Reply to Nozawa et al.: Complementary statistical methods support positive selection of a duplicated UV opsin gene in *Heliconius*

Statistical methods used to test for positive selection have a long history and continue to evolve (1–4). In their letter, Nozawa et al. (5) question our use of the branch-site method in our recent paper in PNAS (6). As experimental biologists, we welcome all methods that facilitate the detection of interesting parts of the genome for functional exploration. In this case, a statistically significant result using the branch-site method combined with structural modeling and the identification of a few biochemically relevant substitutions provided us with an incentive for the in vivo physiological characterization of the UV-sensitive rhodopsins in *Heliconius*. Had we not had that first hint from sequence data alone, it is unlikely that we would have made that functional discovery, which makes the eyes of *Heliconius* unique compared with all other studied butterflies.

In turn, the finding of two spectrally distinct UV-sensitive rhodopsins gave us an incentive to make an even more interesting biological observation: namely, that *Heliconius* butterflies have evolved the capacity to display UV-yellow colors on their wings in contrast to the yellow colors displayed on the wings of close relatives lacking the UV opsin duplicate. Visual modeling of how butterflies perceive color indicates this has resulted in an expansion of the number of distinctive colors on *Heliconius* wings. If *Heliconius* do indeed use the two functionally distinct UV-sensitive rhodopsins together in the context of species recognition, then this might help explain why *Heliconius* are an example of an adaptive radiation, whereas their close relatives have remained more limited in species number

and wing-color pattern variety. Last, we note that although the major findings of our paper do not rest on statistics alone, application of the small-sample method (1) to an expanded collection of sequences does indeed support the robustness of our initial result using the branch-site method.

In isolation, none of these individual observations would have much meaning, but together, they paint a fascinating picture of the biology of these beautiful butterflies. We look forward to applying statistical work by Nozawa et al. and Yang et al. (2–5) in this field to our system.

Adriana D. Briscoe^{a,1}, Seth M. Bybee^a, Gary D. Bernard^b, Furong Yuan^a, Marilou P. Sison-Mangus^a, Robert D. Reed^a, Andrew D. Warren^c, Jorge Llorente-Bousquets^d, and Chuan-Chin Chiao^e

^aDepartment of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697; ^bDepartment of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195; ^cMcGuire Center for Lepidoptera and Biodiversity, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611; ^dMuseo de Zoología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, CP 04510, DF, Mexico; and ^eDepartment of Life Science, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan

- Zhang J, Kumar S, Nei M (1997) Small-sample tests of episodic adaptive evolution: A case study of primate lysozymes. Mol Biol Evol 14:1335–1338.
- Nozawa M, Suzuki Y, Nei M (2009) Reliabilities of identifying positive selection by the branch-site and the site-prediction methods. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106:6700–6705.
- Yang ZH, Nielsen R, Goldman N (2009) In defense of statistical methods for detecting positive selection. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106:E95.
- Nozawa M, Suzuki Y, Nei M (2009) Response to Yang et al.: Problems with Bayesian methods of detecting positive selection at the DNA sequence level. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106:E96.
- Nozawa M, Suzuki Y, Nei M (2010) Is positive selection responsible for the evolution of a duplicate UV-sensitive opsin gene in *Heliconius* butterflies? *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107:E96.
- Briscoe AD, et al. (2010) Positive selection of a duplicated UV-sensitive visual pigment coincides with wing pigment evolution in *Heliconius* butterflies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107:3628–3633.

Author contributions: A.D.B., S.M.B., G.D.B., F.Y., M.P.S.-M., R.D.R., A.D.W., J.L.-B., and C.-C.C. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: abriscoe@uci.edu.