

evolution CONNECTION

The Evolution of the Coelom

One of the first steps in the classification of animals is to examine the animal's body. One structure that is used in classification of animals is the body cavity or coelom. The body cavity develops *within* the mesoderm, so only triploblastic animals can have body cavities. Therefore body cavities are found only within the Bilateria. In other animal clades, the gut is either close to the body wall or separated from it by a jelly-like material. The body cavity is important for two reasons. Fluid within the body cavity protects the organs from shock and compression. In addition, since in triploblastic embryos, most muscle, connective tissue, and blood vessels develop from mesoderm, these tissues developing within the lining of the body cavity can reinforce the gut and body wall, aid in motility, and efficiently circulate nutrients.

To recap what we have discussed above, animals that do not have a coelom are called *acoelomates*. The major acoelomate group in the Bilateria is the flatworms, including both free-living and parasitic forms such as tapeworms. In these animals, mesenchyme fills the space between the gut and the body wall. Although two layers of muscle are found just under the epidermis, there is no muscle or other mesodermal tissue around the gut. Flatworms rely on passive diffusion for nutrient transport across their body.

In *pseudocoelomates*, there is a body cavity between the gut and the body wall, but only the body wall has mesodermal tissue. In these animals, the mesoderm forms, but does not develop cavities within it. Major pseudocoelomate phyla are the rotifers and nematodes. Animals that have a true coelom are called *eucoelomates*; all vertebrates, as well as molluscs, annelids, arthropods, and echinoderms, are eucoelomates. The coelom develops within the mesoderm during embryogenesis. Of the major bilaterian phyla, the molluscs, annelids, and arthropods are *schizocoels*, in which the mesoderm splits to form the body cavity, while the echinoderms and chordates are *enterocoels*, in which the mesoderm forms as two or more buds off of the gut. These buds separate from the gut and coalesce to form the body cavity. In the vertebrates, mammals have a subdivided body cavity, with the thoracic cavity separated from the abdominal cavity. The pseudocoelomates may have had eucoelomate ancestors and may have lost their ability to form a complete coelom through genetic mutations. Thus, this step in early embryogenesis—the formation of the coelom—has had a large evolutionary impact on the various species of the animal kingdom.

27.3 | Animal Phylogeny

By the end of this section, you will be able to do the following:

- Interpret the metazoan phylogenetic tree
- Describe the types of data that scientists use to construct and revise animal phylogeny
- List some of the relationships within the modern phylogenetic tree that have been discovered as a result of modern molecular data

Biologists strive to understand the evolutionary history and relationships of members of the animal kingdom, and all of life, for that matter. The study of *phylogeny* (the branching sequence of evolution) aims to determine the evolutionary relationships between phyla. Currently, most biologists divide the animal kingdom into 35 to 40 phyla. Scientists develop phylogenetic trees, which serve as *hypotheses* about which species have evolved from which ancestors.

Recall that until recently, only morphological characteristics and the fossil record were used to determine phylogenetic relationships among animals. Scientific understanding of the distinctions and hierarchies between anatomical characteristics provided much of this knowledge. Used alone, however, this information can be misleading. Morphological characteristics (such as skin color, body shape, etc.) may evolve multiple times, and independently, through evolutionary history. Analogous characteristics may appear similar between animals, but their underlying evolution may be very different. With the advancement of *molecular technologies*, modern phylogenetics is now informed by genetic and molecular analyses, in addition to traditional morphological and fossil data. With a growing understanding of genetics, the animal evolutionary tree has changed substantially

and continues to change as new DNA and RNA analyses are performed on additional animal species.

Constructing an Animal Phylogenetic Tree

The current understanding of evolutionary relationships among animal, or **Metazoa**, phyla begins with the distinction between animals with *true differentiated tissues*, called **Eumetazoa**, and animal phyla that do not have true differentiated tissues, such as the sponges (**Porifera**) and the Placozoa. Similarities between the feeding cells of sponges (choanocytes) and choanoflagellate protists (**Figure 27.12**) have been used to suggest that Metazoa evolved from a common ancestral organism that resembled the modern colonial choanoflagellates.




Figure 27.12 Choanoflagellates and choanocytes. Cells of the protist choanoflagellate clade closely resemble sponge choanocyte cells. Beating of choanocyte flagella draws water through the sponge so that nutrients can be extracted and waste removed.

Eumetazoa are subdivided into radially symmetrical animals and bilaterally symmetrical animals, and are thus classified into the clades Bilateria and Radiata, respectively. As mentioned earlier, the cnidarians and ctenophores are animal phyla with true radial, biradial, or rotational symmetry. All other Eumetazoa are members of the Bilateria clade. The bilaterally symmetrical animals are further divided into deuterostomes (including chordates and echinoderms) and two distinct clades of protostomes (including ecdysozoans and lophotrochozoans) (**Figure 27.13a,b**). **Ecdysozoa** includes nematodes and arthropods; they are so named for a commonly found characteristic among the group: the physiological process of exoskeletal *molting* followed by the “stripping” of the outer cuticular layer, called *ecdysis*. **Lophotrochozoa** is named for two structural features, each common to certain phyla within the clade. Some lophotrochozoan phyla are characterized by a larval stage called *trochophore larvae*, and other phyla are characterized by the presence of a feeding structure called a *lophophore* (thus, the shorter term, “lopho-trocho-zoa”).



Figure 27.13 Ecdysozoa. Animals that molt their exoskeletons, such as these (a) Madagascar hissing cockroaches, are in the clade Ecdysozoa. (b) Phoronids are in the clade Lophotrochozoa. The tentacles are part of a feeding structure called a lophophore. (credit a: modification of work by Whitney Cranshaw, Colorado State University, Bugwood.org; credit b: modification of work by NOAA)



Explore an interactive **tree** (http://openstaxcollege.org//tree_of_life2) of life here. Zoom and click to learn more about the organisms and their evolutionary relationships.

Modern Advances in Phylogenetic Understanding Come from Molecular Analyses

The phylogenetic groupings are continually being debated and refined by evolutionary biologists. Each year, new evidence emerges that further alters the relationships described by a phylogenetic tree diagram.



Watch the following **video** (http://openstaxcollege.org//build_phylogeny) to learn how biologists use genetic data to determine relationships among organisms.

Nucleic acid and protein analyses have greatly modified and refined the modern phylogenetic animal tree. These data come from a variety of molecular sources, such as mitochondrial DNA, nuclear DNA, ribosomal RNA (rRNA), and certain cellular proteins. Many evolutionary relationships in the modern tree have only recently been determined from the molecular evidence. For example, a previously classified group of animals called lophophorates, which included brachiopods and bryozoans, were long-thought to be primitive deuterostomes. Extensive molecular analysis using rRNA data found these animals are actually protostomes, more closely related to annelids and mollusks. This discovery allowed for the distinction of the protostome clade Lophotrochozoa. Molecular data have also shed light on some differences within the lophotrochozoan group, and the placement of the Platyhelminthes is particularly problematic. Some scientists believe that the phyla Platyhelminthes and Rotifera should actually belong to their own clade of protostomes termed Platyzoa.

Molecular research similar to the discoveries that brought about the distinction of the lophotrochozoan clade has also revealed a dramatic rearrangement of the relationships between mollusks, annelids, arthropods, and nematodes, and as a result, a new ecdysozoan clade was formed. Due to morphological similarities in their segmented body types, annelids and arthropods were once thought to be closely related. However, molecular evidence has revealed that arthropods are actually more closely related to nematodes, now comprising the ecdysozoan clade, and annelids are more closely related to mollusks, brachiopods, and other phyla in the lophotrochozoan clade. These two clades now make up the protostomes.

Another change to former phylogenetic groupings because of modern molecular analyses includes the emergence of an entirely new phylum of worm called Acoelomorpha. These acoel flatworms were long thought to belong to the phylum Platyhelminthes because of their similar “flatworm” morphology. However, molecular analyses revealed this to be a false relationship and originally suggested that acoels represented living species of some of the earliest divergent bilaterians. More recent research into the acoelomorphs has called this hypothesis into question and suggested that the acoels are more closely related to deuterostomes. The placement of this new phylum remains disputed, but scientists agree that with sufficient molecular data, their true phylogeny will be determined.

Another example of phylogenetic reorganization involves the identification of the Ctenophora as the basal clade of the animal kingdom. Ctenophora, or comb jellies, were once considered to be a sister group of the Cnidaria, and the sponges (Porifera) were placed as the basal animal group, sister to other animals. The presence of nerve and muscle cells in both the Ctenophores and the Cnidaria and their absence in the Porifera strengthened this view of the relationships among simple animal forms. However, recent molecular analysis has shown that

many of the genes that support neural development in other animals are absent from the Ctenophore genome. The muscle cells are restricted to the mouth and tentacles and are derived from cells in the mesoglea. The mitochondrial genome of the Ctenophores is small and lacks many genes found in other animal mitochondrial genomes. These features plus the absence of *Hox* genes from the Ctenophores have been used to argue that the Ctenophores should be considered basal or as a sister group of the Porifera, and that the evolution of specialized nerve and muscle tissue may have occurred more than once in the history of animal life. Although Ctenophores have been shown as basal to other animals in the phylogeny presented in **Chapter 27.2**, debate on this issue is likely to continue as Ctenophores are more closely studied.

Changes to the phylogenetic tree can be difficult to track and understand, and are evidence of the process of science. Data and analytical methods play a significant role in the development of phylogenies. For this reason – because molecular analysis and reanalysis are not complete -- we cannot necessarily dismiss a former phylogenetic tree as inaccurate. A recent reanalysis of molecular evidence by an international group of evolutionary biologists refuted the proposition that comb jellies are the phylogenetically oldest extant metazoan group. The study, which relied on more sophisticated methods of analyzing the original genetic data, reaffirms the traditional view that the sponges were indeed the first phylum to diverge from the common ancestor of metazoans. The ongoing discussion concerning the location of sponges and comb jellies on the animal “family tree” is an example of what drives science forward.

27.4 | The Evolutionary History of the Animal Kingdom

By the end of this section, you will be able to do the following:

- Describe the features that characterized the earliest animals and approximately when they appeared on earth
- Explain the significance of the Cambrian period for animal evolution and the changes in animal diversity that took place during that time
- Describe some of the unresolved questions surrounding the Cambrian explosion
- Discuss the implications of mass animal extinctions that have occurred in evolutionary history

Many questions regarding the origins and evolutionary history of the animal kingdom continue to be researched and debated, as new fossil and molecular evidence change prevailing theories. Some of these questions include the following: How long have animals existed on Earth? What were the earliest members of the animal kingdom, and what organism was their common ancestor? While animal diversity increased during the Cambrian period of the Paleozoic era, 530 million years ago, modern fossil evidence suggests that primitive animal species existed much earlier.

Pre-Cambrian Animal Life

The time before the Cambrian period is known as the **Ediacaran Period** (from about 635 million years ago to 543 million years ago), the final period of the late Proterozoic Neoproterozoic Era (**Figure 27.14**). Ediacaran fossils were first found in the Ediacaran hills of Southern Australia. There are no living representatives of these species, which have left impressions that look like those of feathers or coins (**Figure 27.15**). It is believed that early animal life, termed *Ediacaran biota*, evolved from protists at this time.