


Evolution of cichlid feeding architecture



Diversity of eukaryotic selenoproteins

Protein construction from backbone torsion angles

Glucocorticoids and erythropoietin for spinal injury

MicroRNA regulates neuron morphogenesis

Integration and evolution of the cichlid mandible: The molecular basis of alternate feeding strategies

R. Craig Albertson^{*†}, J. Todd Streebman[‡], Thomas D. Kocher[§], and Pamela C. Yelick^{*}

^{*}Department of Cytokine Biology, The Forsyth Institute, and Department of Oral and Developmental Biology, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Boston, MA 02115; [‡]School of Biology, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0230; and [§]Hubbard Center for Genome Studies, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824

Edited by David B. Wake, University of California, Berkeley, CA, and approved September 21, 2005 (received for review August 3, 2005)

African cichlid fishes have repeatedly evolved highly specialized modes of feeding through adaptations of their oral jaws. Here, we explore the molecular genetic basis of the opening and closing lever mechanisms of the cichlid lower jaw, which have traditionally been used to describe the mechanics of feeding behavior in bony fishes. Quantitative genetic analyses demonstrate that the opening and closing mechanisms are genetically modular and therefore free to evolve independently. *Bmp4* (bone morphogenetic protein 4) is one of two loci that segregate with the mechanical advantage of closing and that together account for >30% of the phenotypic variance in this trait. Species-specific differences in jaw shape are obvious early in cichlid larval development and are correlated with patterns of *bmp4* expression in the mandibular primordium. When *bmp4* is overexpressed in the obligate suction feeder *Danio rerio*, mandibular morphology exhibits specific transformations of opening and closing lever ratios. We conclude that patterns of morphological integration of the cichlid jaw reflect a balance among conflicting functional demands. Further, we demonstrate that *bmp4* has the potential to alter mandibular morphology in a way that mimics adaptive variation among fish species.

adaptive radiation | *bmp4* | jaw shape | morphological integration

A fundamental divergence among bony fishes occurs between species that exploit hard and/or attached prey items and species that feed on highly mobile prey. This divergence is concomitant with the evolution of stereotypical mandibular morphologies that reflect the mechanical properties of the feeding apparatus. Species that prey on hard food evolve short, stout jaws efficient for biting, whereas those that feed on mobile prey often evolve elongate, gracile jaws for suction feeding. This functional dichotomy is exemplified by many percoid groups, where it is strongly correlated with habitat and morphology. For example, shifts along this functional axis are associated with the evolution of North American sunfishes (1, 2). Several coral reef fish lineages exhibit extensive ecological diversity, often associated with elaborate accentuations of biting and suction feeding (3–5). Cichlids have diverged rapidly along this functional axis with the repeated evolution of alternate biting/sucking morphologies that are characteristic of both deep cladogenic events and contemporary fine-scale ecological niche partitioning (6–12). Understanding the molecular basis of changes that differentiate biters from suction feeders will lend significant insight into the adaptive evolution of fish species.

The mechanical implications of jaw shape have been well studied in fishes (4, 5, 11, 13–16). The teleost mandible can be described as two opposing lever mechanisms: one that defines the mechanical advantage of closing and another that defines the mechanical advantage of opening. The closing in-lever is measured as the distance between the jaw joint and the attachment of the adductor mandibulae muscle on the coronoid process (Fig. 1*a*, purple line). The opening in-lever is the distance between the jaw joint and the attachment of the interopercular mandibular ligament on the retroarticular process (Fig. 1*a*, green line). The out-lever is traditionally taken as the distance between the jaw

joint and the tip of the anteriormost tooth (this measure has been modified in our study; see *Materials and Methods* for justification and Fig. 1*a*, blue line). The in-lever-to-out-lever ratio is the fraction of force that is transferred from the muscular attachment to the distal-most point of the jaw and is referred to as the mechanical advantage (4, 16). Greater mechanical advantage equals greater force transmission, which is optimal for biting, whereas smaller mechanical advantage translates to greater velocity transfer, which is typical of suction feeders. There is a direct tradeoff between force and velocity, such that species with greater force transmission will have lower velocity transfer and vice versa (16, 17).

The theory of morphological integration postulates that traits that function together will also be inherited together, whereas unrelated traits will be inherited independently (18, 19). Implicit to this theory is the concept of modularity. A module is a complex of traits integrated by pleiotropy and independent of other complexes (20). Thus, morphological integration predicts that functional units will also be genetically modular. Developmental architecture figures prominently in discussions of morphological integration because genetic and functional modularity are mediated by developmental processes (21–25).

Previous studies have demonstrated that aspects of the cichlid feeding apparatus are genetically correlated and have evolved in response to strong directional selection (26, 27). Here, we test the specific hypothesis that the cichlid lower jaw is a morphologically integrated structure by tracking the segregation of functional morphology in an F₂ mapping population derived from two cichlid species that employ different modes of feeding. We also explore the potential role of *bmp4* (bone morphogenetic protein 4), a candidate gene for the evolution of craniofacial diversity, in regulating lever ratios in the teleost jaw. We show that patterns of integration and modularity are consistent with the theory of morphological integration but that they also underscore the notion that modularity is a matter of degrees (24); we also show that the underlying genetic architecture of the cichlid jaw reflects the functional and developmental complexity of the anatomy it encodes. In addition, we demonstrate that *bmp4* is associated with and has the potential to alter adaptive shape differences of the teleost mandible.

Materials and Methods

Species Rearing and Morphology. We compared two Lake Malawi rock-dwelling cichlid species with distinct feeding behaviors and jaw morphologies (28). *Labeotropheus fuelleborni* (LF) is a specialized biting species, characterized by a short, stout lower jaw with high mechanical advantage. LF feeds by cropping

Conflict of interest statement: No conflicts declared.

This paper was submitted directly (Track II) to the PNAS office.

Abbreviations: Bmp4, bone morphogenetic protein 4; QTL, quantitative trait loci; dpf, days postfertilization; LF, *Labeotropheus fuelleborni*; MZ, *Metriaclicma zebra*.

[†]To whom correspondence should be addressed at: Department of Cytokine Biology, The Forsyth Institute, 140 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115. E-mail: calbertson@forsyth.org.

© 2005 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA




Fig. 1. Genetic basis of jaw opening and closing in cichlids. (a) Lever systems of the lower jaw. The out-lever is shown in blue, the closing in-lever is shown in purple, and the opening in-lever is shown in green. (b) Cichlids linkage groups that show significant associations with functional morphology of the jaw. Bars indicate regions exceeding the 95% genome-wide significance threshold for the corresponding QTL. Colors represent QTL affecting different traits. (c–e) Genetic correlation of traits in the F_2 population. (c) The out-lever is negatively correlated with the closing in-lever. (d) The out-lever is also negatively correlated with the opening in-lever, although the correlation coefficient is significantly less than that for the closing in-lever ($q = 4.21$; $P < 0.01$; ref. 40). (e) Closing and opening in-levers are not correlated in the F_2 population.

attached algae from the substrate. *Metriaclicma zebra* (MZ) is a more generalized feeder, characterized by a more gracile elongate lower jaw with relatively low mechanical advantage. MZ is one of a few rock-dwelling species that actively feeds on plankton in the water column with a suction mode of feeding. The breeding and rearing of cichlids for quantitative trait loci (QTL) analyses has been described in refs. 26–28.

Oral jaw dentition in African cichlids is characterized by multiple rows of often flexible teeth that vary in length and shape. Furthermore, a significant proportion of our F_2 mapping population exhibited aberrant patterning and/or loss of dentition in their oral jaws. For these reasons, we felt that measuring the out-lever to the tip of the mandible (instead of the tip of the tooth) would produce the most reliable estimates of force transmission.

LF and MZ embryos were obtained for developmental studies by natural matings in 40-gallon tanks. Because Lake Malawi rock-dwelling cichlid females incubate their clutch in their mouths, brooding females were easily identified by an enlarged buccal cavity. Embryos were stripped from females' mouths and incubated externally in 1-liter Erlenmeyer flasks containing 600 ml of tank water and 200 ml of egg water (29). An aeration stone was placed at the bottom of the flask to provide enough air to keep the embryos vigorously swirling at the bottom of the flask. Embryo medium was changed every 2–3 days. Embryos were incubated at 25–26°C and staged according to refs. 30 and 31.

Zebrafish were maintained and bred at 28.5°C in a 14-h light/10-h dark cycle at The Forsyth Institute Zebrafish Facility.

Embryos were collected by natural mating of pairwise crosses and maintained at 28.5°C as described in ref. 29.

Linkage Analysis. A Lake Malawi cichlid linkage map was constructed by using JOINMAP 3.0 (32). The locus file consisted of genotypes for 173 F_2 hybrid progeny at 170 marker loci. The grouping module of JOINMAP assigned 152 of 170 loci to 25 linkage groups using a logarithm of odds (LOD) score threshold of 4.0. The mapping module of JOINMAP built the genetic map for each linkage group by using the Kosambi mapping function, a LOD threshold of 1.0, a recombination threshold of 0.450, and a jump threshold of 5.0. A ripple function was performed after each locus was added to ensure optimal marker order. Compared with an earlier report (26), cichlid linkage groups have been renamed according to a more complete cichlid linkage map for the Nile Tilapia (33) and a comparative map of East African cichlids (J.T.S., unpublished data).

QTL Analysis. Multiple QTL mapping (MQM) analysis was performed in MAPQTL 4.0 (34) as described in ref. 26.

Cartilage and Bone Staining. Cartilages and bone of larval fish were stained with alcian blue and alizarin red as described in ref. 35, with slight modification. Larvae were fixed overnight in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in phosphate-buffered solution containing 0.1% Tween 20 (Sigma-Aldrich) (PBT). Larval cartilages were stained with 20 mg of alcian blue (8XG, Sigma-Aldrich) in 65 ml of glacial acetic acid and 35 ml of absolute ethanol. After staining, specimens were enzymatically cleared by using a trypsin

Differences in the degree of integration are consistent with regional differences in the functional and developmental complexity of the jaw. For example, jaw closing is a relatively simple process that involves the coordinated action of elements pertaining mainly to the oral jaws (11, 14, 42). The jaw closing mechanism also emerged early among ray-finned fishes (actinopterygians) and has remained relatively unchanged (reviewed in ref. 43, pp. 540–549). Alternatively, jaw opening is a more complex process that has been extensively modified over actinopterygian evolution (43). In advanced teleosts, this function is achieved by means of the synchronized action of several biomechanical systems defined by the jaws, hyoid, operculum, skull, and pectoral girdle (4, 16, 44). Thus, higher levels of integration were observed among traits intimately associated by function, whereas traits that are part of a more complex functional network were integrated to a lesser extent. Differences in integration might also reflect differences in developmental complexity. Most of the mandible originates from cranial neural crest cells that migrate from the embryonic midbrain (45). In contrast, the retroarticular process develops from a heterogeneous population of crest cells derived from up to three hind-brain segments (45). Thus, lower levels of integration were observed among traits with different developmental origins. These observations are also consistent with the theory of morphological integration (16, 19).

The mechanical advantage of closing segregates with allelic variation at *bmp4* on LG19. In recent years, *Bmp4* has emerged as an attractive candidate for the evolution of craniofacial diversity in vertebrates. The suspected importance of this molecule stems from several observations. From a developmental perspective, *bmp4* exhibits distinct mandibular expression patterns during craniofacial development (46). Levels of *bmp4* expression in the frontonasal prominence have also been correlated with adaptive variation in beak shape among diverse avian species (47, 48), and misexpression of *Bmp4* in the beak primordium of the developing chick has been shown to modulate shape in a way that approximates natural variation among birds (47, 48). From a genetic perspective, East African cichlids exhibit a rate of *Bmp4* amino acid evolution that is significantly greater than that of other craniofacial genes (49). Furthermore, the accumulation of amino acid substitutions in cichlid *Bmp4* was restricted to the prodomain, with little variation found in the signal peptide or mature domain, suggesting that regulation of *Bmp4* might underlie some aspect of cichlid evolution. Our genetic data offer evidence that a causative mutation affecting functional morphology is linked to *bmp4* in cichlids. To further investigate the potential role of *bmp4* in regulating adaptive variation of the teleost mandible, we examined its expression and function during jaw morphogenesis.

Cichlids that employ alternate feeding strategies exhibited differences in mandibular morphology by 7 dpf. The pharyngeal skeleton is not mineralized at this stage, but differences in lever ratios were obvious in the cartilaginous precursor of the mandible, Meckel's cartilage (Fig. 3c). LF larvae exhibited a relatively high mechanical advantage of closing, whereas MZ larvae showed a much lower closing mechanical advantage. The mechanical advantage of opening was also significantly different at this stage, although the difference was far less pronounced. Thus, at least some part of the patterning mechanism that establishes alternate feeding morphologies appears to be acting early in cichlid development.

Differences in larval lever ratios were correlated with patterns of *bmp4* expression in the mandibular pharyngeal arch. LF and MZ embryos showed little difference in the expression of *dlx2*, *bmp2*, *msxD/E*, and *fgf8* during segmentation and pharyngula stages of development, and differences at later stages were mainly associated with variation in the timing of development of bone and teeth (unpublished data). In contrast, dramatic dif-




Fig. 3. Ontogeny of biomechanical lever systems in cichlids. (a) Adult LF and MZ (>1 year) show significant differences in the mechanical advantage of closing and opening ($n = 29$). (b and c) This difference is evident in juveniles at 21 dpf ($n = 6$) (b) and in larvae as early as 7 dpf ($n = 10$) (c).

ferences in *bmp4* expression were observed in the first arch of LF and MZ embryos at the high-pec stage (late pharyngula period) of embryonic development (Fig. 4). At this stage, *bmp4* is expressed in a variety of tissues, including ear, nose, brain, heart, and fins. *Bmp4* transcripts were also detected in the mesenchyme of the mandibular arch in both LF and MZ embryos. Although expression of *bmp4* mRNAs in MZ embryos was restricted to the distal-most portion of the first arch (Fig. 4a, red arrowhead), *bmp4* was ubiquitously expressed throughout the mandibular mesenchyme in LF embryos (Fig. 4b, red arrowhead). To assess the potential of *bmp4* in regulating functional shape differences among fish species, we manipulated levels of *bmp4* mRNA during embryonic development in the experimentally tractable zebrafish, *Danio rerio*.

Zebrafish are obligate suction feeders with mandibular morphology that is characterized by relatively low mechanical advantage at all stages of development. Very little *bmp4* was detected in the mandibular arch of the zebrafish pharyngula, and by 6 dpf, Meckel's cartilage is little more than rod with no coronoid process (closing in-lever) (Fig. 5). Observations in both cichlids and zebrafish suggest that levels of *bmp4* expression in the mandibular arch are associated with growth of the coronoid process. We tested this hypothesis by overexpressing *bmp4* in the zebrafish embryo. We found that *bmp4* mRNA-injected embryos exhibited specific differences in jaw shape compared with those injected with *gfp* mRNA (Fig. 6). Specifically, *bmp4* overexpression elicited growth of a coronoid-like process. This phenotype is consistent with observations in other vertebrates, where the application of BMP in the mandibular arch induced ectopic cartilage formation (50, 51). Interestingly, zebrafish injected with *bmp4* also exhibited attenuated growth along the rostral axis of Meckel's cartilage, as well as increased growth of the retroarticular (Fig. 6). In other words, zebrafish treated with *bmp4* displayed a greater mechanical advantage of opening and closing.




Fig. 4. LF and MZ embryos exhibit different levels of *bmp4* expression in the mandibular arch. (a) At the high-pec stage, MZ pharyngula express *bmp4* at the distal tip of the first arch (red arrowhead). In *Left*, the black arrows indicate the first and second pharyngeal arches. In *Right*, the black arrow indicates the mandibular arch. (b) Similarly staged LF embryos express *bmp4* throughout the mandibular mesenchyme (red arrowhead). In *Left*, the black arrow indicates the second arch. In *Right*, the black arrow indicates the mandibular arch. Differences in *bmp4* expression were not size-dependent. At no stage did MZ embryos show a level of mandibular *bmp4* expression comparable to what was observed in LF. (Scale bars, 20 μ m.)

These results are consistent with recent findings that suggest that Bmp4 signaling may have contributed to the evolution of beak shape in Darwin's finches (47). In both fish and finches, increased levels of *bmp4* were associated with biting/crushing morphologies, demonstrating a remarkable consistency of effects. Expanded *bmp4* expression was also associated with increased proliferation in the frontonasal mass in ducks (48). Given the extensive diversity in jaw shape exhibited by birds and fishes, the idea that *bmp4* might underlie adaptive morphological transformations in these two groups implicates this molecule as a key player in vertebrate diversity. It remains to be seen, however, whether *bmp4* is associated with only certain types of




Fig. 5. *Bmp4* expression and jaw morphogenesis in the zebrafish, *D. rerio*. (a) Expression of zebrafish *bmp4* at 36 h postfertilization. Throughout much of the pharyngula period of embryonic development, *bmp4* was expressed in the developing heart (h), ear (ototic vesicle, ov), and pectoral fin (pf). However, very little *bmp4* was detected in the mandibular arch (black arrowhead). (b) In 6-dpf wild-type embryos, Meckel's cartilage (Mk) possessed a distinct retroarticular process (rp) but lacked a discernible coronoid process (cp).




Fig. 6. Distinct morphological transformation of Meckel's cartilage (Mk) by *bmp4* overexpression. Landmark-based morphometric analysis revealed concomitant growth of the coronoid and retroarticular processes in 6-dpf zebrafish larvae when embryos were injected with 100 or 150 ng/ μ l translation-competent *bmp4* mRNA at the one- to two-cell stage, compared with *gfp*-injected negative control embryos.

transformations (e.g., gracile to robust jaws) or a wider array of craniofacial diversity.

Our work demonstrates the potential of integrating studies in natural populations and model organisms to address questions relating to evolution and development. Quantitative genetic analyses in cichlids show that the lower jaw is a morphologically integrated structure. They also implicate *bmp4* as a candidate for differences in the mechanical advantage of closing. Functional analyses in zebrafish substantiate a role for *bmp4* in regulating the closing lever system, but they also show that *bmp4* has the potential to stimulate growth of both the coronoid and retroarticular processes, traits that were decoupled in cichlids.

This study takes important steps toward understanding the molecular changes that have accompanied morphological evolution in cichlids, but several important questions remain to be addressed. For one, what other genes might be involved in the evolution of cichlid trophic diversity? Several vertebrate mutants exhibit mandibular phenotypes that resemble variation in cichlid feeding morphology. Mice deficient of *otx2* exhibit a shortened mandible (52), whereas mice lacking *pax9* are missing the coronoid process (53), and both chickens and zebrafish lacking *bapx1* are missing the retroarticular process (54, 55). In addition, it remains unclear whether differences in *bmp4* expression in the cichlid mandible are due to divergence in protein structure or regulatory elements. High rates of amino acid substitution in the prodomain of East African cichlid Bmp4 implicate posttranslational processing as a possible mechanism of diversity (49); however, accumulating empirical and theoretical evidence in a variety of organisms posits a significant role for the evolution of cis-regulatory systems in generating morphological diversity (reviewed in ref. 56). It is also interesting to speculate about the evolutionary importance of variances that cannot be explained by genetic effects. Several researchers have recently argued that phenotypic plasticity is an important factor underlying cichlid trophic evolution (57, 58). We present evidence for genetic control of cichlid jaw shape acting early in development; however, our data do not discount the possibility that phenotypic plasticity could reshape the mandible at later stages of development. Understanding how the interaction between genetic and environmental effects might influence the evolution of cichlid feeding morphology will be an important topic to explore. Finally, it is important to note that our interpretation of differences in cichlid feeding performance was based on variation in bone shape. Studies that take into consideration additional mechanical param-

eters, including muscle mass, origin, and insertion (as described in ref. 42), could help us gain a more comprehensive understanding of the genetic basis of alternate feeding strategies. Identifying the causative mutations and characterizing the molecular pathways that contribute to adaptive morphological transformations remains an ambitious task that may be facilitated by continued work in evolutionary and developmental fish models.

1. Wainwright, P. C. (1996) *Ecology* **77**, 1336–1343.
2. Wainwright, P. C. & Shaw, S. S. (1999) *J. Exp. Biol.* **202**, 3101–3110.
3. Motta, P. J. (1988) *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **22**, 39–67.
4. Wainwright, P. C., Bellwood, D. R., Westneat, M. W., Grubich, J. R. & Hoey, A. S. (2004) *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **82**, 1–25.
5. Westneat, M. W. (1995) *Syst. Biol.* **44**, 361–383.
6. Albertson, R. C. (2002) Ph.D. dissertation (University of New Hampshire, Durham).
7. Bouton, N., Seehausen, O. & van Alphen, J. J. M. (1997) *Ecol. Freshwater Fish* **6**, 225–240.
8. Bouton, N., Witte, F., van Alphen, J. J. M., Schenk, A. & Seehausen, O. (1999) *Proc. R. Soc. London B* **266**, 355–360.
9. Liem, K. F. (1974) *Syst. Zool.* **22**, 425–441.
10. Liem, K. F. (1980) *Am. Zool.* **20**, 25–31.
11. Otten, E. (1983) *Neth. J. Zool.* **33**, 55–98.
12. Reinthal, P. N. (1990) *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **27**, 215–233.
13. Alfaro, M. E., Bolnick, D. I. & Wainwright, P. C. (2004) *Evolution* **58**, 495–503.
14. Barel, C. D. N. (1983) *Neth. J. Zool.* **33**, 357–424.
15. Westneat, M. W. (1990) *J. Morphol.* **205**, 269–295.
16. Westneat, M. W. (1994) *Zoomorphology* **114**, 103–118.
17. Wainwright, P. C. & Richards, B. A. (1995) *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **44**, 97–113.
18. Olson, E. & Miller, R. (1958) *Morphological Integration* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago).
19. Cheverud, J. M., Routman, E. J. & Irschick, D. K. (1997) *Evolution* **51**, 2004–2014.
20. Wagner, G. P. (1996) *Am. Zool.* **36**, 36–43.
21. Atchley, W. R. & Hall, B. K. (1991) *Biol. Rev.* **66**, 101–157.
22. Cheverud, J. M. (1996) *Am. Zool.* **36**, 44–50.
23. Hallgrímsson, B., Willmore, K., Dorval, C. & Cooper, D. M. (2004) *J. Exp. Zool. B Mol. Dev. Evol.* **302**, 207–225.
24. Klingenberg, C. P. (2004) in *Phenotypic Integration: Studying the Ecology and Evolution of Complex Phenotypes* (Oxford Univ. Press, New York), pp. 213–230.
25. Klingenberg, C. P., Mebus, K. & Auffray, J.-C. (2003) *Evol. Dev.* **5**, 522–531.
26. Albertson, R. C., Streelman, J. T. & Kocher, T. D. (2003) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 5252–5257.
27. Albertson, R. C., Streelman, J. T. & Kocher, T. D. (2003) *J. Heredity* **94**, 291–301.
28. Albertson, R. C. & Kocher, T. D. (2001) *J. Exp. Zool.* **289**, 385–403.
29. Westerfield, M. (1995) *The Zebrafish Book: A Guide for the Laboratory Use of Zebrafish (Danio rerio)* (Univ. of Oregon Press, Eugene), 3rd Ed.
30. Balon, E. K. (1977) *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **2**, 147–176.
31. Kimmel, C. B., Ballard, W. W., Kimmel, S. R., Ullmann, B. & Schilling, T. F. (1995) *Dev. Dyn.* **203**, 253–310.
32. Van Ooijen, J. W. & Voorrips, R. E. (2001) JOINMAP 3.0, Software for the Calculation of Genetic Linkage Maps (Plant Research International, Wageningen, The Netherlands).
33. Lee, B. Y., Lee, W. J., Streelman, J. T., Carleton, K. L., Howe, A. E., Hulata, G., Slettan, A., Stern, J. E., Terai, Y. & Kocher, T. D. (2005) *Genetics* **170**, 237–244.
34. Van Ooijen, J. W., Boer, M. P., Jansen, R. C. & Maliepaard, C. (2002) JOINMAP 3.0, Software for the Calculation of QTL Positions on Genetic Maps (Plant Research International, Wageningen, The Netherlands).
35. Potthoff, T. (1984) in *Ontogeny and Systematics of Fishes* (Am. Soc. Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Lawrence, KS), pp. 35–37.
36. Sagerstrom, C. G., Grinbalt, Y. & Sive, H. (1996) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **122**, 1873–1883.
37. Thisse, C., Thisse, B., Schilling, T. F. & Postlethwait, J. H. (1993) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **119**, 1203–1215.
38. Nikaido, M., Tada, M., Saji, T. & Ueno, N. (1997) *Mech. Dev.* **61**, 75–88.
39. Schilling, T. F., Concordet, J. P. & Ingham, P. W. (1999) *Dev. Biol.* **210**, 277–287.
40. Zar, J. H. (1996) *Biostatistical Analysis* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ), 3rd Ed.
41. Westneat, M. W., Alfaro, M. E., Wainwright, P. C., Bellwood, D. R., Grubich, J. R., Fessler, J. L., Clements, K. D. & Smith, L. L. (2005) *Proc. Biol. Sci. B* **272**, 993–1000.
42. Westneat, M. W. (2003) *J. Theor. Biol.* **223**, 269–281.
43. Liem, K. F., Bemis, W., Walker, W. F., Grande, L. & Walker, W. (2000) *Functional Anatomy of the Vertebrates: An Evolutionary Perspective* (Brooks Cole, Philadelphia), 3rd Ed.
44. Liem, K. F. (1978) *J. Morphol.* **158**, 323–360.
45. Köntges, G. & Lumsden, A. (1996) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **122**, 3229–3242.
46. Semba, I., Nonaka, K., Takahashi, I., Takahashi, K., Dashner, R., Shum, L., Nuckolls, G. H. & Slavkin, H. C. (2001) *Dev. Dyn.* **217**, 401–414.
47. Abzhanov, A., Protas, M., Grant, B. R., Grant, P. R. & Tabin, C. J. (2004) *Science* **305**, 1462–1465.
48. Wu, P., Jiang, T. X., Suksaweang, S., Widelitz, R. B. & Chuong, C. M. (2004) *Science* **305**, 1465–1466.
49. Terai, Y., Morikawa, N. & Okada, N. (2002) *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **19**, 1628–1632.
50. Barlow, A. J. & Francis-West, P. H. (1997) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **124**, 391–398.
51. Nonaka, K., Shum, L., Takahashi, I., Takahashi, K., Ikura, T., Dashner, R., Nuckolls, G. H. & Slavkin, H. C. (1999) *Int. J. Dev. Biol.* **43**, 795–807.
52. Hide, T., Hatakeyama, J., Kimura-Yoshida, C., Tian, E., Takeda, N., Ushio, Y., Shiroishi, T., Aizawa, S. & Matsuo, I. (2002) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **129**, 4347–4357.
53. Peters, H., Neubüser, A., Kratochwil, K. & Balling, R. (1998) *Genes Dev.* **12**, 2735–2747.
54. Wilson, J. & Tucker, A. S. (2004) *Dev. Biol.* **266**, 138–150.
55. Miller, C. T., Yelon, D., Stainier, D. Y. R. & Kimmel, C. B. (2003) *Development (Cambridge, U.K.)* **130**, 1353–1365.
56. Carroll, S. B., Grenier, J. K. & Weatherbee, S. D. (2005) *From DNA to Diversity: Molecular Genetics and the Evolution of Animal Design* (Blackwell, Oxford), 2nd Ed.
57. Bouton, N., Witte, F. & van Alphen, J. J. M. (2002) *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **77**, 185–192.
58. Stauffer, J. R., Jr., & Gray, E. V. S. (2004) *Anim. Biol.* **54**, 137–158.