A PHYLOGENETIC STUDY OF EVOLUTIONARY TRANSITIONS IN SEXUAL SYSTEMS IN AUSTRALASIAN WURMBEA (COLCHICACEAE)

Andrea L. Case,1,2,* Sean W. Graham,1,† Terry D. Macfarlane,‡ and Spencer C. H. Barrett§

*Department of Biological Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242, U.S.A.; †University of British Columbia Botanical Garden and Centre for Plant Research, Faculty of Land and Food Systems, and Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z4, Canada; ‡Manjimup Research Centre, Department of Environment and Conservation, Brain Street, Manjimup, Western Australia 6258, Australia; and §Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, 25 Willcocks Street, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3B2, Canada

Using phylogenies to make sound inferences about character evolution depends on a variety of factors, including tree uncertainty, taxon sampling, and the degree of evolutionary lability in the character of interest. We explore the effects of these and other sources of ambiguity for maximum likelihood (ML)-based inferences of sexual-system evolution in Wurmbea, a small genus of geophytic monocots from the Southern Hemisphere. We reconstructed Wurmbea phylogeny using four noncontiguous regions (ca. 5.5 kb) of the plastid genome across a broad sampling of taxa, and we confirm that the genus is divided into two well-supported clades, each defined by its geography (Africa vs. Australasia) and variation in sexual system (i.e., uniformly monomorphic vs. sexually variable, respectively). We demonstrate that the predominantly Australian clade includes the sexually monomorphic species Iphigenia novae-zelandiae. We observe treewide uncertainty in the state of all ancestral nodes, and therefore all state transitions, when all taxa in Wurmbea are considered. We demonstrate that this is primarily a consequence of interspersion of terminals with gender dimorphism vs. monomorphism throughout the Australasian clade, rather than tree uncertainty or the presence of very short internal branches. We accounted for tree uncertainty by randomly sampling alternative resolutions of branches that are poorly supported by ML bootstrap analysis, effectively interpreting these as soft polytomies. Under the assumption that well-supported aspects of our gene tree accurately depict organismal phylogeny, there is a marked evolutionary lability in the sexual systems of Australasian Wurmbea. A more problematic issue is that our results contradict the monophyly of two sexually polymorphic Australian species, Wurmbea dioica and Wurmbea biglandulosa. If this reflects paraphyly at the species level, lateral gene transfer, or failed coalescence, then the interpretations of character transitions will need to be adjusted. Our analysis provides an example of the impediments to linking macroevolutionary pattern with microevolutionary processes for evolutionarily labile traits in recently evolved plant groups that possess a high degree of variation in sexual characters.
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Introduction

Evolutionary transitions between hermaphroditism (gender monomorphism) and separate sexes (gender dimorphism) have occurred frequently in the history of flowering plants (e.g., Weiblen et al. 2000; Vamosi et al. 2003). Understanding the evolutionary history of sexual systems and the mechanisms responsible for such transitions is thus an important issue in plant evolutionary biology (reviewed in Geber et al. 1999). The conditions for the evolution and maintenance of gender dimorphism have been the subject of much theoretical and empirical research, aimed primarily at explaining the sporadic but taxonomically widespread occurrence of this condition in the angiosperms (reviewed in Thomson and Brunet 1990; Miller 2002; Vamosi et al. 2003; Graham and Barrett 2004; Givnish et al. 2005; Gleiser and Verdú 2005; Levin and Miller 2005). These studies are primarily aimed at estimating evolutionary transitions in plant reproductive characters (e.g., Weller and Sakai 1999; Sakai and Weller 1999; Heilbuth 2000). Phylogenies can provide us with windows into the past history of organisms, enabling investigation of the long-term significance of evolutionary transitions and ecological processes that otherwise can be observed only on local or instantaneous time frames. For example, because phylogenies span multiple speciation events, they can be used to identify convergent traits that arose under similar selective regimes in distantly related taxa, to develop chronological sequences of character transitions by reconstructing states at ancestral nodes (e.g., Kohn et al. 1996), and to measure cross-taxon correlations among characters of interest (e.g., Friedman and Barrett 2008; Sargent and Vamosi 2008).

A number of studies have employed phylogenies to investigate evolutionary transitions in plant reproductive characters (e.g., Weller and Sakai 1999 and references therein; Weiblen et al. 2000; Renner and Won 2001; Krahenbuhl et al. 2002; Miller 2002; Vamosi et al. 2003; Graham and Barrett 2004; Givnish et al. 2005; Gleiser and Verdú 2005; Levin and Miller 2005). These studies are primarily aimed at estimating...
the number of times particular traits arose and/or the ecological or morphological context in which traits may have evolved, which provide indirect evidence of the proximate mechanisms responsible for phenotypic change and the adaptive significance of trait transitions. Although character correlations and estimates of transition rates do not necessarily require precise localization of character state changes on a phylogenetic tree, it is often useful to know the local direction of change (e.g., on which terminal or near-terminal branches particular transitions occurred). Pinpointing transitions on particular branches can guide further sampling efforts and subsequent microevolutionary studies that delve into the local-scale processes responsible for observed macroevolutionary patterns. In practice, mapping traits onto trees with precision is not necessarily straightforward, particularly for characters that show a high degree of evolutionary lability and/or intraspecific polymorphism (Weller and Sakai 1999).

In this article, we describe a phylogenetic analysis of transitions in the sexual systems of the Australasian members of Wurmbea (Liliaceae: Colchicaceae), a widespread genus that displays considerable variation in gender strategies. In doing so, we address some of the challenges associated with inferences of historical transitions in variable characters.

Recent advances have been made in developing and implementing model-based methods for studying character evolution using phylogenies (e.g., Pagel 1994, 1999; Cunningham et al. 1998; Mooers and Schluter 1999; Huelsenbeck et al. 2003; Pagel et al. 2004; Ronquist 2004; Maddison and Maddison 2005). This has led to more nuanced approaches than maximum parsimony (MP), which accommodate uncertainty in how ancestral states are reconstructed on a given tree and, increasingly, underlying uncertainty about the phylogenetic tree itself. MP estimates of character evolution are still widely used but could be misleading because they do not take account of available branch-length information (e.g., multiple changes along a branch are not permitted in MP reconstructions). Maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of character states and their transitions offer the advantage that they are explicitly model based and can incorporate branch-length information (Pagel 1994, 1999). A Bayesian approach that stochastically maps character evolution (Nielson 2002; Huelsenbeck et al. 2003; Pagel et al. 2004; Bollback 2006) can accommodate uncertainty in assignment of ancestral states, in addition to uncertainty in the tree itself, using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) samples from the posterior distribution of trees, substitution model parameters, and character ancestral states (Bollback 2006). Stochastic character mapping requires that the prior probability of the rate parameter of character state change be assigned, although usually this will not be known. In this method, tree uncertainty can be accounted for by using post-burn-in trees sampled by MrBayes using MCMC (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist 2001). The MCMC tree output has also been used to account for tree uncertainty in MP and ML ancestral-state reconstructions in recent studies (e.g., Miadlikowska and Lutzoni 2004; Lewis and Lewis 2005; Jones and Martin 2006; Vanderpoorten and Goffinet 2006; Galley and Linder 2007). However, MCMC samples may lead to inflated estimates of clade confidence (e.g., Suzuki et al. 2002; Cummings et al. 2003; Erxian et al. 2003; Simmons et al. 2004), potentially biasing reconstructions of ancestral states.

The most common method of accounting for tree uncertainty in phylogenetic analysis is the bootstrap (Felsenstein 1985). Bootstrapping provides a nonparametric estimate of the effect of sampling error on tree topology and is performed by resampling the characters used to infer the tree (Felsenstein 1985). Using the bootstrap profile of trees for character mapping (Jones and Martin 2006) arguably provides a more conservative approach for taking account of tree uncertainty than using an MCMC tree sample. Instead of using the raw bootstrap profile for character mapping in our study of Wurmbea, we retained branches that were moderately to strongly supported by ML bootstrap analysis and randomly sampled possible resolutions of poorly supported branches (i.e., we considered branches with <70% support to represent soft polytomies). These trees were used to perform ML and MP reconstructions of the ancestral states of sexual systems in Wurmbea. It is not our intent to compare the efficacy of different character mapping approaches, although recent empirical studies suggest that reconstructions based on MP, ML, and stochastic mappings may be quite closely related (e.g., Lewis and Lewis 2005; Jones and Martin 2006; Vanderpoorten and Goffinet 2006; Leschen and Buckley 2007).

The diversity of gender strategies within and among species of Wurmbea—ca. 48 species of perennial, geophytic herbs (Nordenstam 1978, 1985; Macfarlane 1980, 1986; Bates 1995, 2007; Macfarlane and van Leeuwen 1996)—has drawn much recent attention (Barrett 1992; Vaughton and Ramsey 1998, 2002, 2003, 2004; Barrett et al. 1999; Case and Barrett 2001, 2004a, 2004b; Jones and Burd 2001; Ramsey and Vaughton 2001, 2002; Barrett and Case 2006; Ramsey et al. 2006a, 2006b). Most of this work has been conducted on Wurmbea discica and Wurmbea biglandulosa, two wide-ranging polymorphic species that exhibit considerable intraspecific variation in sexual systems, including hermaphroditism, gynodioecy, subdioecy and dioecy (Barrett 1992; Vaughton and Ramsey 2002; Case and Barrett 2004). Biogeographical surveys and experimental studies have investigated the role of resource availability and pollination biology in the evolution and maintenance of gender dimorphism in these taxa (Case and Barrett 2001, 2004a, 2004b; Vaughton and Ramsey 2004). However, evaluating these selective hypotheses in an ahistorical context could be misleading, not least because of the potential problems of species circumscription that are common in morphologically diverse groups (e.g., Funk and Omland 2003).

Although Wurmbea has a relatively even African-Australian distribution (Goldblatt 1978; Nordenstam 1978; Conran 1985), the types of sexual system represented in the two continental regions are strikingly different. Gender dimorphism is present only among the Australian species, while African Wurmbea and all other members of Colchicaceae are uniformly monomorphic for gender (Nordenstam 1978; Macfarlane 1980; Dahlgren et al. 1985). Wurmbea probably originated in southern Africa and arrived in western Australia via long-distance dispersal (Nordenstam 1978; Barrett 1992; Vinnersten and Bremer 2001). The nested position of Wurmbea in Colchicaceae, along with the probable monophyly of the Australian taxa (Vinnersten and Reeves 2003), tends to support the idea that gender dimorphism is evolutionarily derived in Wurmbea and that one or more origins of dimorphism followed its arrival and establishment in
Australia (Nordenstam 1978; Barrett 1992). Within Australia, gender and sexual dimorphism are more prevalent in eastern states, with a larger proportion of gender-dimorphic taxa and greater sexual dimorphism there than in western Australia. This may indicate region-specific selection for gender and sexual dimorphism.

Biogeographical signals evident in our phylogenetic analysis may inform hypotheses for variation in sexual systems as *Wurmbea* spread across the continent and perhaps beyond. We were also interested in investigating whether an additional eastward dispersal event from Australia to New Zealand occurred in *Wurmbea*. *Iphigenia novae-zelandiae* is the sole New Zealand member of Colchicaceae, and it may be a taxonomically misplaced member of *Wurmbea* (Moore and Edgar 1970; T. D. Macfarlane, personal observation). Plants of *I. novae-zelandiae* are small and have few leaves and tiny, solitary, and "poorly-formed" flowers (Moore and Edgar 1970); firm decisions on its generic position based on morphology alone are difficult because of its floral instability and reduced stature. The high degree of developmental instability of flowers may indicate that *I. novae-zelandiae* is self-compatible and predominantly autogamous (e.g., Barrett 1985). Although no mating system information is available for *I. novae-zelandiae*, some *Wurmbea* species are self-compatible (Vaughton and Ramsey 1998, 2003; Case 2000; Ramsey and Vaughton 2002). Baker’s Law (Baker 1967) predicts an increased likelihood of successful establishment after long-distance dispersal by plants capable of autonomous selfing. Thus, an additional goal of our study was to use molecular data to determine whether *I. novae-zelandiae* is indeed a species of *Wurmbea* whose New Zealand distribution resulted from a more recent long-distance dispersal event from Australia.

We used phylogenetic evidence from four noncontiguous regions of the plastid genome to investigate evolutionary transitions between monomorphic and dimorphic sexual systems in Australian species of *Wurmbea*, the biogeographical structure of gender dimorphism within Australia, and the phylogenetic status of *I. novae-zelandiae*. We encountered several possible sources of uncertainty in our inferences of character evolution. These included pronounced interspersion of monomorphic and dimorphic taxa on inferred trees, suggesting substantial evolutionary lability in character shifts; tree uncertainty (reflected in several polytomies and short branches with limited bootstrap support); and evidence of the nonmonophyly of at least two of the species that are polymorphic for sexual system. We explored the implications of these sources of uncertainty on the inferred evolutionary history of gender variation in the Australian *Wurmbea*. Our exploration provides general insights into the challenges associated with the reconstruction of evolutionary labile characters on phylogenetic trees, particularly for groups with a recent origin or those that include classically described species that may not be monophyletic.

**Methods**

**Taxon Sampling and Outgroup Selection**

*Wurmbea* has been the subject of recent taxonomic study; species delimitations are generally well accepted (Nordenstam 1978, 1986; Macfarlane 1980, 1986, 1987; Bates 1995, 2007; Macfarlane and van Leeuwen 1996). Of the ca. 48 species of *Wurmbea*, 18 occur in Africa and 30 in Australia. Our sampling focused on the latter because the former are exclusively sexually monomorphic. We include 16 Australian species and three species from the Cape Province of South Africa. The Australian sample includes representatives of all five dimorphic species of *Wurmbea* (see appendix). According to the most recent circumscription (Bates 2007), the widespread species *Wurmbea dioica* consists of four subspecies (*alba*, *dioica*, *brevisilpha*, and *lacinaria*), and the species *Wurmbea biglandulosa* consists of two (*biglandulosa* and *flindersica*). *Wurmbea dioica* subspecies are uniformly dimorphic for gender, except in western Australia, where monomorphic and dimorphic populations of *W. dioica* ssp. *alba* co-occur (Macfarlane 1980; Barrett 1992; Case and Barrett 2001, 2004a, 2004b). Both subspecies of *W. biglandulosa* have monomorphic populations, whereas ssp. *biglandulosa* also contains dimorphic populations (Vaughton and Ramsey 2002). Our analysis included one population of each of the following: *W. biglandulosa* ssp. *flindersica*, both subspecies of *Wurmbea latifolia*, and two subspecies of *W. dioica*. We included both monomorphic and dimorphic populations of the two polymorphic species, one population of each sexual system in *W. dioica* ssp. *alba*, and two populations of each sexual system in *W. biglandulosa* ssp. *biglandulosa*.

We sampled multiple putative outgroups representing three of the four tribes of the Colchicaceae: *Onixotis punctata* and *Onixotis stricta* (Anguillarieae); *Baeomea uniflora* (Baeomeeae); *Iphigenia indica*, *Iphigenia novae-zelandiae*, and *Gloriosa superba* (Iphigenieae); and *Colchicum* (Colchiceae). Among these outgroups, the nearest relatives to *Wurmbea* is indeed a species of *Onixotis* because *Wurmbea* and *Onixotis*, together with South African *Neodredgea*, make up tribe Anguillarieae (Nordenstam 1978, 1986). Vinnersten and Manning (2007) recognize *Onixotis* and *Neodredgea* under *Wurmbea* (see also Vinnersten 2003), but for the purposes of this article we follow the narrower circumscription. We also included *Burchardia multiflora*, a species of previously uncertain taxonomic position that is now well supported as a member of Colchicaceae (Chase et al. 1993; Radall et al. 2000; Vinnersten and Bremer 2001; see also Nordenstam 1998).

**Molecular Data**

We extracted DNA from frozen or silica-gel-dried leaf tissue using either CTAB (Doyle and Doyle 1987) or Qiagen DNEasy isolation kits (Qiagen, Valencia, CA). We sequenced four segments of the large single-copy region of the chloroplast genome possessing a range of evolutionary rates (e.g., Graham et al. 2006): a cluster of four photosystem II genes (*psb*B, *psb*T, *psb*N, and *psb*H; hereafter *psb*BTN), two tRNA genes with an intervening spacer region and a single intron (*trn*UAA and *trn*F-GAA; hereafter *trn*LF), the intragenic spacer region between *atp*B and *rbc*L (hereafter *atp*B-*rbc*L), and the 3’ end of the coding region of NADH dehydrogenase, subunit F (hereafter *ndh*F). These regions were amplified and sequenced using primers described by Taberlet et al. (1991) for *trn*LF, Graham and Olmstead (2000) for *psb*BTN, Mannen et al. (1994) and Savolainen et al. (1994) for *atp*B-*rbc*L, and Olmstead and Sweere (1994) and Graham et al. (1998) for *ndh*F. Two of the internal sequencing primers
of atpB-rbcL did not work for Wurmbea, so we designed two additional primers for sequencing (IGS4A = 5' - AATTGTGAGTAAATGTGTATTTA; IGS4B = 5' - GATTCATTATTTGATCGATTACC). A few regions could not be recovered for individual taxa, as is noted in the appendix.

We conducted PCR amplifications, using standard methods and profiles (e.g., Graham and Olmstead 2000). PCR products were purified with QiaQuick PCR purification columns (Qiagen) following manufacturer instructions; for cycle sequencing we used primers located internally to those used for amplification. For each gene region, we compiled and base-called contiguous sequence fragments using Sequencher (Gene Codes, Ann Arbor, MI). We used Clustal W (Thompson et al. 1994) to generate initial sequence alignments and manually adjusted alignments using Se-Al 1.0 (Rambaut 1998), following criteria described by Graham et al. (2000). Alignment gaps were coded as missing data. The aligned matrix is available on request from the first author.

**Phylogenetic Inference Methods**

We inferred trees with ML, using PhyML, version 2.4.4 (Guindon and Gascuel 2003), and MP, using PAUP*, version 4.0b10 (Swofford 2002), and we used Mesquite, version 1.12 (Maddison and Maddison 2005) for ML reconstructions of ancestral character states. The optimal model of DNA sequence evolution, chosen using hierarchical likelihood ratio tests (hLRTs) in ModelTest, version 3.06 (Posada and Crandall 1998), is TVM + G + I (see ModelTest documentation for model details). We performed heuristic searches in PhyML while determining optimal model parameters from the data but otherwise using default settings. We assessed branch support using 100 bootstrap replicates (Felsenstein 1985), using 10 random-addition replicates for each bootstrap replicate for the MP analysis.

**Reconstructions of Sexual-System Evolution**

We performed ML optimization of sexual systems on the best ML tree to trace their evolutionary history, using Mesquite (equivalent to the “global” option in Pagel’s Discrete). We coded sexual system as a binary character (monomorphic vs. dimorphic) rather than assigning dimorphic taxa as gynodioecious, subdioecious, or dioecious, because extensive surveys indicate a substantial degree of gender variation among populations of all dimorphic taxa (e.g., Barrett 1992; Barrett et al. 1999; Vaughton and Ramsey 2002). Branch lengths were estimated from the data using PAUP*. The best ML tree contained four polytomies, which we interpret as “soft,” reflecting a lack of evidence for resolving nodes (Maddison 1997). Because Mesquite cannot fully accommodate zero-length branches in ML ancestral-state reconstructions, we randomly resolved these four polytomies using the “create trees” tool in MacClade, version 4.03 (Maddison and Maddison 2001) and assigned them very short nonzero branch lengths (0.000001 substitutions per site; see also Ferrer and Good-Avila 2007). We refer to this tree as the “resolved best tree.”

We estimated the overall likelihoods of one-rate and two-rate (asymmetric) models of evolution; the one-rate model (the Mk1 model in Mesquite, equivalent to the Markov model of Lewis [2001]) was the better-fitting one based on likelihood-ratio tests (Pagel 1999). We considered ancestral states of individual nodes with a difference in log-likelihood scores greater than 2.0 to be statistically significant (Edwards 1972). Preliminary reconstructions indicated numerous transitions in sexual system in Wurmbea and uncertain reconstructions (monomorphic vs. dimorphic) for all nodes subtending Wurmbea. Although dimorphism is restricted to Wurmbea, the rest of Colchicaceae (and possibly related families) are uniformly sexually monomorphic. It is therefore quite possible that the one-rate model or its rate parameter does not apply consistently across the whole family. Most implementations of ML-based inference of ancestral states assume that a single, consistent evolutionary model applies across the tree under consideration. Mooers and Schluter (1999) describe a method for taking account of a shift in the evolutionary model on a specific branch. However, it is not clear how to pinpoint where (or whether) shifts in the evolutionary model or model parameters occurred. Simply placing a rate shift between an ingroup and outgroup is an unwarranted assumption. In the absence of knowledge of whether or where a rate shift occurred, we conducted separate ML reconstructions on Wurmbea alone and on Australasian Wurmbea alone (an approach suggested by W. Maddison, personal communication). We assessed both cases because it is not clear whether we should include the monomorphic African species in ML ancestral-state reconstructions; like the outgroups, the African species of Wurmbea are sexually monomorphic.

We used an additional approach to account for uncertainty in tree topology (phylogenetic uncertainty) and its effect on our character reconstructions. We used MacClade to collapse four branches with <70% ML bootstrap support in the best ML tree (fig. 1), taking 70% support as an indication of moderately well-supported branches (e.g., Graham et al. 1998). We generated a random sample of >10,000 resolutions of the eight resulting polytomies (the original four plus the four additional collapsed branches). We then used the “condense trees” function in PAUP* to remove duplicate trees, leaving 10,000 unique topologies for character reconstructions. After recalculation of ML branch lengths for all trees using PAUP*, we assigned very short nonzero branch lengths (0.000001 substitutions per site), as we did for the resolved best tree. It is unlikely that this small departure from the ML branch lengths has a substantive effect on our overall conclusions from character reconstructions (see “Results”).

Because zero-length or very short branches with poor support may make it difficult to make robust ancestral-state reconstructions, we repeated our reconstructions on trees with all branches set to unit length (e.g., Mooers and Schluter 1999) and also on trees with all zero-length branches assigned the median length estimated within the Wurmbea clade (0.001445 substitutions per site). The former ignores branch-length information altogether and reflects solely the number of speciation events separating species (Pagel 1994; Mooers et al. 1999); the latter does not reflect actual evolution on the tree but permits us to assess how robust inferences of ancestral states at individual nodes would be, had there been a more even timing of speciation events.

We used the “trace character over trees” function in Mesquite to determine how many of the 10,000 topologies had significant ancestral-state reconstructions for the nodes considered in the
resolved best tree, also noting the number of trees in which each node appeared. In addition, we used MP to estimate the minimum total number of transitions between monomorphism and dimorphism in either direction. We estimated total parsimony changes (Fitch 1971; Hartigan 1973) using the summary table option of the “state changes and stasis” tool in MacClade.

The best ML tree indicates that at least two species of Wurmbea are not monophyletic (see “Species Nonmonophyly”). We evaluated whether enforcing the monophyly of each species results in a significant increase in tree score by running heuristic ML searches in PAUP* with topological constraints enforced. The constraints enforced the monophyly of all (or subsets of) the populations for these species. We evaluated the significance of difference in scores of the shortest unconstrained and constrained trees, using the Shimodaira-Hasegawa test (Shimodaira and Hasegawa 1999), with resampling estimated log likelihoods (RELL) bootstrap, using ML estimates of TVM + I parameters as determined on an MP tree (base frequencies were estimated empirically) and otherwise using default settings. All tree score comparisons were made simultaneously (see Goldman et al. 2000).

Results

Data Characteristics

The total data set, including all outgroups, consists of 5337 aligned nucleotides (233 are parsimony informative), excluding a short (<15 bp) homopolymer region in the trnLF
intergenic spacer region. The data set for all *Wurmbea* samples contains 131 informative sites, with 79 informative sites for the Australia/New Zealand samples. For the full taxon set, the four chloroplast regions consist of 2090 (psbBTNH), 1262 (trnLF), 857 (atpB-rbcL), and 1128 bp (ndhF), which contribute 24%, 30%, 17%, and 28% of the informative sites, respectively. A 41-bp inversion in the trnLF intergenic spacer of one taxon (*Wurmbea inframediana*; see table 3 in Graham et al. 2000) was reinserted before alignment, following Graham and Olmstead (2000).

**Phylogenetic Relationships in *Wurmbea* and Relatives**

We rooted the best ML tree such that *Burchardia multiflora* is sister group to all other sampled Colchicaceae (Vinnersten and Reeves 2003). *Wurmbea* is then nested within a grade of *Onixotis*, a South African genus (fig. 1). *Iphigenia novae-zelandiae* is supported as a misclassified member of *Wurmbea* because of its nested position within a well-supported clade of eastern Australian members of the genus. *Wurmbea* is therefore monophyletic only if it is considered to include *I. novae-zelandiae*. A formal combination has not yet been made, but for simplicity in the rest of this article we will refer to *Wurmbea* as if it includes *I. novae-zelandiae*. There is a strongly supported basal division of *Wurmbea* into an African and an Australia/New Zealand clade. *Wurmbea odorata* is sister to the rest of the Australasian taxa, with weak to moderate support (fig. 1). A broadly eastern Australian clade of *Wurmbea* is also well supported and contains all taxa sampled from South Australia (which constitute a well-supported subclade), plus all taxa from New South Wales and New Zealand (another well-supported subclade). Relationships among four distinct *Wurmbea* lineages in western Australia are unresolved and poorly supported: (1) *W. murchisoniana*; (2) *W. inframediana* + *W. pygmaea* + *W. drummondii* + *W. tubulosa*; (3) *W. densiflora* + *W. dilatata* + *W. tenella*; and (4) *W. monantha* + *W. sinora* + *W. dioica* ssp. *alba*. Clades 2 and 3 are well supported; clade 4 is moderately supported.

**Inference of Ancestral States**

The resolved best tree shown in figure 2 includes all nodes in the best ML tree and one possible set of resolutions of the four polytomies in the best ML tree (fig. 1). No internal nodes on the resolved best ML tree for *Wurmbea* have significantly supported ancestral-state reconstructions (fig. 2). In large part, this appears to be because the 10 dimorphic taxa (terminals) in our taxonomic sample are widely interspersed among monomorphic Australian taxa. All but one of the major well-supported subclades within eastern and western Australia (see above) contain both dimorphic and monomorphic taxa. Deletion of the African clade of *Wurmbea* had no effect on the lack of significant reconstructions (data not shown).

Logically, the interspersion of dimorphic and monomorphic taxa must require multiple origins and/or losses of gender dimorphism. Mesquite does not provide an estimate of the ML number of transitions, but lower bounds to the number of transitions can be estimated using MP. The MP estimate should be close to the minimum possible number of transitions, because it permits at most one state change per branch to explain the observed distribution of character states; the true number of changes may be higher. The MP estimate of the range of total transitions across the 10,000 alternative resolutions of the weakest parts of the tree (as revealed by ML bootstrap analysis) is five to eight. This spans zero to eight gains versus zero to eight losses of gender dimorphism. The same ranges are obtained for reconstructions made across *Wurmbea* as a whole and for Australasian *Wurmbea* alone. This indicates that there were frequent evolutionary transitions in the sexual systems of *Wurmbea*.

As stated above, the resolved best tree has no significantly supported ancestral-state reconstructions (fig. 2). We explored whether any nodes on the resolved best tree might have significant ancestral reconstructions, given a large sampling of alternate resolutions of eight nodes—the four original polytomous nodes, plus the additional four nodes with relatively weak (<70%) ML bootstrap support, which were collapsed for this analysis. Below, we describe the outcome of these analyses. As a rule of thumb, we consider an assignment of an ancestral state in these reconstructions noteworthy if two conditions are met: (1) the node is present in all of the sampled alternate resolutions (indicated by “10,000” in the second column of table 1) and (2) it is assigned a significant ancestral state in the majority (>50%) of these 10,000 resolutions (indicated by values >50% in cols. A–F of table 1; see Miadlikowska and Lutzoni 2004).

First, we address the tree resolutions where the collapsed branches are resolved and assigned very short lengths (cols. A and D in table 1). Of all nodes that are strongly supported in the best ML tree (i.e., present in all 10,000 resolutions; second column in table 1), significant inferences of ancestral state were assigned in less than 5% of the sampled resolutions (all values for these nodes are ≤4.1 in cols. A of table 1). In only one case, which represents a random resolution of a polytomy in the best tree (node q; fig. 2; table 1), is there an unambiguous assignment of an ancestral state in more than 50% of cases (underlined numbers in col. A of table 1); however, this node is present in only 1126 of the 10,000 sampled resolutions (second column in table 1), and this level of significant ancestral-state assignments is seen only in trees that include African *Wurmbea* (cf. cols. A and D in table 1).
most of the time (i.e., most nodes have low values in cols. C and F in table 1).

A further indication of uncertainty is evident for several nodes (e.g., c, m, and r) that have significant reconstructions of both sexual-system states in at least some tree resolutions (occurrences of both M and D in cols. A–F in table 1). None of these findings is substantially affected by inclusion or exclusion of African *Wurmbea* from the reconstructions (cf. cols. A–C vs. D–F in table 1), although the proportion of nodes with high levels of significance is generally higher with these taxa included (cols. A–C in table 1).

Note that in order to pinpoint a transition between sexual systems with confidence, we would need to detect a change in sexual states at consecutive nodes in which each has a significant inference of ancestral state. Although we detected significant reconstructions in >50% of the sampled resolutions in a few instances (see underlined values in table 1), these particular branches are all terminal or near-terminal, and most do not indicate transitions between monomorphism and dimorphism because the inferred ancestral state in each case is identical to the states of the terminals it subtends (nodes g, i, w, y; see fig. 2). Nodes q and t provide evidence of transitions in some reconstructions, predicting a recent reversal from D to M in *Wurmbea biglandulosa* ssp. *biglandulosa* (population M1) and *W. biglandulosa* ssp. *flindersica*, respectively (fig. 2; table 1).

Species Nonmonophyly

Within the ingroup, we found evidence for nonmonophyly of two species containing both monomorphic and dimorphic populations (*Wurmbea dioica* and *W. biglandulosa*). When the monophyly of *W. dioica* as a whole is enforced, the score of the constrained tree is significantly higher than that of the best unconstrained tree (difference in $-\ln L = 111.92$; $P < 0.001$); however, when the two populations of *W. dioica* ssp. *alba* sampled here are constrained to form a small clade, this does not result in a significant increase in tree length (difference in $-\ln L = 4.03$; $P = 0.785$). *Wurmbea biglandulosa* is also not monophyletic in our analyses, but forcing the four sampled populations of *W. biglandulosa* ssp. *biglandulosa* together as a clade did not result in a significant increase in tree length (difference in $-\ln L = 5.56$; $P = 0.81$). *Wurmbea biglandulosa* ssp. *flindersica* is well supported as the sister group of *Wurmbea citrina* and *Wurmbea latifolia*, and constraining the monophyly of *W. biglandulosa* as a whole resulted in significantly longer trees (difference in $-\ln L = 85.9$; $P < 0.001$).

Discussion

We address the implications of our data for understanding sexual-system evolution in *Wurmbea*. Several strong biogeographic patterns are evident, and our reconstructions indicate...
that sexual systems in the Australian clade are evolutionarily labile. However, we were unable to pinpoint where sexual system transitions occurred with any statistical confidence. We address the source of this uncertainty and discuss how the nonmonophyly of individual species may further complicate attempts to make inferences about the evolution of gender strategies using phylogenies. The inference-related problems that we encountered are unlikely to be restricted to Wurmbea and may be commonplace (but poorly recognized) in morphologically variable groups with a recent origin or in those that contain wide-ranging polymorphic taxa with evolutionarily labile traits.

### Geography and Phylogeny

Species of Wurmbea tended to be geographically clustered within well-supported clades and subclades. The existence of African and Australasian clades received strong statistical support, as did an eastern Australian/New Zealand subclade. The relationships among western Australian subclades and of these to the eastern Australian/New Zealand subclade were poorly supported. However, there was weak support for the eastern subclade being nested in a western Australian grade. This arrangement, if correct, is consistent with migration and diversification eastward from the coast of western Australia. The Australasian clade of Wurmbea is nested in a larger African grade that includes the African clade of Wurmbea (mostly from the Cape Province of South Africa), a grade of Onixotis (two of three species in the genus are sampled here, all from the Cape Province), and Baeometra uniflora (the sole species in this genus, native to the Cape Province but collected in western Australia). Vinners ten and Manning (2007) recognize Onixotis and Neodredgea as part of Wurmbea; the former genus is paraphyletic with respect to Wurmbea, and the latter is monotypic and sister to Onixotis + Wurmbea s.s. (Vinnersten and Reeves 2003). Arguably, Baeometra might also

### Table 1

**Percentage of Nodes with Significant Maximum Likelihood (ML) Assignments of Ancestral States in 10,000 Resolutions of Eight Polytomies in the “Resolved Best” ML Tree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node in figure 2</th>
<th>No. trees with node</th>
<th>All Wurmbea species</th>
<th>Australasian Wurmbea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shortest branches = .000001 (A)</td>
<td>Shortest branches = median length (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: .02</td>
<td>D: .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: .02</td>
<td>M: .01; D: .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>M: .9</td>
<td>M: .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 4.0</td>
<td>M: 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 3.0</td>
<td>M: 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>D: 2.1</td>
<td>D: .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: .1</td>
<td>M: 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 7.7</td>
<td>M: 50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>M: 5.7</td>
<td>M: 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>M: 6.5</td>
<td>M: 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>M: 1.7</td>
<td>M: .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: .7; D: .2</td>
<td>M: 7.8; D: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>D: .3</td>
<td>D: 3.7; D: .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>M: .2</td>
<td>D: 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>M: .4</td>
<td>D: 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>M: 57.2</td>
<td>M: 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>D: 4.1</td>
<td>D: 29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D: .9</td>
<td>D: .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>D: 3.6</td>
<td>D: 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: .3</td>
<td>D: 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>3288</td>
<td>M: .4</td>
<td>M: 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 57.7</td>
<td>M: 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 20.3</td>
<td>M: 34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>M: 3.0</td>
<td>M: 75.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The eight resolved polytomies comprise the four original polytomies plus four branches with <70% bootstrap support collapsed post hoc (fig. 2). Lowercase letters correspond to nodes present in this tree, which shows one possible resolution of the four original polytomies seen in figure 1. Numbers in the second column indicate the number of resolutions in which a node was observed. The last six columns (A–F) represent reconstructions for each of two taxon sets (with analyses limited either to Wurmbea as a whole [A–C] or to Australasian Wurmbea alone [D–F]) but considering branch lengths in three different ways. The percentage of cases with a particular state at a node is noted in columns A–F (M = monomorphic; D = dimorphic); underlined numbers indicate cases for which at least 50% of the resolved trees had a significant ancestral state. Analyses were performed with zero-length branches assigned a very short length (A, D), with all branches assigned equal lengths (B, E), or with all zero-length branches assigned the median branch length within Wurmbea (C, F). na = not applicable.
be recognized under *Wurmbea* in a broader sense (*Wurmbea* would have taxonomic priority in this situation) because it is monotypic and sister to all of these taxa (see Backlund and Bremer 1998 for a rationale). Regardless of the classification used, the taxa that we accept as *Wurmbea* are clearly nested in a grade of South African taxa. Thus, our results (and those of Vinnersten and colleagues) support a single origin of Australasian *Wurmbea*, following a relatively recent long-distance dispersal event from southern Africa.

Paradoxically, such long-distance dispersal is inconsistent with several features of colchicoid life history. Seed shadows are probably very local in Colchicaceae; most plants have a diminutive stature, and seeds are generally shaken from dry dehiscent capsules. Moreover, aside from the possibility of rafting, fruits and seeds are unlikely to be dispersed by water, and many are ant dispersed (Nordenstam 1978). Although some species of *Wurmbea* have the capacity for limited clonal reproduction, daughter corms remain enclosed within the tunics covering the parent corm and apparently do not disperse readily (Nordenstam 1978; Macfarlane 1980; A. L. Case, personal observation). Hence, the mechanism(s) by which long-distance dispersal was achieved in *Wurmbea*, and in Colchicaceae as a whole, remains an enigmatic problem for biogeographical research (Vinnersten and Bremer 2001). However, this predicted long-distance dispersal was clearly not a unique event in *Wurmbea* biogeographic history, as exemplified by our finding that *Iphigenia novae-zelandiae* dispersed from within the Australian *Wurmbea* clade to the South Island of New Zealand.

**Dynamic Evolutionary History of Sexual Systems in Wurmbea**

Previous phylogenetic analyses of the evolution of gender strategies have aimed at identifying independent transitions to evaluate the selective mechanisms responsible for gender dimorphism (e.g., Hart 1985; Wagner et al. 1995; Weller et al. 1995; Solitis et al. 1996; Sakai et al. 1997; Sakai and Weller 1999; Renner and Won 2001; Levin and Miller 2003). These findings, in conjunction with population-level studies, can support hypotheses that specific ecological factors favor transitions from gender monomorphism to dimorphism (reviewed in Ashman 2006; Barrett and Case 2006). If our plastid-based estimate of phylogeny represents species relationships accurately, then there were numerous transitions in sexual system in the Australian clade of *Wurmbea*. This means that the high degree of sexual variation in this clade mirrors high evolutionarily lability of sexual systems. This makes evaluating ecological correlates of dimorphic sexual systems more difficult within a phylogenetic framework, although uncertainty in ancestral states is not necessarily problematic when among-character correlations are assessed using ML analysis (Pagel 1999). Our analyses indicate that there were a minimum of five changes in sexual system, but they do not indicate the balance or direction of these changes. For example, we cannot distinguish whether dimorphism evolved repeatedly within Australia or just once after dispersal to Australia, followed by repeated reversions to monomorphism. Moreover, the possibility that an unknown dimorphic taxon was dispersed from Africa, although it might be considered less parsimonious (and less probable because it would usually require dispersal of both sexes), is not altogether unlikely, as indicated in the ML reconstructions (see the root node of the Australian taxa in figs. 2, 3).

Reversals from gender dimorphism to monomorphism are not commonly reported and are traditionally thought of as being exceedingly unlikely to occur, particularly in the case of dioecy, which has previously been thought generally irreversible (Bull and Charnov 1985). Bull and Charnov's arguments for the irreversibility of dioecy are probably appropriate for animal systems, but sex expression in flowering plants is subject to very different constraints (e.g., modular body plans, sexual inconstancy). Gender dimorphism has arisen independently from cosexual ancestors in almost half of flowering plant families (Renner and Ricklefs 1995), suggesting that it is not necessarily difficult to evolve. Although there are a few notable exceptions (e.g., *Cotula*, Lloyd 1975; *Fuchsia*, Sytsma et al. 1991; *Mercurialis*, Obbard et al. 2006; *Sagittaria*, Dorken et al. 2002; *Cucurbitaceae*, Zhang et al. 2006), reversals to cosexuality from gender dimorphism are still typically presumed to be less likely in plants (note, however, that many gender-dimorphic groups that include dioecious species exhibit a continuum of sex expression between unisexuality and hermaphroditism; Delph and Wolf 2005; Ehlers and Bataillon 2007). In the few cases (i.e., nodes) where we detected a high proportion of significant ancestral-state assignments in *Wurmbea*, our inferences of sexual-system transitions indicated reversals from dimorphism to monomorphism. These cases all included a reversal in *Wurmbea biglandulosa* ssp. *flindersica* and often also included reversals in *W. biglandulosa* ssp. *biglandulosa* and *I. novae-zelandiae*. This is not surprising, given the extensive sexual inconstancy within *Wurmbea* species (Barrett et al. 1999; Ramsey and Vaughton 2001; Barrett and Case 2006). It would be interesting to know what features of Australian *Wurmbea* biology make the clade so unusually sexually labile. Comparative microevolutionary studies would be particularly informative, as would broadscale comparative analyses of the ecology and biology of African versus Australian species.

One possible reversal to monomorphism may be associated with the long-distance dispersal event that yielded *I. novae-zelandiae*. Losses of dimorphism have been associated with long-distance dispersal in other plant groups in the Southern Hemisphere (Baker and Cox 1984; Sytsma et al. 1991). Because *I. novae-zelandiae* is nested within a local clade that includes some dimorphic taxa (*Wurmbea dioica* ssp. *dioica* and *W. biglandulosa*), a dimorphic common ancestor could have given rise to it via (or after) dispersal. A scenario in which a polleniferous plant with sex inconstancy from a gender-dimorphic species could have established a monomorphic population is consistent with ecological evidence from several species. First, there is ample evidence of labile sex expression in *Wurmbea*; individual plants with sex inconstancy reproduce as hermaphrodites in some years but as males in others (Barrett et al. 1999; Ramsey and Vaughton 2001). A single founding individual would need to reproduce as a hermaphrodite to establish a monomorphic population. Second, this type of dispersal event would also require self-compatibility for successful establishment. Self-compatibility has been reported in several *Wurmbea* species (Barrett 1992; Ramsey and Vaughton 2002;
Vaughton and Ramsey (2003), and the biology of *I. novae-zelandiae* suggests that it is predominantly selfing. Autonomous selfing would aid in the establishment of this lineage after dispersal from Australia (Baker 1967), particularly in the context of the relatively depauperate pollinator fauna of New Zealand (Webb and Kelly 1993).

We have shown that the largest source of uncertainty in the reconstruction of sexual systems in *Wurmbea* is the intermingling of monomorphic and dimorphic taxa across the phylogenetic tree. This interspersion contributes substantially more to mapping uncertainty than does the presence of zero or near-zero-length branches (or otherwise poorly supported branches; see table 1). Studies of groups with a high degree of gender variation are especially likely to result in ambiguous ancestral-state reconstructions, while reconstructions from only a few dimorphic taxa, where there is less interspersion of sexual systems (e.g., *Lycium*; Levin and Miller 2005), should be more straightforward. In the same way that rapid speciation can obscure phylogenetic signal for determining species relationships, the complex distribution of sexual systems across our *Wurmbea* phylogeny obscures the localization of specific character transitions on the tree.

**Taxon Sampling, Short Branches, Uncertain Species Boundaries, and Their Effects on Inferences of Character-State Transitions**

Some of the dispersion of dimorphic sexual systems across the tree reflects the dispersed pattern of population terminals of *W. dioica* and *W. biglandulosa*. One or more of the population terminals in these taxa may represent distinct (cryptic) species, which may provide an explanation for at least part of the scattered distribution of *W. dioica* populations on the plastid phylogeny (see Vanderpoorten and Goffinet 2006 for a potentially similar situation in mosses). As currently circumscribed, *W. dioica* has the widest distribution of Australian *Wurmbea* species and a high degree of morphological variation, particularly with regard to floral traits and sex expression. Distinct morphological characters acknowledged in taxonomic treatments of each recognized subspecies of *W. dioica* (see Macfarlane 1980, 1986; Bates 1995) lend credence to the idea that at least some of these represent distinct species, either closely related or not. Indeed, during the preparation of this article, one Australian taxon was elevated to species status (*Wurmbea citrina*) from its previous designation as a subspecies of *W. dioica* (Bates 2007). Trees with *W. citrina* and *W.
dioica ssp. dioica enforced as a sister taxa are significantly longer than our best tree (difference in \(-\ln L = 62.0; P < 0.025\)), supporting this proposal. In contrast to W. dioica, there are few obvious morphological or ecological traits in W. biglandulosa ssp. biglandulosa that distinguish the different populations or sexual morphs, particularly in the northern part of the species range, where our samples were collected (M. Ramsey, personal communication).

It is possible that only one of the population terminals in the case of W. dioica or W. biglandulosa is the correct placement for either species. For example, chloroplast capture events or failed coalescence might explain at least some of their dispersion across the phylogeny. Different terminals for individual populations of W. dioica and W. biglandulosa are more closely related to geographically proximal species than to each other, which is consistent with local introgression. Alternatively, these geographic patterns may reflect common descent from geographically proximal ancestors in which at least one member of each descendant species pair retains a more plesiomorphic floral condition and ends up being misclassified (this situation differs from the plesiospecies concept of Olmstead [1995]; in our case the error may be associated with taxonomic definitions that focus on plesiomorphic reproductive characters, whereas Olmstead's potentially genetically cohesive plesiospecies gives rise to isolated apasespecies). At present, we cannot distinguish among these scenarios. However, chloroplast capture or failed coalescence may provide the correct explanation for at least some of the dispersion of dimorphic terminals across the tree.

It is worth considering what we might have reconstructed had we included a more limited sampling of populations, as many phylogenetic studies of reproductive transitions involve restricted taxon sampling. We therefore experimented with character reconstructions on trees with reduced taxon sampling, which may incidentally delete misplaced terminals. Because the main goal of our study was to reconstruct sexual-system evolution, we maintained a reasonable density of sampling, including both monomorphic and dimorphic taxa from across Australia in our taxon-deletion experiments. We subsampled taxa from the tree shown in figure 2 and traced sexual-system transitions in Mesquite, using the same procedure as for the full taxon sample, noting changes in the significance of ancestral states at each node. These taxonomic subsamplings could easily have been the samples collected for our study, if there had been a slightly different emphasis to our field collections.

We found that it can take very few terminal deletions to dramatically increase the number of significantly reconstructed ancestral states across the tree, regardless of the short internal branches observed here. For example, in figure 3 we illustrate a taxon subsample that leaves some level of interspersion and two nonmonophyletic taxa. The number of nodes inferred to have a significant ancestral-state change varies substantially—from no ancestral nodes in figure 2 to 85% significant nodes in figure 3 (i.e., 17 of 20 internal nodes). The estimate for the character transition rate for the trace shown in figure 3 (rate = 102.5) is substantially lower than that of the resolved best tree shown in figure 2 (rate = 760.745).

We experimented with different taxon samplings and found that deletion of just one branch has a large effect on the significance of ancestral-state reconstructions. Specifically, when population D4 or M2 of W. biglandulosa ssp. biglandulosa is removed from consideration, the number of significant nodes jumps from zero to seven or nine, respectively (these significant nodes are all near-terminal; data not shown). The greater uncertainty in ancestral-state reconstructions when both populations are included is a consequence of the populations having different sexual-system states (dimorphic vs. monomorphic) with essentially no evolutionary distance between them (fig. 1). Because they have different states, a state transition must be inferred; because there is no detectable distance between them, this also implies near-instantaneous change, requiring a substantially higher treewise transition rate with both included (760,745) than with either sample excluded (357.4 or 354.9).

The existence of closely related populations of W. biglandulosa with alternate sexual systems contributes to the difficulty in inferring ancestral states. However, it should be emphasized that the overall uncertainty in ancestral-state reconstructions here (i.e., very few nodes with significant ancestral-state reconstructions; table 1) is not a function of high or low numerical values for the overall character transition rate under different treatments of branch length. For example, the resolved best tree (fig. 2) has a transition rate of 248.0 when zero-length branches are replaced with branches of the median length and a rate of only 0.393 when all branches are set to equal length, and yet most reconstructions are still equivocal for all three branch-length scenarios (see table 1). Furthermore, when population M2 of W. biglandulosa is deleted and all branch lengths are treated as having unit length, the transition rate falls to 0.4086 from 357.4, but only two nodes are inferred to have significant states (vs. nine when the ML branch lengths are considered). Although branch length affects character reconstructions in a complex way, the biggest source of uncertainty in our reconstructions is not the overall ML rate or the very short branches subtending some taxa, but rather the interspersion of taxa with different character states (dimorphic vs. monomorphic) on the tree (fig. 2; table 1). This interspersion requires frequent transitions in any explanation of character evolution.

Whatever the cause of the dispersion of W. dioica and W. biglandulosa terminals across the tree, it serves to underline the dramatic effect that the observed interspersion has on character reconstructions. Undoubtedly, both speciation and extinction contribute to the observed patterns of taxa and character states across any phylogeny. The effect of extinction is expected to be comparable to that of incomplete taxonomic sampling, and there is some evidence that dioecious plant lineages have a higher probability of extinction than their hermaphroditic counterparts (Vamosi and Otto 2002). This is difficult to deal with in practice because extinct taxa are usually not observable (unless very good fossil data are available).

**Ancestral-State Reconstruction When Species Boundaries Are Unclear**

In the analyses described above, we treated each population as if it were a valid terminal for phylogenetic inference. Phylogenetic studies often include at most one or two exemplar specimens per species and tend not to be designed to test the (implicit) assumption that species boundaries are well-defined.
or readily definable (e.g., Funk and Omland 2003). In our case, we sampled four and five populations in W. dioica and W. biglandulosa, respectively, and found clear evidence for the nonmonophyly of both species. This may reflect failure of ancestral polymorphisms to coalesce within a species, chloroplast capture events, or the existence of cryptic species, as described above, or even true species-level paraphyly. These alternate hypotheses cannot be distinguished using the current evidence, and, in general, it is not clear how to deal with these contrasting possibilities in phylogenetic studies of character transitions. Approaches exist for estimating species phylogeny when different terminals from a given species are interspersed on a gene tree, but these work well only if the explanation can be ascribed to a single cause (failed coalescence, for example; Maddison and Knowles 2006). It is clear that whatever the source(s) of real or apparent nonmonophyly is for W. dioica and W. biglandulosa, there is a considerable need for population genetic, demographic, and taxonomic work to determine the limits and degree of leakiness in species boundaries in these taxa.

The observed uncertainty in species definitions for W. dioica and W. biglandulosa is problematic for interpreting character reconstructions and for linking these to results from micro-evolutionary or ecological studies (e.g., Barrett 1992; Vaughn and Ramsey 1998, 2002, 2003, 2004; Case and Barrett 2001, 2004a, 2004b; Ramsey and Vaughn 2001, 2002). Our sensitivity analysis using altered taxon sampling indicates that if we accept that there are multiple independent terminals within each “species,” the level of taxon sampling, which is often strongly affected by sampling logistics in a study, can have a profound effect on ancestral-state reconstruction. This should be of concern for any study in which character reconstructions use only one or a few population samples from widespread, highly polymorphic species. We suggest that this would be a fertile area of investigation for other studies of character evolution in recently evolved organisms. The potential error levels in inferences of ancestral state associated with poor taxon sampling may be greater than those associated with tree uncertainty or other sources of analytical error (e.g., use of MP vs. ML in ancestral-state reconstructions). It is clear that all relevant species should be included in a study, but a strong case can also be made that funding agencies should permit (i.e., support) active field collection of multiple population samples for each species. This would at least provide insights into whether exemplar-based sampling of species (the use of one or a few samples to represent a species) may be providing a biased view of the underlying phylogeny or of reconstructions of character transitions.

The inferred lability of sexual systems in Wurmbea is in large part a function of the interspersion of dimorphic terminals of W. dioica and W. biglandulosa among monomorphic taxa. If the observed placement of different populations of W. dioica is a consequence of plastid capture or failed coalescence, this may substantially mislead inference of ancestral states. It is possible that further sampling within Australian Wurmbea will reveal additional problems with species definitions. However, including additional unsampled species is unlikely to overturn our main finding from the current gene tree that sexual-system transitions in Wurmbea are frequent, because, except for the two remaining species of W. dioica, the remaining unsampled taxa appear to be all monomorphic for gender. Wherever these species are located in a better-sampled phylogeny, the various dimorphic terminals will still be substantially interspersed among monomorphic taxa.

It is worth considering how often failure to subsample from across a species’ geographic range may miss nonmonophyly of individual species. Two reviews of this phenomenon suggest that this may be a widespread phenomenon (Crisp and Chandler 1996; Funk and Omland 2003), and it seems especially probable in classically defined species that are geographically widespread and that have a high degree of phenotypic variation. Ironically, these kinds of groups, which provide multiple inferences of convergence for macroevolutionary studies (and therefore are most likely to cause problems in ancestral-state reconstructions as a result of character lability), are also those more likely to have been used in microevolutionary studies concerning the mechanisms responsible for evolutionary transitions. In comparisons involving recently evolved taxa, taking full account of the complexity of species boundaries is likely to be a critical problem for evolutionary biologists to resolve before using phylogenies to make accurate inferences about character transitions.
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### Table A1

#### Sexual System and Collection Localities of *Wurmbea* Species and Outgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon (tribe)</th>
<th>Geographic range</th>
<th>Sexual system</th>
<th>Collection locality</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>GenBank accession numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ndhF</em> <em>atpB-rbcL</em> <em>trnF</em> <em>psbA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wurmbea</em> (Anguillareae), Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. biglandulosa</em> ssp. <em>biglandulosa</em></td>
<td>NSW, Vic, ACT</td>
<td>M (1)</td>
<td>Rocky River, NSW</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>EU044643 EU044623 EU044698 EU044683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. biglandulosa</em> ssp. <em>biglandulosa</em></td>
<td>NSW, Vic, ACT</td>
<td>M (2)</td>
<td>Mt. Yarrowyck, NSW</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>EU044644 EU044618 EU044699 EU044681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. biglandulosa</em> ssp. <em>biglandulosa</em></td>
<td>NSW, Vic, ACT</td>
<td>D (3)</td>
<td>Warrumbungle, NSW</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>EU044645 EU044621 EU044700 EU044680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. biglandulosa</em> ssp. <em>biglandulosa</em></td>
<td>NSW, Vic, ACT</td>
<td>D (4)</td>
<td>Goonigall, NSW</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>EU044646 EU044620 EU044682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. biglandulosa</em> ssp. <em>flindersica</em></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mt. Remarkable, SA</td>
<td>AC9</td>
<td>EU044642 EU044598 EU044701 EU044667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. citrine</em></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Quorn, SA</td>
<td>AC34</td>
<td>EU044639 EU044596 EU044695 EU044664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. dioicassp. alba</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Brookton, WA</td>
<td>AC53</td>
<td>EU044633 EU044601 EU044705 EU044671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. dioica ssp. alba</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Eneabba, WA</td>
<td>AC38</td>
<td>EU044634 EU044600 EU044704 EU044670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. dioica ssp. dioica</em></td>
<td>SA, Vic, NSW, ACT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Burrenjuck Dam, NSW</td>
<td>AC13</td>
<td>EU044647 EU044594 EU044693 EU044662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. densiflora</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Murchison, WA</td>
<td>AC50</td>
<td>EU044632 EU044610 EU044711 EU044677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. dilatata</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kalbarri, WA</td>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>EU044637 EU044608 EU044712 EU044678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. drummondii</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Duck Pool, WA</td>
<td>AC17</td>
<td>EU044636 EU044606 EU044709 EU044675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. inframediana</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Overlander, WA</td>
<td>AC75</td>
<td>EU044638 EU044605 EU044708 EU044674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. latifolia ssp. latifolia</em></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Barunga Gap, SA</td>
<td>AC25</td>
<td>EU044640 EU044597 EU044696 EU044665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. latifolia ssp. vanessa</em></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Williamston, SA</td>
<td>AC29</td>
<td>EU044641 EU044599 EU044697 EU044666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. monantha</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Windy Harbour, WA</td>
<td>AC22</td>
<td>EU044652 EU044602 EU044702 EU044668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. murchisoniana</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Murchison, WA</td>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>EU044635 EU044604 EU044703 EU044669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. odorata</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Coral Bay, WA</td>
<td>AC68</td>
<td>EU044649 EU044611 EU044707 EU044673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. pygmaea</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Helena Valley, WA</td>
<td>AC77</td>
<td>AF547012 AY699143 EU044714 AY465384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. sinora</em></td>
<td>WA, SA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Venus Bay, SA</td>
<td>AC28</td>
<td>EU044540 EU044603 EU044706 EU044672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. tenella</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Murchison, WA</td>
<td>AC78</td>
<td>EU044631 EU044609 EU044713 EU044679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. tubulosa</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Guranu, WA</td>
<td>AC72</td>
<td>EU044651 EU044607 EU044710 EU044676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Outgroups</em> (tribe or family):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baeometra uniflora</em> (Baeometreae)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Strand-Gordons Bay, South Africa</td>
<td>LK1</td>
<td>EU044614 EU044692 EU044661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burchardia multiflora</em></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Darling, South Africa</td>
<td>LK2</td>
<td>EU044612 EU044690 EU044659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ilphigenia indica</em> (Ilphigeniae)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Little Lions Head, South Africa</td>
<td>LK3</td>
<td>EU044613 EU044691 EU044660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veronica spicata var. spicata</em></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Littler Lions Head, South Africa</td>
<td>LK3</td>
<td>EU044613 EU044691 EU044660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

Sexual systems are either monomorphic (M) or dimorphic (D) for gender. Locality and range abbreviations are: Western Australia (WA), South Australia (SA), New South Wales (NSW), Victoria (Vic), Australian Capital Territory (ACT), Northern Territory (NT), Queensland (Qld), and New Zealand (NZ). Vouchers for all WA species are deposited in the Western Australian Herbarium, South Perth (PERTH); the voucher for *Ilphigenia indica* is lodged at the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew (K); all other vouchers are in the Vascular Plant Herbarium, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto (TRT).
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