Polyploid Formation Shapes Flowering Plant Diversity
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Abstract: Polyploidy, or whole genome duplication, has been an important feature of eukaryotic evolution. This is especially true in flowering plants, where all extant angiosperms have descended from polyploid species. Here we present a broad comparative analysis of the effect of polyploidy on flowering plant diversity. We examine the widely held hypothesis that polyploid flowering plants generate more diversity than their diploid counterparts, by fitting stochastic birth/death models to observed ploidal frequency data from 60 extant angiosperm genera. Our results suggest the opposite, that diploids speciate at higher rates than polyploids, through a combination of simple diploid speciation and tetraploidy. Importantly, the estimated diploid advantage stemmed primarily from a higher rate of polyploidization in diploids than polyploids. Our model is also able to account for the empirically observed correlation between polyploidy and species richness without assuming that polyploids have a speciation advantage over diploids.
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Introduction

Recent genome level data has confirmed the ubiquity of polyploidy in plants (Soltis et al. 2009). Current estimates suggest all extant angiosperms have a polyploid ancestor, sharing at least two whole genome duplication events, and that 20%–50% are recently formed polyploids (Levin 2002; Soltis et al. 2009; Amborella Genome Project 2013). Although little doubt remains about the pervasiveness of polyploidy in flowering plants, there is considerable debate over whether diploids and polyploids differ in speciation and diversification rates.

Otto and Whitten (2000) reported a positive correlation between polyploidy and species richness. This, combined with evidence for polyploid-biased lineage survivorship through the Cretaceous-Tertiary boundary (Fawcett et al. 2009; Soltis and Burleigh 2009) and anecdotal support for polyploid superiority, has stimulated an ongoing discussion focused on possible biological and genetic (intrinsic) advantages of polyploids relative to diploids, as reviewed by Soltis et al. (2003). One hypothesis is that chromosome doubling itself may alter the ecological tolerances of populations, thereby allowing them to invade new habitats and rapidly establish (Stebbins 1980, 1985; Levin 1983, 2002). Another hypothesis is that phenotypic variation arising during polyploidy events enables the invasion of new habitats, mediated by a range of possible genetic and epigenetic mechanisms, as reviewed by te Beest et al. (2012).

In contrast, several recent studies estimating speciation and extinction rates of polyploids and diploids have failed to find evidence for a polyploid speciation advantage: Wood et al. (2009) found no evidence for higher polyploid diversification rates in twelve angiosperm genera, and Mayrose et al. (2011) found that net speciation rates in recently formed polyploids were lower than congeneric diploids. These studies have led some to conclude that polyploids lead to evolutionary dead ends (Arrigo and Barker 2012).

In response to the various hypotheses about polyploid advantages, Meyers and Levin (2006) proposed that the high frequency of polyploids in flowering plants might simply be an inevitable consequence of the directionality of polyploidy. Ploidal increases are largely irreversible over short evolutionary timescales, and therefore the abundance of polyploids should increase over time in a ratchet-like manner (Stebbins 1971). In their analysis, Meyers and Levin (2006) fit a simple, deterministic evolutionary model of polyploid evolution to data from 10 angiosperm genera. Although this model assumed that speciation in congeneric diploids and polyploids occurred at the same rate, it was still able to produce distributions of ploidal levels that were statistically similar to those observed in 9 of the 10 focal genera. This suggests that the irreversibility of polyploidy itself may explain the ubiquity of polyploids. These results also imply that this ratchet model should serve as a parsimonious baseline (null model) when considering other possible explanations for polyploid abundance.
Here, we address the three conflicting hypotheses about the evolutionary potential of polyploids—that they are drivers of diversification, evolutionary dead-ends, or neither—by examining the relationship between polyploidy and flowering plant diversity in a broad comparative context. Specifically, we extend the model introduced in Meyers and Levin (2006) and apply it to data from 60 angiosperm genera to assess whether (1) the simple ratchet model can explain ploidal level distributions across this phylogenetically broader set of taxa; (2) there is statistical evidence for differences in the net speciation rates of polyploids and diploids, and, if so, in which direction; and (3) allopolyploidy has contributed more to the formation of new polyploid lineages than autopolyploidy.

Models, Methods, and Data

Data

Our analysis was based on the observed ploidal level distributions of 60 flowering plant genera chosen from several issues of the Missouri Botanical Garden Index to Plant Chromosome Numbers, spanning the years 1967 to 2000; data are deposited in Dryad Digital Repository, http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.35r23 (Moore 1973; Goldblatt 1981; Missouri Botanical Garden 2005; Scarpino et al. 2014). We sought genera for which chromosome counts were available for large numbers of species and included at least three ploidal levels. In total, we identified the ploidal level of 7,271 species, with an average of 121 species at each ploidal level. The ploidal level of each species in the genus is given with respect to the original founder. We let \( x_k \) denote the number of species of ploidal level \( k \), and consider only even values of \( k \). For a species with ploidal level \( k \), \( r_k \) denotes the within-ploidal level diversification rate, which is the rate species give rise to daughter lineages with the same ploidal level, and \( h_k \) denotes the rate at which the species gives rise to new species through successful polyploidy events. The resulting polyploids are autopolyploids with probability \( a \) and allopolyploids with probability \( (1 - a) \). Extinction happens at a background rate \( \mu \). Using these parameters, the net speciation rate for ploidal level \( k \) is \( \lambda_k = r_k + h_k - \mu \). The model assumes that polyploidy is irreversible over short evolutionary timescales, specifically, the estimated or assumed age of each genus.

In this study, we consider simple and complex versions of this model. “Simple ratchet” (two parameters) is the original Meyers and Levin (2006) model where all species in a genus share a single diversification rate \( r \) and a single polyploidization rate \( h \), all polyploids are autopolyploids (\( a = 0 \)), and there is no extinction (\( \mu = 0 \)). In the “complex ratchet” (five parameters), polyploid species share a single polyploidization rate \( h_4 = h_6 = h_8 = ... \) and diversification \( (r_p = r_4 = r_6 = r_8 = ... \) rate that can be different from the diploid polyploidization \( h_2 \) and diversification rates \( (r_d = r_2) \). The fraction of autopolyploids (\( a \)) can take on nonzero values. Extinction is set at a fixed rate for all species in a genus (\( \mu = \mu_4 = \mu_6 = \mu_8 = ... \)).

Simulation of the Model

Here, we outline a numerical algorithm for simulating the complex ratchet model, henceforth called the “simulation.” This continuous-time stochastic algorithm has evolutionary parameters specific to each genus: the diversification rates (\( r \)), polyploidization rates (\( h \)), the probability that a polyploidy event yields an autopolyploid species (\( a \)), the final size of the genus (number of species = \( N_g \)), the estimated age of the genus (\( T_g \) million years), and extinction rate (\( \mu \)). Each genus is simulated separately, beginning with a single diploid species at time zero and tracking the number of species in each ploidal class as the genus diversifies through speciation and polyploidization.

In the continuous-time version of the model, the times between both speciation and polyploidization events for a single lineage are distributed exponentially. The simulation has a constantly updating queue of speciation and polyploidization events, and iteratively performs the first event in the queue until the genus reaches its final size. Each event has three pieces of information: type (speciation or polyploidization), time (\( t_s \) million years), and spe-
cies ($A_i$). Speciation events occur as follows. S1: the simulation clock is updated to the time of the event ($t_e$). S2: the parent species $A$ persists and a new offspring species $B$ is created. S3: species $A$ is assigned a new time until speciation ($\sigma_A$). This value is a random deviate from an exponential distribution with rate $r_A$ or $r_A$ if $A$ is a diploid or polyploid, respectively. S4: species $B$ is assigned a time until speciation ($\sigma_B$) and a time until polyploidization ($\gamma_B$). These values are random deviates from an exponential distribution with rates $r_B$ or $r_B$ and $h_B$ or $h_B$, depending on whether the species is a diploid or higher ploid. S5: event times $\sigma_A$, $\sigma_B$, and $\gamma_B$ are inserted into the queue and the queue is sorted in ascending order, based on the timing of the event.

For polyploidization events, a random deviate from a Bernoulli distribution with probability of success ($a$) is drawn, and the event will be an autopolyploid event if a one is selected and an allopolyploid event otherwise. If it is an allopolyploid event, a second parent species is required. The simulation checks whether another species is waiting to form an allopolyploid. If so, polyploidization occurs, and if not, the parent species is wait-listed for polyploidization (at any time, there is at most a single species waiting). During an allopolyploidization event the following operations occur. P1: the simulation clock is updated to the time of the event ($t_p$; the latter of the two parental polyploidization times). P2: the parent species $A_1$ and $A_2$ with ploidal levels $k_1$ and $k_2$ persist, and new offspring $B$ is created with ploidal level $k_1 + k_2$. P3: species $A_1$ and $A_2$ are assigned new times until polyploidization ($\gamma_{A_1}$ and $\gamma_{A_2}$). These times are random deviates from an exponential distribution with rate $h_B$. P4: The offspring species $B$ is assigned a time until speciation ($\sigma_B$) and a time until polyploidization ($\gamma_B$), as per S4. P5: The event times $\gamma_{A_1}$, $\gamma_{A_2}$, $\gamma_B$, and $\sigma_B$ are added to the queue such that the queue remains sorted from the earliest to the latest event.

For autopolyploidy events, the daughter species will have a ploidal level double that of the parent species. The parent species will be given a new polyploidization waiting time and the daughter species both a polyploidization and speciation waiting time as described above.

Extinction is modeled using an exponential waiting time with rate $\mu = 0.1$. When each new species is formed, a random deviate from an exponential distribution with rate $\mu$ is drawn, and that plus the current simulation clock time becomes the extinction time for that species. Once the simulation clock reaches the extinction time, that species is removed from all queues. If a species is waiting to form an allopolyploid when extinction occurs, the daughter species are not created.

Parameter Estimation

Of the parameters included in the model ($r_A$, $a$, $h_B$, $T_p$, $N_p$, and $\mu$), we used fixed values for $T_p$, $N_p$, and $\mu$. The total genus size ($N_p$) and age of the genus ($T_p$) were taken from the literature; where no $T_p$ was reported, we assumed that species had an age equal to $T_p = 22$ million years; our data are deposited in Dryad Digital Repository, http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.35r23 (Scarpino et al. 2014). Ages were taken from the literature and the Missouri Botanical Garden Index to Plant Chromosome Numbers, spanning the years 1967 to 2000 (Moore 1973; Goldblatt 1981; Missouri Botanical Garden 2005), data deposited in Dryad Digital Repository, http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.35r23 (Scarpino et al. 2014). To estimate the remaining parameters, we employed the aforementioned simulation and the model-fitting procedure approximate Bayesian computation—sequential Monte Carlo (ABC-SMC; Beaumont et al. 2002; Toni et al. 2008); data deposited in Dryad Digital Repository, http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.35r23 (Scarpino et al. 2014). We used ABC-SMC because closed-form expressions for the likelihood equation necessary to calculate the joint-posterior distribution was unattainable; our acceptance levels were a posteriori; see table A1, available online). (2) Simulate a data set $D$ with parameter set $\Theta$. (3) Generate a parameter set $\Theta$ by selecting a random deviate from the joint prior distribution $\Theta = \pi(\theta_A) \circ \pi(\theta_B) \circ \pi(\theta_S)$ (the prior distributions were all uniform over a broad range of values; see table A1, available online). (4) Simulate a data set $D$, with parameter set $\Theta$. (5) Calculate the distance between the observed data, $D_{obs}$, and the simulated data, $D$, using a set of prespecified distance metrics $d(D_{obs}, D)$. In our case, we calculated the Euclidean distance on nine summary statistics that have been transformed using partial least squares regression. For a description of the summary statistics, see the appendix, available online, and for the value of each summary statistic in each genus, see data
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deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository, http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.35r23 (Scarpino et al. 2014). (6) Accept \( \Theta \) if \( \delta(D_{\text{obs}}, D_{\text{r}}) < \epsilon \) (7); repeat steps 3–5 until \( S \) sets of parameters are accepted, each time recording the parameter set and the corresponding distance, \( \delta(D_{\text{obs}}, D_{\text{r}}) \). (8) Once \( S \) sets of parameters are accepted, update the prior distributions to be equivalent to the distribution of accepted parameters, and add noise to the distributions using a uniform kernel (see appendix for a description of prior distributions to be equivalent to the distribution of (8) Once \( S \) sets of parameters are accepted at tolerance \( \epsilon_{\text{post}} \), the algorithm stops and the accepted parameter sets are taken as the joint posterior distribution over the parameters \( \Theta \).

Comparative Analyses

To assess whether there is evidence of a polyploid advantage or disadvantage in terms of relative evolutionary rates across our study genera, we considered parameter estimates under the complex ratchet model with \( \mu = 0 \). The reason for setting the extinction rate to zero is discussed below, but importantly, this was a statistically conservative decision. To evaluate the fit of the simple ratchet model, we used the goodness-of-fit test described below. We controlled for phylogenetic nonindependence using a method proposed by Lajeunesse (2009) for use in meta-analyses. First, we constructed a phylogeny of angiosperm genera using data from Jansen et al. (2007). To fill in taxa not represented in the Jansen et al. (2007) data set, we used family level relationships, while maintaining the original topology. We then calculated the difference between the diploid and polyploid evolutionary rates; for example, the diversification rate difference for each genus would be \( r_d - r_p \), and the pooled variance \( \sigma^2(r_d - r_p) \). Using a random effects model that incorporates a variance/covariance matrix derived from the phylogenetic relationships, we determined the phylogenetically independent effect size and 95% confidence interval (Lajeunesse 2009). Finally, we determined whether each difference in evolutionary rate was significantly different from zero. These calculations were performed using the software package PHYLOMETA (Lajeunesse 2011).

Polyploidy and Species Richness

To investigate the effect of polyploidy on within-genus species richness (the total number of species), we compared two models: one where \( h = 0 \) and another where \( h > 0 \). Under each model, we simulated going forward in time, recording the absolute number of species at time \( T_{\text{r}} \). The net speciation rates of diploid and higher ploids were set to be equal in both models \( (\lambda_p = \lambda_0) \), allowing us to focus on the relative contribution of polyploid formation to within-genus species richness.

Goodness-of-Fit Test

We used a goodness-of-fit test to determine whether, for each of the 60 genera included in this study, the simple ratchet model could generate distributions of ploidal levels statistically similar to the empirical distributions. Because the number of observations in individual ploidal classes is often too low to perform a standard \( \chi^2 \) test, null distributions must be generated via Monte Carlo simulation, originally described in Meyers and Levin (2006). Briefly, the estimated parameters values are used to simulate 10,000 ploidal level distributions for each genus. For every simulated distribution we calculate a \( \chi^2 \) statistic,

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{16} (O_k - E_k)^2}{E_k}
\]

where \( O_k \) is the simulated or observed number of species in ploidal class \( k \) and \( E_k \) is the actual or expected number. By aggregating each of the 10,000 \( \chi^2 \) statistics, we can calculate a \( P \) value, which is the proportion of this distribution that is greater than or equal to the \( \chi^2 \) statistic calculated using the simple ratchet model.

Results

Estimating and Comparing Evolutionary Rates

Using the goodness-of-fit test, we find that the simple ratchet model of polyploid evolution introduced in Meyers and Levin (2006) is sufficient to account for the distribution of ploidal levels in 47 of the 60 genera considered (fig. 1). This model assumes that congeneric diploids and polyploids speciate at equal rates, polyploid formation is irreversible, and all polyploids are allopolyploids. While we find less support for the simple ratchet model than Meyers and Levin (2006), it can account for the diversity observed in a majority of genera considered.

Using the complex ratchet model with no extinction, which allows different diversification rates for diploids and higher ploidal species, we estimated and compared these rates. We found statistical support for a diploid advantage (fig. 2). Using phylogenetic group as a random effect, we calculated a phylogenetically independent difference between diploid and polyploid net speciation rates:

\[
\text{diff} = (r_d + h_d) - (r_p + h_p).
\]

The estimated difference was 0.101 (95% confidence interval, 0.093 – 0.110, \( P < 1 \times 10^{-4} \)), indicating a diploid advantage. Not surprisingly, given the broad phylogenetic distribution of our genera, there was no significant effect of phylogenetic non-independence on the results. These results were further
supported using a Welch’s two-sample t-test (ignoring phylogeny; $t = 4.944$, $P < 3.7 \times 10^{-5}$). This diploid advantage was driven primarily by a difference in the polyploidization rates ($r_d - r_p > 0$, $P = 0.054$; $h_d - h_p > 0$, $P < .003$).

To investigate the effect of extinction, we compared versions of the complex ratchet model with and without extinction, $m = 0.1$ and $m = 0$. Intuitively, extinction caused an increase in the estimates of all speciation rates. However, extinction yielded a larger discrepancy between the estimated net speciation rate of diploids and polyploids, driven primarily by differences in polyploidization rates, as determined using the proportional increase in diversification rate (Welch t-test comparing $r_d^{m=0.1}/r_d^{m=0.0}$ and $r_p^{m=0.1}/r_p^{m=0.0}$, $t = 1.325$, $P = .19$) and polyploidization rate: (Welch t-test comparing $h_d^{m=0.1}/h_d^{m=0.0}$ and $h_p^{m=0.1}/h_p^{m=0.0}$, $t = 5.336$, $P = 1 \times e^{-6}$).

We also considered models where the extinction rate was either a free parameter or a function of the diversification rate, $r$. However, this introduced a substantial amount of uncertainty in all parameter estimates, and we were unable to estimate the relative speciation rates of diploids and polyploids.

The Role of Allopolyploidy and Autopolyploidy

We estimated that allopolyploidy (as opposed to autopolyploidy) was responsible for the majority of polyploidy events in most genera (fig. 3). Importantly, individual species are not identified as being allo- or autopolyploids; instead, we estimate the fraction of autopolyploids in each genus. However, this approach suffered from low statistical power to estimate the fraction autopolyploid. Most of the statistical information on the fraction of polyploid events...
Figure 2: Boxplots with the median, interquartile, and range for the estimated diversification ($r$), polyploidization ($h$), and net speciation rates ($\lambda = r + h - \mu$) from each of the 60 genera. Using phylogenetic group as a random effect, we calculated a phylogenetically independent difference between the mean diploid and polyploid net speciation rates across all 60 genera. The estimated difference was 0.101 (95% credible interval 0.093–0.110, $P < 1 \times 10^{-4}$), indicating a diploid advantage. This diploid advantage was driven primarily by a difference in the polyploidization rates ($r_d - r_p$, $P = .054$; $h_d - h_p$, $P < .003$). These tests include uncertainty in the estimated model parameters, which is not presented in the figure.

due to autopolyploidy derives from the number of 6n–14n species. The model assumes diploid foundry, and therefore under a model with autopolyploidy alone, $a = 1$, no species with 6n–14n genomes can be formed. The vast majority of species considered have ploidal levels less than 6n.

Polyploidy and Species Richness

Polyploidization increases diversity by directly generating new species and creating lineages able to undergo further diversification and thus can fuel increases in species richness even if polyploids diversify at the same rate as (or even slower than) diploids. For example, in *Eriospermum*, the polyploid net speciation rate is estimated to be equal to the diploid net speciation rate, and the simple ratchet model projects that polyploid species will grow to dominate the genus (fig. 4). In this way, polyploidization itself can explain the increased species richness associated with clades containing more polyploids, without invoking an intrinsic evolutionary advantage of polyploids.

Discussion

We have analyzed ploidal distribution data from 7,271 species in 60 flowering plant genera representing 25 families across 17 orders and found evidence that diploids speciate faster than their congeneric polyploids. This diploid advantage stems primarily from a higher rate of polyploidization in diploids than polyploids. Our model also accounts for the empirically observed, positive correlation between average ploidal-level and species richness, without assuming a polyploid speciation advantage.

In their original article, Meyers and Levin (2006) introduced a simple quantitative model of angiosperm evolution in which polyploids held no evolutionary advantage over diploids and polyploidy events were irreversible. This model was able to account for the distribution of ploidal classes across nine angiosperm genera. Although this model is quite general, Meyers and Levin (2006) made a number of simplifying assumptions: (1) congeneric diploids and higher ploids shared a single diversification and polyploidization rate, (2) all polyploids were allopolyploids, (3) no extinction, and (4) deterministic evolution. Here, we have advanced our understanding of angiosperm evolution by relaxing these assumptions and analyzing the broadest phylogenetic distribution of species yet considered in a study of polyploid evolution.

Forty-seven of the 60 flowering plant genera considered have ploidal distributions statistically consistent with the simple Meyers and Levin (2006) ratchet model. These genera included 5,435 species, representing 23 of the 25 families and 16 of the 17 orders contained in the full data set. We therefore conclude that this provides support for the utility of the ratchet model of polyploid evolution. Many of the genera not supporting the simple ratchet model clearly violate one or more of the assumptions made by that model. For example, *Silene* had the highest ratio of diploids to tetraploids and *Geranium* the lowest, and the simple ratchet model was rejected for both. The simple ratchet model was also rejected for *Acacia* and *Rabus*, which both have a high prevalence of autopolyploids, violating a key assumption of the model, that polyploids are allopolyploids (Mandal and Ennos 1995; Thompson 1997). Although variation in diversification rates has undoubtedly contributed to the expansion of some angiosperm genera, the abundance of polyploids observed in many lineages can be explained without assuming that polyploids are superior to diploids. This finding highlights again the importance of irreversibility in shaping evolutionary trajectories (Bull and Charnov 1985; Gray et al. 2010).

At first glance, our assumption about polyploidy irreversibility may seem at odds with the recent suggestion that all extant angiosperms have descended from a polyploid ancestor (Levin 2002; Soltis et al. 2009; Amborella...
Figure 3: The estimated proportion of polyploid lineages formed due to autopolyploidy (rather than allopolyploidy) for each genus ($a$). Error bars represent the 95% credible intervals of the posterior distribution. Only *Acacia* and *Rubus* are estimated to have a proportion of autopolyploids greater than 0.5 (gray vertical bar), indicating that more than half of the polyploidy events in those genera were due to autopolyploidy.

Genome Project 2013). However, this assumption need hold only over the evolutionary timescales considered in each simulation. For example, Jiao et al. (2011) estimated that two ancestral whole genome duplications shared by all angiosperms occurred between 100–300 and 200–450 million years ago, whereas the genera in our study have a mean age of 16 million years. Thus, our study assumes irreversibility over only a relatively short and recent period of angiosperm evolution. This assumption is further supported by Mayrose et al. (2011), who found statistical support for the irreversibility of polyploidy.

Successful polyploidization is infrequent, in part because fertilization events in which unreduced gametes unite to form viable and fertile polyploids are rare (Soltis and Soltis 1999). However, unreduced gamete formation is more prevalent in interspecific crosses, a finding in support of our result that allopolyploids may be more common than autopolyploids (Ramsey and Schemske 1998; Brownfield and Kohler 2011; De Storme and Geelen 2013; Tayale and Pariso 2013). These nascent polyploids then must overcome a substantial minority disadvantage (Levin 1975). Consequently, newly formed polyploids frequently
Figure 4: The correlated ascent of polyploids and species richness in the genus Eriospermum. Using the estimated values for the diversification and polyploidization rates for Eriospermum, we projected the number of species over time (in millions of years), both with (dark) and without (gray) polyploids. The greater than twofold difference in the number of species at 22 Ma suggests that the simple ratchet model can generate the observed correlation between species richness and average ploidal level (without assuming any polyploid superiority).

Importantly, our model considers only random extinction. Since we assume all genera are founded by diploids, random extinction ultimately reduces diploid diversity proportionally more than polyploid diversity. For this reason, we presented results from a version of the complex ratchet model without extinction. However, as stated earlier, the diploid speciation advantage increased in the presence of random extinction. Incorporating nonrandom extinction; for example, an upper bound on viable genome size may impact the evolutionary rate estimates, which we cannot predict a priori. Such extensions of our model to include more complex evolutionary processes should prove insightful.

We lacked statistical power to precisely estimate the proportion of polyploid lineages founded by autopolyploidy versus allopolyploidy. Our method gauges the balance between the two forms of polyploidy primarily from observed numbers of 6n, 10n, 12n, and 14n species, which cannot be created via autopolyploidy alone in our model. Because the model assumes diploid foundry, if all polyploids are autopolyploids, then only 2n, 4n, 8n, and 16n species can be formed. However, there were too few higher ploidal species in most of our focal genera to estimate the relative importance of autopolyploidy, and it thus remains an important topic for future investigation.

Our results are consistent with an emerging consensus that polyploids do not have a speciation advantage over related diploids. Wood et al. (2009) failed to detect increased diversification rates in lineages with higher ploidal levels using a method of nonnested sister group contrasts, and Mayrose et al. (2011) found evidence for a decrease in the speciation rate of recently formed polyploids. Interestingly, five of our genera were included in the Mayrose et al. (2011) analysis, and despite different data and methods, our qualitative conclusions agree (see appendix and fig. A1, available online). Importantly, the Mayrose et al. (2011) method considered phylogenetic relationships within genera, while ours does not.

Speculation about the advantage of polyploids has been motivated, in part, by the positive relationship between
species diversity and the incidence of polyploidy. We demonstrate that this relationship arises naturally from polyploidy irreversibility, and can occur even if polyploids have an evolutionary disadvantage. Concordantly, Vamosi and Dickinson (2006) reported a correlation between polyploid incidence and species richness in Rosaceae, yet found no evidence that polyploids diversified faster than their diploid counterparts. They concluded that ploidal evolution alone could account for the pattern. Additionally, when Mayrose et al. (2009) recreated chromosome number evolution in Helianthus, they hypothesized that major polyploid events are followed by depressed speciation rates. These studies have led some to conclude that polyploids should, in fact, be considered evolutionary dead-ends (Arrigo and Barker 2012).

Our results suggest that a simple ratchet model for polyploid evolution can explain the within-genus distribution of ploidal levels across many angiosperm groups, with the caveat that our data set contained 44 core eudicots, 3 noncore eudicots, and 13 monocots. We argue that this model should serve as a null model for future studies on polyploidy and diversity. We have taken this approach in evaluating more complex evolutionary drivers and find statistical evidence for a diploid advantage driven by the relatively frequent emergence of new tetraploid species. We conclude that the rise of polyploids and the concomitant rise of biodiversity do not require the evolutionary superiority of polyploids. Nonetheless, polyploidy as a process should be considered a central driver of evolutionary diversification (Freeling 2009; Soltis et al. 2009; Freeling et al. 2012; Huminiecki and Conant 2012; Garsmeur et al. 2013; Mayfield-Jones et al. 2013).
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“At first I thought that the plant could be nothing more than a curious form of Leucanthemum vulgare Lam., that it was nothing more than the result of a mere freak of nature; and when, on the 10th inst., I went in search of more specimens, I half expected to find the new form and the common one growing on one and the same stem. But although I found specimens by scores, not a stem among them all had the two forms upon it.” From “A Supposed New Columbine, and a New Ox-eye Daisy” by Sanborn Tenney (The American Naturalist, 1867, 1:388–389).