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Summary

Transposable elements (TEs) represent an important fraction of plant genomes and are likely to play a pivotal role in fuelling genome reorganization and functional changes following allopolyploidization. Various processes associated with allopolyploidy (i.e. genetic redundancy, bottlenecks during the formation of allopolyploids or genome shock following genome merging) may allow accumulation of TE insertions. Our objective in carrying out a survey of the literature and a comparative analysis across different allopolyploid systems is to shed light on the structural, epigenetic and functional modifications driven by TEs during allopolyploidization and subsequent diploidization. The available evidence indicates that TE proliferation in the short or the long term after allopolyploidization may be restricted to a few TEs, in specific polyploid systems. By contrast, data indicate major structural changes in the TE genome fraction immediately after allopolyploidization, mainly through losses of TE sequences as a result of recombination. Emerging evidence also suggests that TEs are targeted by substantial epigenetic changes, which may impact gene expression and genome stability. Furthermore, TEs may directly or indirectly support the evolution of new functionalities in allopolyploids during diploidization. All data stress allopolyploidization as a shock associated with drastic genome reorganization. Mechanisms controlling TEs during allopolyploidization as well as their impact on diploidization are discussed.

Introduction

Transposable elements (TEs) are stretches of DNA that move around the genome and can be categorized into two main classes: retrotransposons, which move via RNA intermediates, and DNA transposons, which move via DNA intermediates (Wicker et al., 2007; Fig. 1). TE expression and mobility seem to respond to specific stimuli, such as...
stress conditions for plant long terminal repeat (LTR) retrotransposons (reviewed in Grandbastien et al., 2005). Given that TEs represent a major fraction of eukaryotic genomes, especially in plants, they can be substrates for unequal and illegitimate recombination and account for a variety of mutations such as deletions, insertions, frameshifts, inversions, translocations and duplications (Lonnig & Saedler, 2002). Therefore, TEs contribute greatly to structural repatterning of genomes through transposition and/or recombination (Vitte & Panaud, 2005). TEs can also affect gene expression and function by inserting into genic regions (Lockton & Gaut, 2009). As expression of TE sequences is usually controlled by epigenetic host regulation, TE insertions may indirectly participate in further regulation of gene expression (Slotkin & Martienssen, 2007). Given that TEs are highly mutagenic and silenced by overlapping epigenetic mechanisms, they are likely to play a pivotal role in fuelling genome reorganization and functional changes.

McClintock (1984) postulated that TE activation could play a significant role in genome changes under evolutionary challenges, such as interspecific crosses. Accordingly, allopolyploidization (i.e. the hybridization of divergent genomes associated with their doubling) is usually coupled with rapid structural and functional alterations of genomes (Leitch & Leitch, 2008), which seem to be especially dramatic in the repetitive component (Comai et al., 2003). While most allopolyploid genomes show extensive and reproducible restructuring in the first generations following their formation (e.g. Lim et al., 2007), some cases of near structural stasis have also been reported (e.g. Ainouche et al., 2009). Polyploidy is certainly one of the predominant challenges encountered by flowering plants, but our understanding of the origin and genetic processes underlying their rapid genome repatterning is far from comprehensive and the impact of TEs deserves attention.

Polyploidization has generally been assumed to induce a burst of transposition (Matzke & Matzke, 1998; Comai, 2000). Indeed, several nonexclusive processes associated with allopolyploidize the accumulation of TE insertions: genome doubling certainly relaxes purifying selection against deleterious TE insertions, which may result in apparent TE amplification in polyps (the Redundancy and Bottleneck hypotheses; Matzke & Matzke, 1998); polyploid formation usually involves an important reduction in effective population size, which may favor the fixation of neutral or moderately deleterious TE insertions through stochastic effects (the Bottleneck hypothesis; Lynch, 2007); hybridization between divergent genomes and polyploidization may represent a shock activating TEs and hence promoting transposition (the Genome Shock hypothesis; McClintock, 1984). While the Redundancy and Bottleneck hypotheses build on the evolutionary fate of inserted TEs, only the Genome Shock hypothesis assumes a polyploidy-induced change in TE activity per se (i.e. expression and transposition). However, if redundancy alone affects the observed rate of transposition, active TEs would show nearly continuous accumulation after polyploidization until full diploidization is reached. By contrast, a discrete burst of transposition is expected under the Bottleneck or Genome Shock hypothesis. A transient reduction in population size or shock-induced TE activation would indeed promote TE dynamics in the first generations after polyploidization, dynamics that would then be damped down as the population expanded. It should be possible to determine whether bursts of instability originate from bottlenecks or from genome shocks by considering different TE families, because a bottleneck is a demographic process influencing the whole

Fig. 1 Transposable elements (TEs) frequently observed in plant genomes. Class I TEs or retrotransposons move via RNA intermediates by a ‘copy-and-paste’ mechanism. Retrotransposons bordered by long terminal repeats (LTRs) are further divided into Copia and Gypsy according to the architecture of their coding sequence. Terminal-repeat retrotransposons in miniature (TRIMs) lack coding sequences and thus are nonautonomous. Non-LTR retrotransposons are divided into long and short interspersed nuclear elements (LINE and SINE, respectively). Class II TEs or DNA transposons move via DNA intermediates, by either a ‘cut-and-paste’ mechanism or replication of the DNA copy. Most transposons are bordered by terminal inverted repeats (TIRs) and are either autonomous or nonautonomous. Miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements (MITEs) represent a heterogeneous group of very short TEs. Helitrons are TEs that replicate via a rolling-circle mechanism. GAG, capsid protein; PR, protease; INT, integrase; RT, reverse transcriptase; RNAse, ribonuclease H; RPA, replication protein A; HEL, helicase. See Wicker et al. (2007) for a comprehensive description.
genome similarly (including most TE families), while a genome shock response is expected to affect specific TE families only.

In this paper, we review recent insights emerging from the analysis of different allopolyploid systems at different evolutionary time scales. More specifically, our aims here are: to evaluate patterns of TE dynamics after allopolyploidization to shed light on the processes underlying genome plasticity; and to explore the multiple mechanisms through which TE-induced genome reorganization may contribute to the evolution of allopolyploid genomes.

Short-term changes in the TE genome fractions of polyploids

Newly synthesized or recent (less than few hundred years old) allopolyploids allow one to examine immediate responses to allopolyploidy (short-term ‘revolutionary’ changes as defined by Feldman & Levy, 2009), and to distinguish the respective impacts of genome merging and genome doubling. Accordingly, allopolyploidy-induced genome reorganization associated with TEs can be quantified by comparing the organization of TE genome fractions in parental and nascent allopolyploid lineages using transposon display strategies. Transposon displays, such as sequence-specific amplified polymorphism (SSAP; Waugh et al., 1997), simultaneously amplify multiple TE insertions throughout the genome, allowing one to visualize the gain and loss of fragments in hybrids and allopolyploids and to detect whether reorganization in TE fractions mainly affects a particular parental subgenome (Fig. 2). Results from such investigations in various allopolyploid systems are reported in Table 1.

Transposition burst immediately after allopolyploidy?

Polyploid-specific SSAP fragments that are not present in the parental diploids (Fig. 2) are often considered as indicative of transposition. This assumption is not, however, always valid as new SSAP fragments may also result from molecular changes at insertion sites that modify the size of the amplification product, and assessment of the transpositional nature of new SSAP bands requires experimental validation (Petit et al., 2010).

No evidence for transposition was reported in synthetic allopolyploids resulting from the doubling of a cross between Arabidopsis thaliana and Arabidopsis lyrata subsp. petraea, up to the third generation (Beaulieu et al., 2009). Also, all TE insertions were found to be fixed in the recent allopolyploid Arabidopsis suecica, providing indirect evidence for the absence of a transposition burst after allopolyploidization (Hazzouri et al., 2008). By contrast, limited evidence gathered from various polyploids of A. thaliana and Arabidopsis arenosa suggested transposition events involving Sunfish transposons (Madlung et al., 2005).

Investigation of the 150-yr-old allopolyploid Spartina anglica yielded little evidence of transposition in natural populations. Comparisons of the SSAP profiles of the parental species (Spartina alterniflora and Spartina maritima), the F1 homoploid hybrids (Spartina × neyrautii and Spartina

---

**Fig. 2** Principle of the sequence-specific amplified polymorphism (SSAP) transposon display strategy. (a) Schematic representation of the SSAP procedure. This transposable element (TE)-anchored PCR strategy allows the simultaneous detection of labeled fragments containing the termini of inserted copies of a given TE and its flanking genomic region up to the nearest restriction site. (b) Schematic representation of commonly observed SSAP fragment patterns. F1 hybrids and/or allopolyploids are expected to present profiles additive to those of their progenitor parents. Deviation from additivity corresponds to structural changes in the TE genome fraction. (c) Example of SSAP profiles with Tnt1 in the allopolyploid Nicotiana tabacum (various landraces) and its diploid progenitors Nicotiana sylvestris (syl) and Nicotiana tomentosiformis (tom) (Petit et al., 2007).
Table 1  Current data on the reorganization of the transposable element (TE) genome fraction after allopolyploidy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model species</th>
<th>TEs</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Loss of TE sequences</th>
<th>Transcriptional and epigenetic changes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term reorganization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabidopsis thaliana × Arabidopsis arenosa</td>
<td>Sunfish</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Epigenetic changes and transcriptional activation</td>
<td>Madlung et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabidopsis thaliana × Arabidopsis lyrata (F1/S0, S1, S2)</td>
<td>CAC and Ac-III</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+ (P)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Beaulieu et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartina alterniflora × Spartina maritima (F1)</td>
<td>Wis-like, Cassandra and Ins2</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>++ (M)</td>
<td>++ (methylation levels)</td>
<td>Parisod et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartina alterniflora × Spartina maritima (SO = Spartina anglica)</td>
<td>Wis-like, Cassandra and Ins2</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ε (M)</td>
<td>+ (methylation levels)</td>
<td>Parisod et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotiana sylvestris × Nicotiana tomentosiformis (F1/S0)</td>
<td>Tnt1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Petit et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotiana sylvestris × Nicotiana tomentosiformis (S4)</td>
<td>Tnt1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++ (P)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Petit et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegilops sharonensis × Triticum monococcum (S1)</td>
<td>Wis 2-1A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Transcriptional activation</td>
<td>Kashaush et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triticum turgidum × Aegilops tauschii (S0, S1, S2)</td>
<td>Retrotransposons and CACTA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Epigenetic changes and transcriptional activation</td>
<td>Mestri et al. (unpublished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassica rapa × Brassica oleracea</td>
<td>Athila-like and MITEs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>V. Sarilar &amp; K. Alix (unpublished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term reorganization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotiana tabacum (Nicotiana sylvestris × Nicotiana tomentosiformis)</td>
<td>Tnt1, Tnt2 and Tto1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++ (P for Tnt2)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Petit et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassica napus</td>
<td>CACTA Bot1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Alix et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossypium hirsutum (Gossypium arboreum × Gossypium raimondii)</td>
<td>Various TEs</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>+++ (M)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Zhao et al. (1998); Grover et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oryza minuta (Oryza punctata × Oryza officinalis)</td>
<td>Various TEs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++ (M)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Lu et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triticum aestivum (Triticum turgidum × Aegilops tauschii)</td>
<td>Various TEs</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Chantret et al. (2005); Charles et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-, no evidence; ε, ≤ 5%; +, 5–10%; ++, 10–40%; ++++, > 40%; NE, not evaluated.
P, paternal; M, maternal, referring to the parental origin of the TE sequences predominantly lost.
× townsendii) and the allopolyploid revealed only a few possible new TE insertions, suggesting that a transposition burst did not occur in the TE families investigated (Parisod et al., 2009). In synthetic allopolyploid wheat (Aegilops sharonensis × Triticum monococcum), Kashkush et al. (2003) screened 1000 insertion sites of the retrotransposon Wits-2-1A but reported no evidence of polyploidy-induced transposition. Similarly, the organization of seven retrotransposons and one CACTA transposon in synthetic allohexaploid wheat (Triticum aestivum) revealed no evidence of de novo insertions in the first three generations (Mestiri et al., unpublished).

In resynthesized allopolyploids of Nicotiana tabacum (Nicotiana sylvestris × Nicotiana tomentosiformis), amplification of the Tnt1 retrotransposon was detected (Petit et al., 2010). Interestingly, TE proliferation was detected mostly for young and active Tnt1 elements, indicating that activation in response to allopolyploidy may be restricted to a few specific TE populations. However, there was evidence of transposition in neither newly synthesized F1 homoplaid hybrids nor artificially doubled lineages (S0), but only in distinctive synthetic allopolyploids of the fourth generation (S4), suggesting that TE activation may not be immediate and may require meiosis (S0 to S1) during which homoeologous genomes may interact (Petit et al., 2010).

In summary, few surveys have found evidence of a TE transposition burst immediately after allopolyploidization (Table 1), suggesting that triggering of TE mobility is not a common phenomenon and may be restricted to specific TE families in particular allopolyploids, and to mostly young active TE populations.

Structural changes in TE genome fractions immediately after allopolyploidy

Further rearrangements in TE sequences can be indicated by SSAP fragment losses. While such losses may be caused by excisions of DNA transposons, such restructuring is also frequently found with retrotransposons that do not excise, and the nature of genetic changes leading to fragment losses is often hard to determine. Fragment losses may be due to indels at TE insertion sites or rearrangements encompassing TE insertion sites (Petit et al., 2010). Loss of fragments has been reported in most polyploids and is always more frequent than putative TE transpositions (Table 1).

In synthetic allohexaploid wheat, 186 insertions characterized in the progenitor genomes from various TEs showed additive patterns of amplification when checked for deletion by direct PCR, indicating no major short-term rearrangements (Mestiri et al., unpublished). When different resynthesized Brassica napus allotetraploids are compared with their diploid progenitors (Brassica rapa and Brassica oleracea), work in progress indicates that genome reorganization seems to be dependent on the TE considered (V. Sarilar & K. Alix, unpublished). A pericentromeric retrotransposon (Athila-like) generates mostly additive SSAP profiles, while an interstitial miniature inverted-repeat transposable element (MITE) yields up to 20% nonadditive SSAP fragments, notably in the more advanced generations after allopolyploidy. Transposition events were only rarely identified; most reorganization apparently includes other types of restructuring in the TE fraction.

In resynthesized Nicotiana tabacum, structural changes after polyploidization were predominantly losses of SSAP fragments of paternal origin (Petit et al., 2010). By contrast, losses of SSAP fragments of maternal origin seem to predominate in S. anglica (Parisod et al., 2009). In the latter case, changes in TE genome fractions mostly occurred after hybridization rather than genome doubling and differentially affected sequences near TEs (SSAP) as compared with random sequences (amplified fragment length polymorphism: AFLP), suggesting TE-specific genome reorganization associated with genome merging.

Thus, the first generations following polyploidization seem to be characterized by substantial structural rearrangements in the TE fraction, usually targeting chiefly one parental subgenome.

Epigenetic reorganization and transcriptional activation in the TE genome fraction of nascent allopolyploids

Drastic epigenetic and expression changes have been reported immediately after allopolyploidization, and epigenetic changes, such as changes of DNA methylation affecting the TE genome fraction, and their putative relationship to TE expression, are increasingly documented (Comai et al., 2003; Josefsson et al., 2006; Michalak, 2009). Increased expression of TEs was found in synthetic allopolyploid wheat (Kashkush et al., 2002) and Arabidopsis (Madlung et al., 2005), but did not seem to be regularly associated with increased transposition. However, epigenetic changes enhancing TE expression after polyploidization might have pervasive effects across the genome by rewiring gene expression networks. In wheat, alteration in gene expression (either activation or silencing) through transcriptional activation of retrotransposons was demonstrated (Kashkush et al., 2003), showing that epigenetic changes in the vicinity of TE insertions also participate in reorganizing the functional genome after polyploidization.

The young allopolyploid S. anglica was recently investigated by SSAP using enzymes with differential sensitivity to DNA methylation (Parisod et al., 2009). Methylation changes were significantly more frequent around TE insertions as compared with random sequences and predominantly affected the maternal subgenome. This reorganization mainly occurred just after hybridization, suggesting that TEs fuel epigenetic alterations at the merging
of diverged genomes. Whether methylation changes around TEs also affect gene expression remains an open question, but preliminary observations suggest that transcriptional changes following allopolyploidization may occur in the vicinity of TEs (H. Chelaiâ & M. Ainouche, unpublished).

As a whole, epigenetic changes induced by polyploidy seem to widely and specifically affect TE genome fractions, suggesting connections with possible structural reorganization of the genome through TE activation. Furthermore, TEs also mediate epigenetic influences and may transfer them to neighboring sequences, generating heritable variation in gene expression (Slotkin & Martienssen, 2007).

Impact of TEs on the long-term reorganization of allopolyploid genomes

Long-term ‘evolutionary’ changes as defined by Feldman & Levy (2009) are usually studied in natural counterparts of synthetic hybrids or in related species resulting from allopolyploidy events occurring a few thousands to millions of years ago. Such comparative approaches in current species provide detailed information about the long-term dynamics of TEs during diploidization. However, adopting a genome-wide perspective within a well-defined phylogenetic framework is difficult, notably because the life-span of TE insertions is c. 3 Myr in most model systems (Vitte & Panaud, 2005), limiting the power of transposon display strategies. As a consequence, most studies have relied on the sequencing of orthologous loci in parental and derived allopolyploids, and our understanding of diploidization is presently limited to selected genomic regions. Nevertheless, this latter approach has the advantage of quantifying all existing TE insertions present in these regions and allowing accurate inferences about the nature of genetic changes.

Structural changes in the TE genome fraction of established allopolyploids

The combination of molecular cytogenetics and SSAP in various allopolyploid Nicotiana species highlighted the impact of repetitive sequences on the long-term diploidization of genomes (Lim et al., 2007). Recent Nicotiana allopolyploid species (up to 200 kyr old) such as tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum) show partial restructuring in TE genome fractions, with gains and losses of SSAP fragments (Petit et al., 2007). As in resynthesized allopolyploids, the proportion of new fragments in natural tobacco was found to be higher for young active retrotransposon populations, suggesting amplification events (Petit et al., 2007). Furthermore, losses of SSAP fragments clearly are more frequent than possible transpositions. In older Nicotiana allopolyploids, such as Nicotiana quadristalvis (c. 1 Myr old) and Nicotiana neophila (c. 4.5 Myr old), evidence of considerable exchange of repetitive sequences between subgenomes has been found (Lim et al., 2007). Thus, a nearly complete turnover of intergenic regions occurred in less than 5 Myr in Nicotiana allopolyploids. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that the differential proliferation and removal of various repetitive sequences played an important role in the structural differentiation of homoeologous genomes within a conserved karyotype structure.

By contrast, analysis of three diploid Brassica species (Brassica rapa, Brassica oleracea and Brassica nigra) and the three corresponding allopolyploids (Brassica napus, Brassica carinata and Brassica juncea) did not reveal any particular retrotransposon proliferation in the allopolyploids (Alix & Heslop-Harrison, 2004). In addition, Alix et al. (2008) characterized a Brassica C-genome-specific CACTA transposon (Bot1) that played a major role in genome divergence at the diploid level. Cytogenetic evidence revealed no spreading of Bot1 to the other subgenome in the recent allopolyploid B. napus, suggesting that, in Brassica, polyploidization was not correlated to activation of TEs, or that homogenization of TE insertions had not yet occurred.

In cotton, molecular cytogenetic studies in Gossypium arboreum, Gossypium raimondii and the 1.2-Myr-old allopolyploid Gossypium hirsutum have demonstrated that different TEs spread from one to the other subgenome after allopolyploidization (Zhao et al., 1998). Comparative analysis of the alcohol dehydrogenase A (AdhA) locus in the same species revealed breaks of microsynteny between the diploid genomes to be mostly attributable to insertions of Gypsy retrotransposons (Grover et al., 2007). However, this study found no marked difference in TE activity across the ploidy levels in Gossypium (Table 1). Indeed, the dynamics at two loci (AdhA and cellulose synthase; CesA) revealed that structural changes in the allopolyploid were frequently small deletions in TE sequences (Grover et al., 2008). Thus, diploid genomes were characterized by overall growth, while homoeologous genomes in the polyploid showed an increased rate of deletion and a reduced rate of insertion (i.e. contraction). Lu et al. (2009) compared the MONOCULM1 region of the diploids Oryza punctata and Oryza officinalis with that of the c. 2-Myr-old allopolyploid Oryza minuta, and found restructuring of the TE fraction in the allopolyploid, including several specific insertions and losses of TE sequences. The fate of TE insertions seems dependent on the parental origin, as most of the TE insertions that were not fully transmitted to the polyploid were of paternal origin.

The genomes of hexaploid wheat diverged less than 3 Myr ago, and the sequencing of 10 genomic regions showed that they are c. 90% divergent as a result of differential proliferation of TE families (Charles et al., 2008). After an ancestral proliferation of Athila-like retrotransposons, specific amplification of Copia and of Gypsy retrotransposons fuelled the divergence of genomes before
allopolyplodization. However, genome merging appears to have neither enhanced nor repressed transposition, which persisted at the same rate in diploid and allopolyploid species. By contrast, the different subgenomes of the hexaploid wheat presented extensive deletions in TE sequences as compared with their diploid progenitors, suggesting that TEs facilitate unequal or illegitimate recombination (Chantret et al., 2005). Given that data gathered using transposon display provided similar evidence (Bento et al., 2008), TEs are strongly suggested to mediate deletions and rearrangements in response to changes in ploidy levels.

In polyploid maize (Zea mays) (c. 10 Myr old), sequence comparison among diverged lineages revealed surprisingly variable arrangements of TE insertions in intergenic regions (Bruggmann et al., 2006). Many TE insertions seem to have occurred after polyploidization, suggesting amplification. A recent study showed extensive recombination in the abundant CRM1 retrotransposon of maize, suggesting that the acquisition of advantageous mutations in TE sequences might account for their proliferation (Sharma et al., 2008). The authors speculated that allopolyploidy might sustain inter-element recombination by bringing together TEs that evolved in different backgrounds and thus promote TE amplification. Studies in maize also revealed dramatic expansion and contraction of different portions of the genome under the influence of differential TE insertions/deletions and gene translocations, indicating that genome plasticity and turnover of intergenic regions might be largely controlled by TEs during diploidization.

Although genome downsizing after polyploidization appears to be a general trend, mechanisms underlying DNA sequence elimination remain largely unknown (Leitch & Bennett, 2004). Intrastrand recombination between retrotransposon LTRs would adequately remove substantial pieces of DNA and counteract genome expansion through transposition (Vitte & Panaud, 2005). However, illegitimate recombination, which only requires small homologous motifs, might be one of the dominant mechanisms for genome contraction after polyploidization. Although it mainly creates small deletions, comparative sequencing has revealed a multitude of truncated TE insertions and experimental evidence suggesting illegitimate recombination as a major process in genome restructuring during diploidization is accumulating (see Chantret et al., 2005).

**Impact of allopolyploidy on TE fractions and genome reorganization**

The available evidence demonstrates considerable reorganization of the TE genome fraction after allopolyploidy. However, in contrast to the assumption that polyploidy induces spectacular bursts of transposition, only a small proportion of TEs showed increased insertional activity as compared with other types of structural changes in the TE genome fraction. Indeed, our survey of the literature suggests that allopolyploidization activates TE expression, but that transposition of particular TEs impacts the short- or the long-term evolution of allopolyploid genomes in only a few allopolyploid systems. By contrast, the studies we found in the literature mainly reported immediate loss of TE sequences and epigenetic repatterning in TE fractions after allopolyploidy. Furthermore, such reorganization usually seems targeted toward TE insertions from one subgenome. Discounting a significant role of either relaxed selection against TE insertions, as postulated by the Redundancy hypothesis, or evolutionary stochasticity, as assumed by the Bottleneck hypothesis, this pattern suggests that allopolyploidy is a major genome shock associated with drastic structural and epigenetic reorganization in the TE fraction, possibly to overcome incompatibilities unmasked by hybridization (McClintock, 1984; Comai et al., 2003).

Immediate reorganization of TE sequences suggests that TEs play a central role during the early stage of allopolyploid evolution, and two nonexclusive hypotheses might explain the observed bursts of instability. On the one hand, prevailing restructuring of the TE fraction may simply reflect nontargeted DNA lesions resulting from failed chromosome pairing between homologous chromosomes at the first meiosis of the hybrid structure, which could primarily reflect on TEs since they are major genome components. Additionally, epigenetic changes predominate around TE insertions compared with random sequences (e.g. Parisod et al., 2009) and decreased methylation in response to stress.

**Long-term impact of TEs on the functioning of allopolyploid genomes**

Recent studies illustrate the multiple mechanisms through which TEs regulate gene expression and function (Kashkush et al., 2003; Bennetzen, 2005), and ultimately phenotypes. In addition, an indirect impact of TE-generated rearrangements on phenotypes has also been reported. For instance, unequal or illegitimate recombination implicating different TEs has driven the recurrent deletion of the Hardness locus, which controls grain hardness in wheat, in different subgenomes of various polyploid wheat species (Chantret et al., 2005). Given the high mutagenic nature of TEs, insertions may also allow duplicated genes to explore pioneering evolutionary trajectories and turn into beneficial innovation. A reasonable fraction of TE insertions might indeed affect regulatory sequences or coding portions of genes, some of which may be adaptive and account for the subfunctionalization or neofunctionalization of duplicates (Walsh, 2003). Although various mechanisms through which TEs might promote subfunctionalization or neofunctionalization have been demonstrated (Bennetzen, 2005), the extent to which TEs contribute to functional evolution according to this appealing model remains an open question in polyploids.
has been associated with increased levels of recombination (Boyko et al., 2007). Genome rearrangements in the TE fraction of nascent allopolyploids might thus result from temporal overlap between TE activation and the formation of DNA lesions. On the other hand, it is also tempting to speculate that a shock-induced burst of transposition would be deleterious and that viable polyploids would have circumvented proliferation by immediately repressing TEs. This could be achieved through both structural changes and reorganization of epigenetic marks in TE sequences. Indeed, overcoming incompatibilities related to parent-specific TE fractions and achieving proper development of hybrid zygotes requires balanced proportions of interacting components (Josefsson et al., 2006; Michalak, 2009). For instance, insufficient quantities of repressing factors (such as small interfering RNAs) to saturate quiescent TEs could translate into TE activation and a burst of transposition (Fig. 3). As only the female parent immediately contributes to cytoplasmic TE repressing factors, it is possible that such incompatibilities may induce asymmetrical reorganizing among the subgenomes. Such a dosage-dependent process could be accentuated in the triploid endosperm tissue (where the maternal genome contributes twice as much material as the paternal genome), which is crucial for seed viability. In this context, restructuring of TE sequences may add to epigenetic silencing in repressing excess TEs from transposition after allopolyploidization.

Although TEs are likely to be pivotal players during the diploidization process, little is actually known about their long-term impact on allopolyploid genomes. TEs may have played a major role during structural diploidization, as found in Nicotiana (Lim et al., 2007) or maize (Bruggmann et al., 2006), because extensive reorganization of the TE genome fraction as a result of recombination and, to a lesser extent, transposition is likely to break microsynteny and may increase the differentiation between homoeologous genomes. TEs may also fuel functional diploidization by supporting various types of rearrangements with potential implications for gene function and expression (Bennetzen, 2005).

To summarize, the effect of allopolyploidy on TE genome fractions may be more complex than generally assumed. As TEs are abundant and dispersed throughout genomes, they predispose a young allopolyploid genome to rapid shuffling, participating in natural genetic engineering and producing abundant raw material for adaptive evolution at a crucial moment. These effects of TEs warrant more detailed study in the future.
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