD-1-binding elements than *Ce-tra-2*^{32,50}. This suggests that *gld-1* has divergent functions, at least in part, because of lineage-specific evolution of target mRNA 3' UTRs. The robust association of GLD-1 with *tra-2* mRNA in *C. elegans* may synergize with the ability of its cofactor, FOG-2, to recruit an E3 ubiquitin ligase complex¹⁰ (Figure 2). This has been proposed to target translation-stimulating factors associated with the 3' end of the mRNA for degradation⁵¹.

In *C. elegans*, the factors regulating *fem-3* translation are the PUF family RBPs FBF-1 and FBF-2⁴⁰. FBF-1 and FBF-2 also indirectly promote female fate by serving as negative regulators of GLD-1 expression. *C. briggsae* lacks strict *fbf* orthologs, but members of the related PUF-2 sub-family (*Cbr-puf-1.2* and *Cbr-puf-2*) have nevertheless been implicated in *C. briggsae* hermaphrodite germline sex determination. Pair-wise RNAi knockdown of either *Cbr-puf-1.2* and *Cbr-puf-8*⁴⁹ or *Cbr-puf-1.2* and *Cbr-puf-2*⁵² both feminize the hermaphrodite germ line. This is in complete opposition to the roles of *fbf-1*, *fbf-2*, and *Ce-puf-8*, which are redundantly necessary for hermaphrodite oogenesis in *C. elegans*^{40,53}. The unexpected sperm-promoting roles of *Cbr*-PUF-2 and *Cbr*-PUF-1.2 can be explained by their ability to negatively regulate the *Cbr-gld-1* transcript, which (as noted above) promotes female fate in *C. briggsae*⁵². Translation of *gld-1* appears to be regulated by PUF proteins in all *Caenorhabditis* species⁵², probably indicative of an ancestral role in the regulation of germ cell proliferation (rather than sex). Thus the FBF and PUF-2 sub-families were

apparently “coopted by association” in each hermaphrodite due to their long-standing linkage with *gld-1*.

Possible genetic complexity of self-fertility in *Caenorhabditis*

The above studies have deepened our understanding of how hermaphrodite development evolved in the *C. elegans* and *C. briggsae* lineages, and they have even guided a successful effort to engineer selfing in *C. remanei* females⁵⁴. However, they have not defined the historical genetic variants distinguishing females from hermaphrodites with certainty. More generally, the comparative candidate-gene approach is problematic when the trait is not completely understood in the model system¹⁶ and when taxa are substantially diverged⁵⁵. Because simple genetic changes can produce dramatic sexual transformations, and because self-fertility has evolved repeatedly (Figure 1), it may be expected that only a few changes are necessary for hermaphroditic self-fertility to evolve. However, it is also possible that hermaphroditism evolves through multiple changes of moderate to minor effect. Quantitative variation in self brood size^{56–59} and cryptic variation in somatic sex determination⁶⁰ exist in *C. elegans*. Furthermore, *C. elegans* sex determination mutations that disrupt wild-type self-fertile hermaphroditism on their own can produce fertile animals in combination³⁰. Thus, the use of natural variants is a desirable alternative in determining the causes of self-fertility.

Recent work on interspecies *Caenorhabditis* hybrids with divergent reproductive modes has shown the utility and limitations of this approach. The F1 hybrid progeny of *C. briggsae* and *C. sp. 9* (a recently discovered gonochoristic species) are fertile females⁶¹. That self-fertility is recessive indicates that no *C. briggsae* gene is sufficient for self-fertility at a single dose, and that that the *C. sp. 9* XX germline may be highly canalized in the female state. An important aspect of the evolution of self-fertility, therefore, may have been a weakening of the commitment to female germ-line sexual identity⁶². Certain informative backcrosses in the *C. briggsae*-*C. sp.9* system are inviable, but those that can be performed are unable to regenerate self-fertility⁶¹. This result is consistent with a requirement for homozygosity of *C. briggsae* alleles of multiple unlinked genes. Hybridization therefore eliminates self-fertility, suggesting that incipient hermaphrodites achieved the requisite fixation of multiple genetic variants promoting XX spermatogenesis via isolation and inbreeding. A quantitative genetic approach for understanding the evolution of self-fertility may be a fruitful one for future studies.

Consequences of the evolution of selfing in *Caenorhabditis*

Self-fertility may provide a way to invade a new ecological niche or survive drastic times, but it also has major consequences for genome content and sexual traits. Research that collectively highlights these consequences is summarized below.

Population genetics

Selfing leads to progressive homozygosity, which in turn unmasks deleterious recessive mutations and often results in a decline in fitness called inbreeding depression⁶³. In order to survive, an incipient selfing population must rid themselves of residual deleterious mutation through a process called purging. Because the fitness effects of alleles often depend upon epistatic effects of alleles at other loci, this process is expected to eventually produce unique homozygous genotypes. Consistent with this prediction, selfing *Caenorhabditis* nematodes do not suffer from general inbreeding depression^{64,65}, but instead suffer from outbreeding depression⁶⁶. This is in stark contrast to their gonochoristic congeners, which display severe inbreeding depression^{66,67}.

The succession of inbreeding depression and purging of deleterious mutations predict that self-fertilizing species should retain less genetic diversity than dioecious counterparts. Indeed, higher selfing rates lead to a decrease of the effective population size for neutral alleles of autosomal genes⁶⁸. The neutral theory of evolution predicts that outcrossing species will display at least twice as much genetic diversity as selfing species⁶⁹, and other factors are likely to reduce genetic diversity in selfing species further^{70–72}. For example, severe population bottlenecks are facilitated by the fact that any single individual can found a new population. Moreover, progressive homozygosity leads to extensive linkage disequilibrium across the genome of selfing species. The impact of natural selection is then limited because both deleterious and advantageous loci are effectively linked to one another.

The above dynamics might lead to reduced selection against weakly deleterious mutations and thereby accelerate rates of evolution in sequences located in non-recombining parts of the genome. By contrast, selection for a new beneficial mutation would be expected to sweep a large swath of the genome along with it, lowering population-level variation. Consistent with the latter, dramatically less nucleotide diversity is observed in the genomes of selfing *Caenorhabditis* compared with gonochoristic *Caenorhabditis*^{73–75} and is lowest in the low-recombination central domain of the *C. elegans* chromosomes⁷⁶. Similar findings have been described in plants (e.g.^{77,78}).

In addition to lower genetic diversity, the smaller effective population sizes of selfing should lead to weaker selection against various forms of selfish elements, which would in turn inflate genome size⁷⁹. This is consistent with observations of the abundance of transposable elements (TE) in low-recombining regions of the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome⁸⁰ and a higher copy number of certain TEs in *Arabidopsis thaliana*⁸¹ and *C. elegans*⁸² compared to their obligately outcrossing congeners. However, more recent studies contradict some of the above predictions. In *Arabidopsis*, the genome size of the selfing *A. thaliana* is smaller than that of outcrossing relatives^{83–85}. Furthermore, in the obligately outcrossing *A. lyrata*, TEs are more active and younger than in the selfing *A. thaliana*⁸⁶. In *Caenorhabditis*, the genome sequences of *C. elegans* and *C. briggsae* also harbor fewer repeats than those of three gonochoristic species⁸⁷.

Ten *Caenorhabditis* species have or will soon have their genomes completely sequenced, annotated and available^{34,88}. Preliminary assemblies of the gonochoristic *C. japonica*, *C. remanei* and *C. brenneri* genomes suggests they have larger genome sizes than *C. elegans* and *C. briggsae*, even when the substantial amounts of heterozygosity retained in the sequenced strains⁸⁹ is considered. While genome sizes and the emergence of selfing could be unrelated, the intriguing possibility of repeated genome shrinkage in selfing lineages remains. If this is borne out by more direct measures, it may be driven by an interaction between partial selfing and the preferential segregation of deletion-bearing autosomes with the X chromosome in male meiosis⁹⁰.

Role of males and outcrossing

Though neither *C. elegans* nor *C. briggsae* hermaphrodites need to mate with males to reproduce, males exist in wild populations. They are produced spontaneously from meiotic X chromosome non-disjunction or through fertilization of XX individuals by males, the latter allowing sex ratios of up to 50%. In laboratory cultures of the *C. elegans* reference strain, N2, the male frequency is close to that of X chromosome non-disjunction rate^{64,91}. Nevertheless, outcrossing can be detected in wild populations of *C. elegans* and *C. briggsae*^{92–96}, and in some isolates of *C. elegans* males persist at a higher rate than in N2 and vary widely in their abilities to mate^{57,91,96}. At the same time, a natural population of *C. elegans* carrying a mutation in *mab-23*, which renders the males unable to mate, has been

reported^{57,97}, illustrating the fact that males are not needed, at least for short-term survival of the population.

Why males are still retained in androdioecious species is a subject of open debate^{64,98–100}. In laboratory environments, *C. elegans* hermaphrodites can invade gonochoristic populations generation after generation, even when starting with a population composed of nearly 50% males^{64,91,99} (though this may not be true for *C. briggsae*⁴⁴). While this suggests that androdioecious males are often useless and perhaps on their way out of existence, another theory is emerging. When environmental conditions are not optimal (i.e., scarce food resources, overpopulation and unfavorable temperatures), *Caenorhabditis* nematodes have the ability to go into a resistant larval phase called the dauer. Males survive dauer arrest better than hermaphrodites, and outcrossing rates increase after starvation¹⁰¹. In addition, in populations subjected to environmental stresses or an increased mutation load, the progeny resulting from crosses between males and hermaphrodites have a higher fitness than those from selfing¹⁰². Thus, outcrossing allows both avoidance of inbreeding depression and more rapid adaptation to new environments for *C. elegans* - as is the case for most species. This also squares well with theoretical calculations that suggest *C. elegans* would go extinct in a few thousand years were it to lose all ability to outcross¹⁰³.

Degradation of mating behavior—the selfing syndrome

Mating in *C. elegans* relies on sex-specific anatomy and on chemosensory and neuronal signals. Briefly, upon contact between the rays and ventral sensilla of the male tail with the hermaphrodite cuticle, the male presses his tail against the hermaphrodite's body and starts scanning the hermaphrodite to find the vulva. When the male tail eventually makes contact with the vulva, the male stops moving and inserts his spicules in the vulval slit. The male then ejaculates and deposits a gelatinous copulatory plug. Larger, male-derived sperm is stored in the hermaphrodite spermathecae along with the hermaphrodite's own sperm, where it has a competitive advantage because of its larger size^{104,105}. In the absence of a mate, males wander away from food source, presumably in search of mates¹⁰⁶.

Because mating is not required for reproduction in androdioecious species, mating-related traits should be under weaker stabilizing and sexual selection. Indeed, in *C. elegans* and *C. briggsae*, both sexes have lost their ability to behave as reliable mating partners in comparison to gonochoristic *Caenorhabditis* species (Table 1)^{64,99,107,108}. Most laboratory crosses between males and hermaphrodites in *C. elegans* or *C. briggsae* use mobility-impaired hermaphrodites or a large excess of males to make up for the low frequency of successful matings. Furthermore, males from androdioecious species do not discriminate between the sexes, and tend to initiate mating behaviors upon contact with any cuticle, including their own¹⁰⁹.

Several steps in the mating process are degraded in androdioecious species. Females from dioecious species attract conspecific males as well as *C. briggsae* and *C. elegans* males, while hermaphrodites do not elicit such a reaction from males from any species^{64,107,109}. *C. elegans* hermaphrodites do produce a mixture of characteristic glycosides, the ascarosides, that attract both conspecific males and males from other species to varying lesser extent¹¹⁰. Females from *C. remanei* and *C. brenneri* secrete a sex pheromone to attract males that seems to be either not produced by hermaphrodites or is less efficient¹⁰⁷. It is unclear whether the attractants secreted by the gonochoristic females are chemically similar to those secreted by *C. elegans* hermaphrodites. In addition, both males and females in dioecious species wander in the absence of potential mate, while in selfing species hermaphrodites do not search for mates¹¹¹.

Once males from gonochoristic species have found a female partner, they are able to immobilize it to facilitate spicule insertion and subsequent copulation. It has been suggested that males produce a 'soporific factor' that allows them to immobilize the female and facilitates spicule insertion by widening the vulval opening¹⁰⁹. However, hermaphrodites seem to be unresponsive to this signal, and most of the matings fail because the hermaphrodite moves away from its partner before copulation occurs. Interestingly, *C. briggsae* males induce the same inactive behavior in females from both gonochoristic species tested, whereas *C. elegans* males do not¹⁰⁹. Similarly, a strain of *C. briggsae* otherwise able to mate seems to lack sex-drive and displays neither mating nor self-plugging behaviors¹⁰⁹. In addition, hermaphrodites have been observed to eject male sperm if their reproductive tracts already contain their own, particularly if they are young¹¹². This behavior is currently unexplained, and stands at odds with the well-documented fertilization advantage experienced by male sperm in a mixed brood^{105,113}. However, both may be true, especially if ejaculate ejection can be overcome by repeated mating.

The above studies indicate that androdioecious species have lost (or are in the process of losing) characteristics that would otherwise make them efficient cross-fertilizers. The genes underlying these traits and/or their regulation may have evolved in response to relaxation of selection¹⁰⁸ and some are still responsive to selection¹¹⁴. However, given that androdioecious species have clear mating defects, some historically important genes associated with mating success may be more readily identified in a gonochoristic species such as *C. remanei*, work that is currently underway (CGT and ESH, unpublished).

Macroevolutionary consequences

The complex molecular biology and repeated evolution of self-fertility in *Caenorhabditis* suggests that it is an adaptation, perhaps driven by selection for reproductive assurance at low density. Selfers can also enjoy a large boost in intrinsic growth rate once males, who cannot produce eggs, are largely eliminated from the population. The power of this can be seen in laboratory cultures of the obligately outcrossing *C. elegans fog-2* mutant, which have been repeatedly observed to revert to selfing by rare gene conversion events that repair the mutation¹¹⁵ and restore self-fertility.

Despite the above advantages, however, across the nematode family Rhabditidae multi-taxon clades of selfing species are rarely seen¹¹⁶, and within *Caenorhabditis* all three known cases are clearly recently evolved from gonochorism^{26,72}. This suggests that conversion to selfing has powerful short-term benefits to species that can evolve XX spermatogenesis and overcome the resulting inbreeding depression, but in the long run extinction generally occurs before speciation. A similar macroevolutionary cost of selfing has been observed in plants of the nightshade family¹¹⁷ and may occur in many taxa that colonize disturbed or ephemeral habitats. The above results suggest the paradoxical result that selfing nematodes need to maintain the ability to outcross to withstand stress and on going mutation, yet at the same time, standing variation falls to very low levels and mating-related traits are gradually degraded. The eventual endpoint may be selfing species that are so poor at mating they cannot respond to an environmental shift and succumb. From this macroevolutionary perspective, the impressive achievement of hermaphrodite development appears to be a Faustian bargain.

Concluding Remarks

In this review, we have shown how *Caenorhabditis* nematodes represent a useful experimental system for the integrative study of shifts in sexual mode. Early comparative studies on the EDB causes of selfing focused on the genetic control of sex determination, and important insights were gleaned from this work. A promising new area will be to

examine the consequences of selfing, both for the genome overall and for reproductive traits. As the natural history and ecological niche of the genus is being refined²⁶, we can also start to address another outstanding question—what ultimately explains the phylogenetic distribution of selfing. An adaptationist hypothesis would be that it is a facile transition driven by ecological shifts to a particular lifestyle. However, it is also possible that gonochoristic lineages have a more or less constant probability of spinning off selfing derivatives, which derive short-term gains but then go extinct. In any case, we can look forward to many interesting connections being made.

BOX 1: An overview of germ-line sex determination in *C. elegans*

The study of *C. elegans* sex determination helped pioneer developmental genetics¹. Decades of work has shown that a two-fold difference in X dosage is first converted to a binary signal by *xol-1*⁴, and through a series of interactions this is converted into differential abundance of the zinc-finger transcription factor, TRA-1^{5,6}. In males, TRA-1 levels are kept low by the combined action of FEM-1, FEM-2, and FEM-3, which form a complex that targets TRA-1 for ubiquitination and degradation by the proteasome¹⁰. TRA-1 abundance is sufficient to explain essentially all sexually dimorphic somatic traits, but in the germ line things become more complicated. First, male *tra-1* mutants cannot sustain spermatogenesis and frequently produce oocytes^{12,13}. In addition, *tra-1*; *fem* double mutants have an unexpected feminized (Fem) phenotype in the germ line (but not the soma)^{13,14}. These results are not fully understood, but are consistent with *tra-1* having both positive and negative effects on spermatogenesis, and with it being only one of a larger set of germline sex determiners.

Germline-specific sex determination mutations have also been discovered¹⁶, generally falling into “no sperm” (feminization of germline, or Fog) and “too many sperm” (masculinization of germline, or Mog) categories. Loss-of-function mutations in *fog-1* and *fog-3* eliminate both male and hermaphrodite sperm^{20–22}, whereas *fog-2* mutations only feminize hermaphrodites²³. In contrast, the *mog*-class loss-of-function mutations produce a vast excess of hermaphrodite sperm^{24,25}. Loss of *gld-1* and *fbf-1/fbf-2* activity also ablates or overproduces XX sperm, respectively, but with pleiotropic defects in hermaphrodites and no effect on male sex determination^{27,28}. Through clever genetic screens, gain-of-function mutations affecting the 3' UTRs of *tra-2* and *fem-3* with germline-specific effects were also found^{29–32}. Eventually it was discovered that the loss-of-function *gld-1* and *fbf-1/2* phenotypes stemmed from an inability to bind RNA motifs defined by the *tra-2* and *fem-3* gain-of-function alleles^{35,36}. FOG-1^{21,22} and several of the MOG proteins^{37–39} are also implicated in mRNA regulation.

Acknowledgments

We thank our colleagues in the *Caenorhabditis* evolution community, the National Institutes of Health (through grant GM079414) for support of the work described here, and the anonymous reviewers who helped improve the manuscript.

References

1. Hodgkin J. One lucky XX male: isolation of the first *Caenorhabditis elegans* sex-determination mutants. *Genetics*. 2002; 162:1501–1504. [PubMed: 12524326]
2. Bonner, J., editor. *Evolution and Development* (Report of the Dahlem Workshop). Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1981.
3. Haag E, Lenski R. L'enfant terrible at 30: the maturation of evolutionary developmental biology. *Development*. 2011; 138:2633–2637. [PubMed: 21652645]

4. Meyer BJ. Sex in the worm: counting and compensating X-chromosome dose. *Trends Genet.* 2000; 16:247–253. [PubMed: 10827451]
5. Zarkower D, Hodgkin J. Molecular analysis of the *C. elegans* sex-determining gene *tra-1*: a gene encoding two zinc finger proteins. *Cell.* 1992; 70:237–249. [PubMed: 1339311]
6. Schvarzstein M, Spence AM. The *C. elegans* sex-determining GLI protein TRA-1A is regulated by sex-specific proteolysis. *Dev Cell.* 2006; 11:733–740. [PubMed: 17084364]
7. Carroll SB. Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: a genetic theory of morphological evolution. *Cell.* 2008; 134:25–36. [PubMed: 18614008]
8. Rudel D, Sommer RJ. The evolution of developmental mechanisms. *Dev Biol.* 2003; 264:15–37. [PubMed: 14623229]
9. Stern DL, Orgogozo V. The loci of evolution: how predictable is genetic evolution? *Evolution.* 2008; 62:2155–2177. [PubMed: 18616572]
10. Starostina NG, et al. A CUL-2 ubiquitin ligase containing three FEM proteins degrades TRA-1 to regulate *C. elegans* sex determination. *Dev Cell.* 2007; 13:127–139. [PubMed: 17609115]
11. Haag ES. Chapter 3. *Caenorhabditis* nematodes as a model for the adaptive evolution of germ cells. *Curr Top Dev Biol.* 2009; 86:43–66. [PubMed: 19361689]
12. Hodgkin J. A genetic analysis of the sex-determining gene, *tra-1*, in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genes and Development.* 1987; 1:731–745. [PubMed: 3428597]
13. Schedl T, Graham PL, Barton MK, Kimble J. Analysis of the role of *tra-1* in germline sex determination in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1989; 123:755–769. [PubMed: 2612895]
14. Hodgkin J. Sex determination in the nematode *C. elegans*: analysis of *tra-3* suppressors and characterization of *fem* genes. *Genetics.* 1986; 114:15–52. [PubMed: 3770465]
15. Raff RA. Direct-developing sea urchins and the evolutionary reorganization of early development. *Bioessays.* 1992; 14:211–218. [PubMed: 1596270]
16. Ellis, R.; Schedl, T. Sex determination in the germ line (March 5, 2007). In: *The C. elegans Research Community.*, editor. *WormBook.* 2007. p. 1-13.
17. Charlesworth D. Evolution of plant breeding systems. *Curr Biol.* 2006; 16:R726–R735. [PubMed: 16950099]
18. Nguyen-Chi M, Morello D. RNA-binding proteins, RNA granules, and gametes: is unity strength? *Reproduction.* 2011; 142:803–817. [PubMed: 21976618]
19. Racher H, Hansen D. Translational control in the *C. elegans* hermaphrodite germ line. *Genome.* 2010; 53:83–102. [PubMed: 20140027]
20. Chen P, Singal A, Kimble J, Ellis R. A novel member of the tob family of proteins controls sexual fate in *Caenorhabditis elegans* germ cells. *Dev. Biol.* 2000; 217:77–90. [PubMed: 10625537]
21. Jin SW, Kimble J, Ellis RE. Regulation of cell fate in *Caenorhabditis elegans* by a novel cytoplasmic polyadenylation element binding protein. *Dev Biol.* 2001; 229:537–553. [PubMed: 11150246]
22. Luitjens C, Gallegos M, Kraemer B, Kimble J, Wickens M. CPEB proteins control two key steps in spermatogenesis in *C. elegans*. *Genes Dev.* 2000; 14:2596–2609. [PubMed: 11040214]
23. Schedl T, Kimble J. *fog-2*, a germ-line-specific sex determination gene required for hermaphrodite spermatogenesis in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1988; 119:43–61. [PubMed: 3396865]
24. Graham P, Kimble J. The *mog-1* gene is required for the switch from spermatogenesis to oogenesis in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1993; 133:919–931. [PubMed: 8462850]
25. Graham PL, Schedl T, Kimble J. More *mog* genes that influence the switch from spermatogenesis to oogenesis in the hermaphrodite germ line of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Dev. Genet.* 1993; 14:471–484. [PubMed: 8111975]
26. Kiontke K, et al. A phylogeny and molecular barcodes for *Caenorhabditis*, with numerous new species from rotting fruits. *BMC Evol Biol.* 2011; 11:339. [PubMed: 22103856]
27. Crittenden SL, et al. A conserved RNA-binding protein controls germline stem cells in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Nature.* 2002; 417:660–663. [PubMed: 12050669]
28. Francis R, Barton MK, Kimble J, Schedl T. *gld-1*, a tumor suppressor gene required for oocyte development in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1995; 139:579–606. [PubMed: 7713419]

29. Ahringer J, Kimble J. Control of the sperm-oocyte switch in *Caenorhabditis elegans* hermaphrodites by the *fem-3* 3' untranslated region. *Nature*. 1991; 349:346–348. [PubMed: 1702880]
30. Barton MK, Schedl TB, Kimble J. Gain-of-function mutations of *fem-3*, a sex-determination gene in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics*. 1987; 115:107–119. [PubMed: 3557107]
31. Doniach T. Activity of the sex-determining gene *tra-2* is modulated to allow spermatogenesis in the *C. elegans* hermaphrodite. *Genetics*. 1986; 114:53–76. [PubMed: 3770471]
32. Goodwin EB, Okkema PG, Evans TC, Kimble J. Translational regulation of *tra-2* by its 3' untranslated region controls sexual identity in *C. elegans*. *Cell*. 1993; 75:329–339. [PubMed: 8402916]
33. Hillier LW, et al. Genomics in *C. elegans*: so many genes, such a little worm. *Genome Res*. 2005; 15:1651–1660. [PubMed: 16339362]
34. Ross J, et al. *Caenorhabditis briggsae* recombinant inbred line genotypes reveal inter-strain incompatibility and the evolution of recombination. *PLoS Genet*. 2011; 7:e1002174. [PubMed: 21779179]
35. Jan E, Motzny CK, Graves LE, Goodwin EB. The STAR protein, GLD-1, is a translational regulator of sexual identity in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *EMBO J*. 1999; 18:258–269. [PubMed: 9878068]
36. Zhang B, et al. A conserved RNA-binding protein that regulates sexual fates in the *C. elegans* hermaphrodite germ line. *Nature*. 1997; 390:477–484. [PubMed: 9393998]
37. Puoti A, Kimble J. The *Caenorhabditis elegans* sex determination gene *mog-1* encodes a member of the DEAH-Box protein family. *Mol Cell Biol*. 1999; 19:2189–2197. [PubMed: 10022905]
38. Puoti A, Kimble J. The hermaphrodite sperm/oocyte switch requires the *Caenorhabditis elegans* homologs of PRP2 and PRP22. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2000; 97:3276–3281. [PubMed: 10737793]
39. Zanetti S, Meola M, Bochud A, Puoti A. Role of the *C. elegans* U2 snRNP protein MOG-2 in sex determination, meiosis, and splice site selection. *Dev Biol*. 2011; 354:232–241. [PubMed: 21504747]
40. Zhang B, et al. A conserved RNA binding protein that regulates sexual fates in the *C. elegans* hermaphrodite germ line. *Nature*. 1997; 390:477–484. [PubMed: 9393998]
41. Clifford R, et al. FOG-2, a novel F-box-containing protein, associates with the GLD-1 RNA-binding protein and directs male sex determination in the *C. elegans* hermaphrodite germline. *Development*. 2000; 127:5265–5276. [PubMed: 11076749]
42. Haag, E. The evolution of nematode sex determination: *C. elegans* as a reference point for comparative biology. In: *The C. elegans Research Community*, editor. *Wormbook*. 2005.
43. Nayak S, Goree J, Schedl T. *fog-2* and the evolution of self-fertile hermaphroditism in *Caenorhabditis*. *PLoS Biology*. 2005; 3:e6. [PubMed: 15630478]
44. Guo Y, Lang S, Ellis R. Independent recruitment of F-box genes to regulate hermaphrodite development during nematode evolution. *Curr Biol*. 2009; 19:1853–1860. [PubMed: 19836240]
45. Haag ES, Kimble J. Regulatory elements required for development of *Caenorhabditis elegans* hermaphrodites are conserved in the *tra-2* homologue of *C. remanei*, a male/female sister species. *Genetics*. 2000; 155:105–116. [PubMed: 10790387]
46. Haag ES, Wang S, Kimble J. Rapid coevolution of the nematode sex-determining genes *fem-3* and *tra-2*. *Curr Biol*. 2002; 12:2035–2041. [PubMed: 12477393]
47. Jan E, Yoon JW, Walterhouse D, Iannaccone P, Goodwin EB. Conservation of the *C. elegans tra-2* 3'UTR translational control. *EMBO J*. 1997; 16:6301–6313. [PubMed: 9321409]
48. Francis R, Maine E, Schedl T. Analysis of the multiple roles of *gld-1* in germline development: interactions with the sex determination cascade and the *glp-1* signaling pathway. *Genetics*. 1995; 139:607–630. [PubMed: 7713420]
49. Beadell AV, Liu Q, Johnson DM, Haag ES. Independent recruitments of a translational regulator in the evolution of self-fertile nematodes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011; 108:19672–19677. [PubMed: 22106259]

50. Ryder SP, Frater L, Abramovitz D, Goodwin E, Williamson J. RNA target specificity of the STAR/GSG domain posttranscriptional regulatory protein GLD-1. *Nat Struct Mol Biol.* 2004; 11:20–28. [PubMed: 14718919]
51. Beuck C, et al. Structure of the GLD-1 homodimerization domain: insights into STAR protein-mediated translational regulation. *Structure.* 2010; 18:377–389. [PubMed: 20223220]
52. Liu Q, Stumpf C, Wickens M, Haag ES. Context-dependent function of a conserved translational regulatory module. *Development.* 2012; 139:TBA.
53. Bachorik JL, Kimble J. Redundant control of the *Caenorhabditis elegans* sperm/oocyte switch by PUF-8 and FBF-1, two distinct PUF RNA-binding proteins. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2005; 102:10893–10897. [PubMed: 16037210]
54. Baldi C, Cho S, Ellis RE. Mutations in two independent pathways are sufficient to create hermaphroditic nematodes. *Science.* 2009; 326:1002–1005. [PubMed: 19965511]
55. Haag ES, True JR. Perspective: From mutants to mechanisms? Assessing the candidate gene paradigm in evolutionary biology. *Evolution Int J Org Evolution.* 2001; 55:1077–1084.
56. Hodgkin J, Barnes TM. More is not better: brood size and population growth in a self-fertilizing nematode. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B.* 1991; 246:19–24.
57. Hodgkin J, Doniach T. Natural variation and copulatory plug formation in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1997; 146:149–164. [PubMed: 9136008]
58. Duveau F, Felix MA. Role of pleiotropy in the evolution of a cryptic developmental variation in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *PLoS Biol.* 2012; 10:e1001230. [PubMed: 22235190]
59. Shook DR, Brooks A, Johnson TE. Mapping quantitative trait loci affecting life history traits in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1996; 142:801–817. [PubMed: 8849889]
60. Chandler CH. Cryptic intraspecific variation in sex determination in *Caenorhabditis elegans* revealed by mutations. *Heredity.* 2010; 105:473–482. [PubMed: 20502478]
61. Woodruff G, Eke O, Baird SE, Félix M, Haag E. Insights into species divergence and the evolution of hermaphroditism from fertile interspecies hybrids of *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. *Genetics.* 2010; 186:997–1012. [PubMed: 20823339]
62. Haag ES. Convergent evolution: regulatory lightning strikes twice. *Curr Biol.* 2009; 19:R977–R979. [PubMed: 19922851]
63. Carr DE, Dudash MR. Recent approaches into the genetic basis of inbreeding depression in plants. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 2003; 358:1071–1084. [PubMed: 12831473]
64. Chasnov J, Chow K. Why are there males in the hermaphroditic species *Caenorhabditis elegans*? *Genetics.* 2002; 160:983–994. [PubMed: 11901116]
65. Johnson TE, Hutchinson EW. Absence of strong heterosis for life span and other life history traits in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics.* 1993; 134:465–474. [PubMed: 8325483]
66. Dolgin ES, Charlesworth B, Baird SE, Cutter AD. Inbreeding and outbreeding depression in *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. *Evolution.* 2007; 61:1339–1352. [PubMed: 17542844]
67. Baer CF, et al. Rapid decline in fitness of mutation accumulation lines of gonochoristic (outcrossing) *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. *Evolution.* 2010; 64:3242–3253. [PubMed: 20649813]
68. Pollak E. On the theory of partially inbreeding finite populations. I. Partial selfing. *Genetics.* 1987; 117:353–360. [PubMed: 3666446]
69. Kimura M, Ota T. Theoretical aspects of population genetics. *Monogr Popul Biol.* 1971; 4:1–219. [PubMed: 5162676]
70. Artieri CG, Haerty W, Gupta BP, Singh RS. Sexual selection and maintenance of sex: evidence from comparisons of rates of genomic accumulation of mutations and divergence of sex-related genes in sexual and hermaphroditic species of *Caenorhabditis*. *Mol Biol Evol.* 2008; 25:972–979. [PubMed: 18281268]
71. Charlesworth D, Wright SI. Breeding systems and genome evolution. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.* 2001; 11:685–690. [PubMed: 11682314]
72. Cutter AD, Wasmuth JD, Washington NL. Patterns of molecular evolution in *Caenorhabditis* preclude ancient origins of selfing. *Genetics.* 2008; 178:2093–2104. [PubMed: 18430935]

73. Cutter AD, Baird SE, Charlesworth D. High nucleotide polymorphism and rapid decay of linkage disequilibrium in wild populations of *Caenorhabditis remanei*. *Genetics*. 2006; 174:901–913. [PubMed: 16951062]
74. Graustein A, Gaspar JM, Walters JR, Palopoli MF. Levels of DNA polymorphism vary with mating system in the nematode genus *Caenorhabditis*. *Genetics*. 2002; 161:99–107. [PubMed: 12019226]
75. Jovelín R, Dunham JP, Sung FS, Phillips PC. High nucleotide divergence in developmental regulatory genes contrasts with the structural elements of olfactory pathways in *Caenorhabditis*. *Genetics*. 2009; 181:1387–1397. [PubMed: 19001295]
76. Rockman MV, Kruglyak L. Recombinational landscape and population genomics of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *PLoS Genet*. 2009; 5:e1000419. [PubMed: 19283065]
77. Baudry E, Kerdellhue C, Innan H, Stephan W. Species and recombination effects on DNA variability in the tomato genus. *Genetics*. 2001; 158:1725–1735. [PubMed: 11514458]
78. Savolainen O, Langley CH, Lazzaro BP, Fr H. Contrasting patterns of nucleotide polymorphism at the alcohol dehydrogenase locus in the outcrossing *Arabidopsis lyrata* and the selfing *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2000; 17:645–655. [PubMed: 10742055]
79. Lynch M, Conery JS. The origins of genome complexity. *Science*. 2003; 302:1401–1404. [PubMed: 14631042]
80. Charlesworth B, Lapid A, Canada D. The distribution of transposable elements within and between chromosomes in a population of *Drosophila melanogaster*. II. Inferences on the nature of selection against elements. *Genet Res*. 1992; 60:115–130. [PubMed: 1334900]
81. Wright SI, Le QH, Schoen DJ, Bureau TE. Population dynamics of an Ac-like transposable element in self- and cross-pollinating *Arabidopsis*. *Genetics*. 2001; 158:1279–1288. [PubMed: 11454774]
82. Dolgin ES, Charlesworth B, Cutter AD. Population frequencies of transposable elements in selfing and outcrossing *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. *Genet Res (Camb)*. 2008; 90:317–329. [PubMed: 18840306]
83. Johnston JS, et al. Evolution of genome size in Brassicaceae. *Ann Bot*. 2005; 95:229–235. [PubMed: 15596470]
84. Lysak MA, Koch MA, Beaulieu JM, Meister A, Leitch IJ. The dynamic ups and downs of genome size evolution in Brassicaceae. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2009; 26:85–98. [PubMed: 18842687]
85. Oyama R, et al. The shrunken genome of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Systematics and Evolution*. 2008; 273:257–271.
86. Hu T, et al. The *Arabidopsis lyrata* genome sequence and the basis of rapid genome size change. *Nat Genet*. 2011; 43:476–481. [PubMed: 21478890]
87. *Caenorhabditis*. 2008 Repeat Libraries Release R1.0, http://genome.sfu.ca/projects/worm_genomes/REPEATS/RELEASE1.0.
88. Gerstein MB, et al. Integrative analysis of the *Caenorhabditis elegans* genome by the modENCODE project. *Science*. 2010; 330:1775–1787. [PubMed: 21177976]
89. Barrière A, et al. Detecting heterozygosity in shotgun genome assemblies: Lessons from obligately outcrossing nematodes. *Genome Res*. 2009; 19:470–480. [PubMed: 19204328]
90. Wang J, Chen PJ, Wang GJ, Keller L. Chromosome size differences may affect meiosis and genome size. *Science*. 2010; 329:293. [PubMed: 20647459]
91. Teotonio H, Manoel D, Phillips PC. Genetic variation for outcrossing among *Caenorhabditis elegans* isolates. *Evolution Int J Org Evolution*. 2006; 60:1300–1305.
92. Barrière A, Félix MA. High local genetic diversity and low outcrossing rate in *Caenorhabditis elegans* natural populations. *Curr Biol*. 2005; 15:1176–1184. [PubMed: 16005289]
93. Barrière A, Félix MA. Temporal dynamics and linkage disequilibrium in natural *Caenorhabditis elegans* populations. *Genetics*. 2007; 176:999–1011. [PubMed: 17409084]
94. Cutter AD, Wasmuth JD, Blaxter ML. The evolution of biased codon and amino acid usage in nematode genomes. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2006; 23:2303–2315. [PubMed: 16936139]
95. Denver DR, Morris K, Thomas WK. Phylogenetics in *Caenorhabditis elegans*: an analysis of divergence and outcrossing. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2003; 20:393–400. [PubMed: 12644560]

96. Sivasundar A, Hey J. Sampling from natural populations with RNAi reveals high outcrossing and population structure in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Curr Biol*. 2005; 15:1598–1602. [PubMed: 16139217]
97. Lints R, Emmons SW. Regulation of sex-specific differentiation and mating behavior in *C. elegans* by a new member of the DM domain transcription factor family. *Genes Dev*. 2002; 16:2390–2402. [PubMed: 12231628]
98. Anderson JL, Morran LT, Phillips PC. Outcrossing and the maintenance of males within *C. elegans* populations. *J Hered*. 2010; 101(Suppl 1):S62. [PubMed: 20212008]
99. Stewart A, Phillips P. Selection and maintenance of androdioecy in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics*. 2002; 160:975–982. [PubMed: 11901115]
100. Wegewitz V, Schulenburg H, Streit A. Experimental insight into the proximate causes of male persistence variation among two strains of the androdioecious *Caenorhabditis elegans* (Nematoda). *BMC Ecol*. 2008; 8:12. [PubMed: 18620600]
101. Morran LT, Cappy BJ, Anderson JL, Phillips PC. Sexual partners for the stressed: facultative outcrossing in the self-fertilizing nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Evolution*. 2009; 63:1473–1482. [PubMed: 19210536]
102. Morran LT, Parmenter MD, Phillips PC. Mutation load and rapid adaptation favour outcrossing over self-fertilization. *Nature*. 2009; 462:350–352. [PubMed: 19847164]
103. Loewe L, Cutter AD. On the potential for extinction by Muller's ratchet in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *BMC Evol Biol*. 2008; 8:125. [PubMed: 18447910]
104. LaMunyon CW, Ward S. Evolution of sperm size in nematodes: sperm competition favours larger sperm. *Proc Biol Sci*. 1999; 266:263–267. [PubMed: 10081163]
105. LaMunyon CW, Ward S. Larger sperm outcompete smaller sperm in the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Proc Biol Sci*. 1998; 265:1997–2002. [PubMed: 9821364]
106. Simon JM, Sternberg PW. Evidence of a mate-finding cue in the hermaphrodite nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99:1598–1603. [PubMed: 11818544]
107. Chasnov JR, So WK, Chan CM, Chow KL. The species, sex, and stage specificity of a *Caenorhabditis* sex pheromone. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007; 104:6730–6735. [PubMed: 17416682]
108. Cutter AD. Reproductive evolution: symptom of a selfing syndrome. *Curr Biol*. 2008; 18:R1056–R1058. [PubMed: 19036334]
109. Garcia LR, LeBoeuf B, Koo P. Diversity in mating behavior of hermaphroditic and male-female *Caenorhabditis* nematodes. *Genetics*. 2007; 175:1761–1771. [PubMed: 17277358]
110. Srinivasan J, et al. A blend of small molecules regulates both mating and development in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Nature*. 2008; 454:1115–1118. [PubMed: 18650807]
111. Lipton J, Kleemann G, Ghosh R, Lints R, Emmons SW. Mate searching in *Caenorhabditis elegans*: a genetic model for sex drive in a simple invertebrate. *J Neurosci*. 2004; 24:7427–7434. [PubMed: 15329389]
112. Kleeman GA, Basolo AL. Facultative decrease in mating resistance in hermaphroditic *Caenorhabditis elegans* with self-sperm depletion. *Animal Behaviour*. 2007; 74:1339–1347.
113. LaMunyon CW, Ward S. Sperm precedence in a hermaphroditic nematode (*Caenorhabditis elegans*) is due to competitive superiority of male sperm. *Experientia*. 1995; 51:817–823. [PubMed: 7649241]
114. LaMunyon CW, Ward S. Evolution of larger sperm in response to experimentally increased sperm competition in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2002; 269:1125–1128. [PubMed: 12061955]
115. Katju V, LaBeau EM, Lipinski KJ, Bergthorsson U. Sex change by gene conversion in a *Caenorhabditis elegans fog-2* mutant. *Genetics*. 2008; 180:669–672. [PubMed: 18757925]
116. Kiontke, K.; Fitch, D. The phylogenetic relationships of *Caenorhabditis* and other rhabditids in. In: *The C. elegans Research Community*. , editor. WormBook: The Online Review of *C. elegans* Biology. 2005.
117. Goldberg EE, et al. Species selection maintains self-incompatibility. *Science*. 2010; 330:493–495. [PubMed: 20966249]

118. Palopoli MF, et al. Molecular basis of the copulatory plug polymorphism in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Nature*. 2008; 454:1019–1022. [PubMed: 18633349]

Glossary Box

Androdioecy	a sexual system with males and hermaphrodite sexes.
Ascarosides	nematode-specific glycosides (modified sugars) that serve as signals for various reproductive decisions.
Congener	member of the same genus.
Conspecific	member of the same species.
Convergent evolution	evolution of an outwardly similar trait in multiple lineages, whose common ancestor did not possess the trait.
Coooption	use of a preexisting feature (gene, organ, etc.) for a new purpose.
Gonochory	a sexual system with separate male and female sexes.
Selfing	hermaphroditic reproduction through union of gametes from the same individual.
Outbreeding and inbreeding depression	loss of viability or fecundity of progeny of mating between distantly or closely related individuals, respectively.

Figure 1. Phylogenetic relationships of *Elegans* group *Caenorhabditis*

The most parsimonious scenario posits that androdioecy evolved convergently in three lineages from a common gonochoristic ancestor. This is supported by the polarity of changes in sex-related traits (see Table 1). The outgroup species, *C. japonica*, belongs to the Japonica group. Cladogram is modified from Ref. ²⁶.

ancestral *tra-2* *C. elegans tra-2*

Figure 2. Evolution of the *tra-2* translational control module in *C. elegans* hermaphrodite sex determination

Orthologs of *tra-2* are found across *Caenorhabditis*, and some level of GLD-1 binding to *tra-2* mRNA may be ancestral^{45,47}. This starting condition is depicted in the upper panel, in which GLD-1 is bound, but does not interfere with the interaction between poly-A-binding protein (PABP) and eIF4F, the protein complex that binds the 7-methylguanosine cap (hexagon). As a result, translation of *tra-2* occurs at an appreciable level in germ cells. In *C. elegans* (lower panel), the tandemly duplicated Direct Repeat Elements³² encode 3 STAR-binding elements (SBEs)⁵⁰. The DREs are unique to *Ce-tra-2* and may stabilize the GLD-1-*tra-2* mRNA complex *in vivo*⁴⁹. Synergizing with this is a *C. elegans*-specific F-box-

containing cofactor, FOG-2^{41,43}, which likely recruits an E3 ubiquitin ligase. Though the targets of FOG-2-mediated ubiquitination remain unknown, one plausible scenario is that they are translation-promoting factors, such as PABP. As a result, poly-A-tails are shortened and translation is strongly inhibited. Loss of FOG-2, GLD-1, or the SBEs thus leads to major TRA-2 over-expression and germline feminization.

Table 1

Comparison of mating-related traits in androdioecious and gonochoristic *Caenorhabditis*.

	gonochoristic	androdioecious
mate discrimination	excellent ¹⁰⁹	poor ¹⁰⁹
pheromone potency	high ^{107,110}	low ^{107,110}
female immobilization	yes ¹⁰⁹	no ¹⁰⁹
mating length	~40 min. ⁶⁴	2 min. ⁶⁴
mating efficiency	100% ⁶⁴	5% ⁶⁴
copulatory plug	always	polymorphic ^{57,118}