Editorial: Human and Evolutionary Genomics

Human Genomics has, from its outset, included a great deal of evolutionary analysis. The structure of the editorial board has representation from many evolution-based disciplines, including population and quantitative genetics, and of course, evolutionary genomics. This inclusion is the result of an obvious trend in the field of genomics to incorporate more and more evolutionary analysis, not just as an extra frill, but as a central component of the field. The world now has over one hundred complete bacterial genomes, and with human, roundworm, multiple fruitflies, mosquito, rice, *Arabidposis*, pufferfish, mouse, rat, dog, chimpanzee, chicken, and a growing number of other multicellular organisms either sequenced or imminent, comparative genomics is coming into its own. Still, one might argue that a journal of *Human Genomics* should focus on its main target, *Homo sapiens*, and leave aside mucking about with the multitude of other species on the planet, most of which many self-respecting *Homo sapiens* individuals might rather target with the bottom of their shoe rather than with a multimillion dollar sequencing project. As the evolutionary genomics editor, it seems necessary to provide some explanation and justification.

The short answer is that the sequence of the human genome is, by itself, of relatively little importance. Its value lies in the utility of the sequence data for figuring out what the genome does and how it operates. We can use the sequence in experiments to determine when, where, and how much a gene is expressed, how it is regulated to create functional effects via proteins or RNA, what its gene products interact with, and we can use it to quickly locate candidate loci affecting functions and traits of interest. But we want more than just a collection of observations, no matter how detailed: we want to understand the genome, to know why it is the way it is, and how it came to be. We want to know what it means, at the genomic level, to *be* humans, and for that we need to know what it means to be something else. Because so many differences in sequence do not matter, the listing of 3 billion human base pairs alone is not enough. We need to know which differences matter, and for that we need an evolutionary perspective. We need the chimpanzee (and the bonobo and gorilla and orangutans, please) to tell us what it means to be human, rather than just another great ape. We need gibbons and colubines, the tarsier and lemurs to tell us what it means to be a great ape, rather than just another primate, and we need the mouse, and rat, and dog, and cat, and cow, and rabbit, and tree shrew, to tell us what it means to be a primate.

In one of the more recent decisions by the National Human Genome Research Institute, we will soon have a marsupial (*Monodelphis domestica*, the Gray, Short-tailed Opossum; Amemiya et al., 2003) to tell us what it means to be eutherian, and presumably we will soon add a monotreme and perhaps another marsupial to solidify the answer. And we will need birds, snakes, lizards, turtles, and crocodiles to tell us what about our genome is critical in making us a mammal. Throughout our evolutionary history, as we became multicellular, developed vertebrae, learned to walk on land, and learned to reproduce away from water, we have made critical physiological, behavioral, and biochemical

leaps, all of which are reflected in our genome and in the genomes of others that shared the ride to various points of divergence.

From large-scale analyses of chromosome structure and rearrangement (see Murphy et al. in the first issue of *Human Genomics*) to fine-scale comparative analysis of individual repeat elements across the genome (see Batzer et al., 2003), the complete human genome is generating new approaches in evolutionary genomics that help us know what the human genome means. And while complete genomes add an obviously new dimension, evolutionary genomics is also expanding rapidly in its other dimension, the extent of biodiversity being sampled. Rapid increases in taxonomic sampling for large genomic regions are important to allow genetic assessment of the historical rate of evolution and functionality of genes and inter-genic regions (Pollock et al, 2000). From vertebrates alone, we now have around 300 complete mitochondrial genomes, and laboratories such as Eric Green's are extending this concept to increase sampling of biodiversity from targeted BACs across the nuclear genome. High taxonomic sampling density from many genes means dramatically more accurate phylogenies and dramatically more accurate models of evolution, and these genetic footprints (phylogenetic shadowing) lead to better functional predictions and annotations for the human genome. Evolutionary genomics provides a deeper understanding of *Human Genomics*, so scrape off your shoe and pop the goo in your sequencer: you may learn something about yourself.

Amemiya, C. T., J. M. Greally, R. L. Jirtle, E. S. Lander, K. Lindblad-Toh, R. D. Miller, D.D. Pollock, P. B. Samallow, M. S. Springer, and R. K. Wilson, "Proposal for complete sequencing of the genome of a Marsupial, the gray, short-tailed opossum, *Monodelphis domestica*." NHGRI White Paper, *(2003).*

Salem, A-H, D. A. Ray, J. Xing, P. A. Callinan, J. S. Myers, D. J. Hedges, R. K. Garber, D. J. Witherspoon, L. B. Jorde, and M. A. Batzer, "Alu elements and hominid phylogenetics", PNAS 100:12787-12791, 2003

Murphy et al, 2003, "", Human Genomics, 2003.

Pollock, D. D., J. A. Eisen, N. A. Doggett and M. P. Cummings, 2000 "A case for evolutionary genomics and the comprehensive examination of sequence biodiversity". Mol Biol Evol **17:** 1776-88.

David D. Pollock
Department of Biological Sciences
Computation and Visualization Center
Louisiana State University