

Selfish Mitonuclear Conflict

Justin C. Havird^{1,*}, Evan S. Forsythe², Alissa M. Williams², John H. Werren³, Damian K. Dowling⁴, and Daniel B. Sloan²

¹Department of Integrative Biology, The University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA

²Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

³Department of Biology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627, USA

⁴School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia

*Correspondence: jhavird@utexas.edu

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.03.020>

Mitochondria, a nearly ubiquitous feature of eukaryotes, are derived from an ancient symbiosis. Despite billions of years of cooperative coevolution — in what is arguably the most important mutualism in the history of life — the persistence of mitochondrial genomes also creates conditions for genetic conflict with the nucleus. Because mitochondrial genomes are present in numerous copies per cell, they are subject to both within- and among-organism levels of selection. Accordingly, ‘selfish’ genotypes that increase their own proliferation can rise to high frequencies even if they decrease organismal fitness. It has been argued that uniparental (often maternal) inheritance of cytoplasmic genomes evolved to curtail such selfish replication by minimizing within-individual variation and, hence, within-individual selection. However, uniparental inheritance creates conditions for cytonuclear conflict over sex determination and sex ratio, as well as conditions for sexual antagonism when mitochondrial variants increase transmission by enhancing maternal fitness but have the side-effect of being harmful to males (i.e., ‘mother’s curse’). Here, we review recent advances in understanding selfish replication and sexual antagonism in the evolution of mitochondrial genomes and the mechanisms that suppress selfish interactions, drawing parallels and contrasts with other organelles (plastids) and bacterial endosymbionts that arose more recently. Although cytonuclear conflict is widespread across eukaryotes, it can be cryptic due to nuclear suppression, highly variable, and lineage-specific, reflecting the diverse biology of eukaryotes and the varying architectures of their cytoplasmic genomes.

Introduction

Mitochondria are a key feature of eukaryotic life, and their persistence represents one of the most enduring biological unions, as mitochondria are the descendants of ancient bacterial endosymbionts that were acquired prior to the last eukaryotic common ancestor [1]. Remarkably, mitochondria still maintain independent genomes in nearly all eukaryotic lineages. Coevolution between mitochondrial and nuclear genomes is generally considered to be mutualistic, because precise interactions between mitochondrial- and nuclear-encoded gene products are necessary for fundamental cellular functions [2]. The importance and near ubiquity of mitochondria has led to hypotheses that implicate mitonuclear coevolution in nearly all aspects of eukaryotic biology — from speciation to the origins of sex (Box 1) [3–11].

Despite their longstanding symbiosis, the presence of independently replicating mitochondrial genomes in eukaryotes creates the opportunity for selfish conflict between mitochondrial and nuclear genes. The term conflict can be used in different ways, but here we mean more than simple genetic incompatibilities that arise due to disruption of coadapted mitonuclear genotypes during hybridization and genetic admixture [5,12–14]. Rather, we are referring to cases in which opposing selection pressures act on mitochondrial and nuclear genomes such that their evolutionary ‘interests’ are at odds with each other [15]. For example, mutations that benefit the transmission of mitochondrial genomes but reduce the transmission of nuclear genomes create mitonuclear conflict. Such opposing selection pressures were likely much more prominent early in eukaryotic evolution when mitochondria had larger genomes and greater

independence from the nucleus. However, in the billions of years since the origin of mitochondria, the control of nearly all mitochondrial functions has been transferred to the nucleus in a process of cytonuclear integration that is sometimes termed ‘domestication’ [16–19].

Mitochondrial domestication likely eliminated many sources of mitonuclear conflict, but not all of them. The only lineages that have completely lost their mitochondrial genomes lack electron transport systems and survive as parasites on the cellular energy of other eukaryotes [1,20,21]. There is active research into the classic question of whether mitochondrial genomes have been maintained due to adaptive processes or functional constraints [17,22–25]. Regardless of the answer, the persistence of mitochondrial genomes over billions of years has made mitonuclear conflict an enduring feature of eukaryotic evolution.

Although there has been longstanding interest in mitonuclear conflict and similar selfish interactions involving plastids (e.g., chloroplasts) and other endosymbionts [15,26–32], recent work across diverse eukaryotes has employed genomic and modeling-based approaches to yield new insights into the molecular mechanisms of mitonuclear conflict and how such conflict is ameliorated. Here, we review this literature under the two broad themes of selfish mitochondrial replication and sexual antagonism, while drawing parallels and contrasts with cytonuclear conflict in plastids and endosymbionts.

Mitochondrial Genomes as ‘Selfish Little Circles’

“...evolution might be determined not by which plasmon form furthered the organism in which it occurred, but by which

Box 1. The role of mitonuclear conflict in key eukaryotic transitions.

The acquisition of the mitochondrial endosymbiont and the resulting establishment of mitonuclear interactions has been suggested as a driving force for the evolution of nearly every feature that distinguishes eukaryotes from prokaryotes. Organismal complexity, genome complexity, speciation processes, sexual reproduction, the presence of two sexes, sexual selection, apoptosis, aging, the sequestered germline, the nuclear membrane, and introns have all been argued to have arisen at least in part due to mitochondria [3–11].

Many of these hypotheses assume mutualistic coevolution between mitochondrial and nuclear genomes, but mitonuclear conflict could provide insights into these key transitions as well. For example, genomic and organismal complexity has been hypothesized to have arisen due to increased energy supplied by the mitochondrial endosymbiont [2,11]. However, mechanisms of selfish replication in mitochondrial genomes may have selected for novel genes and functions in nuclear genomes to combat selfishness, which would have also increased complexity. Reproductive isolation between populations has been attributed to breaking up coadapted mitonuclear complexes in offspring, resulting in reduced hybrid fitness [5,40,192]. However, in angiosperms, CMS is often manifested in hybrids, not because mutualistically coadapted complexes are disrupted, but because selfish mitochondrial variants are placed against a naïve nuclear background that lacks the proper counteradaptations. Finally, in a recent hypothesis on sexual selection, male ornaments were proposed to act as a signal of how well mitochondrial and nuclear genomes are coadapted to one another, resulting in greater oxidative phosphorylation efficiencies and more attractive ornaments with greater coadaptation [193]. Another view might be that male ornaments can only be maintained when selfish mitochondrial genomes are brought under control by nuclear responses.

While such hypotheses for mitonuclear conflict in key eukaryotic features are speculative, researchers investigating the implications of mitonuclear interactions would do well to consider the role of antagonistic, as well as mutualistic, coevolution between the genomes.

furthered itself most in competition with other plasmon factors..." Grun 1976 [29]

Selection among and within Individuals

An individual eukaryote may possess up to trillions of cells, each of which may contain hundreds of mitochondria, which in turn may each contain many mitochondrial genomes [33,34] (Figure 1). Even unicellular eukaryotes that possess only one or a handful of mitochondria can have many copies of the mitochondrial genome [35,36]. Due to their multicopy nature, selection on mitochondrial genomes operates both among and within individuals [37–40] (Figure 1). Consequently, mitochondrial genomes that harm the organism can outcompete beneficial mitochondrial genomes and rise to high frequencies within an individual because the strength of selection on individual mitochondrial genomes for cellular function can be weak compared to the strength of selection to replicate. Haig [30] referred to this as the "tragedy of the cytoplasmic commons" because mitochondrial replication benefits the individual genome, while efficient cellular function benefits all the genomic inhabitants of the cell and is therefore a 'public good'. In such situations, the self-interest of individuals (mitochondrial genomes) can result in the decay of public goods (cellular function) [41].


Mitochondrial and nuclear selection pressures will generally remain aligned unless there is variation among mitochondrial genomes for selection to act on. Organisms that possess a heterogeneous population of mitochondrial genomes are termed heteroplasmic and are commonly observed. For example, even with low sensitivity detection methods, heteroplasmic females possessing mitochondrial genomes that differ by ~3% have been found to occur naturally at frequencies of up to 12% in *Drosophila* individuals [42]. Most individuals will be heteroplasmic at some point in their life cycle as a result of mutations in individual mitochondrial genome copies [43–45]. Mitochondrial mutation rates are elevated compared to nuclear rates in some eukaryotic lineages [46–49], and all mitochondrial variants that

are fixed between populations or species began as heteroplasmic variants within an individual. Because multiple copies of the mitochondrial genome are also transmitted across generations (albeit often in reduced or 'bottlenecked' numbers — see '*Nuclear Responses to Suppress Selfish Replicators*' below), offspring can inherit heteroplasmies [50]. In such heterogeneous populations of mitochondrial genomes, copies that over-replicate have the potential to spread even if they have harmful effects on organismal fitness. The frequencies of these selfish replicators will be shaped by a balance between the different processes of mutation, multilevel selection, and drift (e.g., due to transmission bottlenecks).

Several elegant studies have experimentally manipulated organismal population sizes to examine selfish mitochondrial transmission and illustrate the conflicting levels of selection in systems such as yeast and nematodes [51–53]. Such experiments reduce the efficacy of selection among individuals by lowering the effective population size. However, reducing the number of organisms has no effect on the number of mitochondrial genome copies within each organism, so selection remains strong among mitochondrial genome copies within individuals. These studies have generally confirmed that reducing organismal selection 'tilts the balance' toward the proliferation of selfish mitochondrial elements (Figure 1).

Mechanisms of Selfish Replication

Several examples and mechanisms of mitochondrial selfish replication have been identified or hypothesized. Here, we describe six different processes that may lead to over-replication of otherwise deleterious mitochondrial genomes (Table 1). First, sequence variants in mitochondrial genomes can directly reduce genome replication time [54]. Smaller mitochondrial genomes arising via deletions are expected to replicate faster and spread within an individual, even though deletions of key genes can have major effects on oxidative phosphorylation activity and organismal fitness. Mitochondrial variants in *Caenorhabditis*



Current Biology

Figure 1. The balance of selection among different levels of organization.

Mitochondrial genomes that have a replication advantage can spread within an organism even if they confer deleterious effects on organismal function because selection on mitochondrial genomes acts both among and within individuals.

nematodes with large deletions in *NAD5* may serve as an example, as they have a replication advantage but compromise organismal energetics [54–56]. Sequence variants that preferentially recruit replication machinery may also accelerate DNA replication and increase in frequency within a variable mitochondrial population. For example, petite mutants in baker's yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) arise spontaneously at high frequencies, often via large deletions in the mitochondrial genome. Therefore, growth is slowed due to compromised respiration, resulting in a small or “petite” colony phenotype [57]. Petite mutants also have duplicated *ORI* sequences in their mitochondrial genomes, which are thought to promote replication and may act as an origin of mitochondrial replication (but see [58]), giving them an additional replication advantage [59]. Enhanced or expanded origins of replication may also explain evidence in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* that larger mitochondrial genomes can have a within-individual replication advantage [60]. In *Drosophila* where a foreign mitochondrial genome has been introduced to compete with the native variant, it was shown that the noncoding region of the genome (containing the origin of replication) governs selfish transmission [40]. In facultative aerobes such as yeast, selfish mitochondrial variants with defective oxidative phosphorylation can rise to fixation (homoplasmy) when the yeast are in an anaerobic phase, because countervailing selection against them at the individual level is weak. However, in species such as nematodes where respiration is critical, selfish mitochondrial variants will rise in frequency

(heteroplasmy), but this process will be counterbalanced by selection on organismal function.

The multicopy nature of mitochondrial genomes can sometimes be extreme. In one remarkable example, the amoeba endosymbiont *Perkinsella* has a single mitochondrion and a mitochondrial genome that encodes only six proteins; nevertheless, this endosymbiont has so many mitochondrial genome copies that it has more DNA in its single mitochondrion than is present in the nuclear genomes of either the endosymbiont or the host [61,62]. This raises questions as to whether highly multicopy mitochondrial genomes, which are common across eukaryotes, are beneficial for organismal fitness or may have arisen at least in part due to selfish replication.

Functional transfer of mitochondrial genes to the nucleus may buffer the effects of mitochondrial gene deletions. In this scenario, an intracellular gene transfer duplication occurs such that a mitochondrial gene is present and functional in both the mitochondrial genome and the nuclear genome (e.g., [63]). Because the mitochondrial and nuclear gene copies are functionally redundant, one copy will likely be lost. Several evolutionary hypotheses have been presented detailing why mitochondrial genes are transferred to the nucleus [19,64,65]. One possibility is that mitochondrial variants in which the transferred gene is deleted might have a replication advantage over intact mitochondrial genomes. As such, variants with deletions would spread and preferentially result in the loss of the mitochondrial copy and retention of the nuclear copy, completing nuclear

Table 1. Six possible mechanisms of selfish mitochondrial replication and six possible nuclear responses.

Mechanism	Details	Example taxa	Citations
<i>Selfish replication</i>			
1. Faster replication	Via deletions and preferential recruitment of replication machinery	Humans, nematodes, <i>Drosophila</i> , yeast	[40,51,53–55,57,59,190,191]
2. Moral hazard hypothesis	Poor organelles result in increased DNA replication	Nematodes (and simulations)	[67–70]
3. Selfish organelle growth and division	Genome variation causes replication of organelles, not DNA	Plastids in evening primrose?	[72]
4. Epigenetic tagging	Replication and transcription may be mutually exclusive	Mammals, possibly in copepods	[73–75]
5. Organelle inheritance bias	Variants causing organelles to move into germline	None, relevant mechanisms proposed in bivalve molluscs	[76]
6. Warfare	Organelles producing toxins to disrupt competing organelles	None, relevant observations in heteroplasmic mice	[79]
<i>Nuclear responses</i>			
1. Gene transfer	Functional movement of genes from the mitochondrial to the nuclear genome	Mitochondrial replication — all eukaryotes; dNTP levels — yeast	[1,80]
2. Organelle selection	Selective mitophagy aided by mitochondrial fusion/fission cycles	Characterized most extensively in mammals	[6,70,81–83,87]
3. Cell selection	Mitochondrial function in germline selective sieves and apoptosis	Characterized most extensively in mammals	[89–91,93]
4. Sexual recombination	Sex may counteract the parasitic nature of selfish replication	None; modeling studies contrarily suggest sex evolved after mitochondrial control	[4,32,97–99]
5. Germline bottlenecks	Reduces heteroplasmy	Mammals; parallels in young endosymbionts	[100,101,105,106]
6. Uniparental inheritance	Reduces heteroplasmy	Figure 2	[96,107]

gene transfer [66]. Under this hypothesized mechanism, the inherent selfishness of multicopy organelle genomes may actually have acted to strip them of much of the very genetic content that allowed them to function in a selfish fashion to begin with (e.g., mitochondrial replication machinery).

A second potential mechanism of selfish replication involves variants that compromise mitochondrial function but do not result directly in shorter DNA replication times. One hypothesized cellular response to under-performing mitochondria that harbor such defective genome copies is to increase the replication of all mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) within such organelles, including both functional and defective variant copies [15,67]. The result over time would be a mitochondrial moral hazard that rewards ‘bad behavior’ and produces a large population of poor-performing mitochondrial genomes that hitchhike along with upregulated mtDNA replication in their compartments. In other words, the very response of the cell to the defective genome results in the spread of the defective genome. The overall result is a snowball effect in which cellular function continues to decline as more dysfunctional genomes accumulate. Modeling studies provide some evidence for this, with implications for why mitochondrial-associated diseases caused by heteroplasmy are manifested later in life [68–70]. There is also empirical evidence that a mutant mitochondrial haplotype in *C. elegans* that has a 3.1 kb deletion may proliferate by exploiting the regulatory machinery that maintains the necessary number of wild-type genome copies [67]. These observations provide an

alternative (or complementary) interpretation for the role of deletions in selfish over-replication.

Importantly, the potential for spread of selfish mitochondrial genome copies within a cell may be shaped by the fact that mitochondria undergo cycles of fusion and fission [71]. In the absence of mitochondrial fusion, a selfish mitochondrial variant that spreads to fixation within a mitochondrion would still require that mitochondrion to proliferate within the cell in order to spread further. Modeling work suggests that fusion/fission makes it possible for defective mtDNA copies to spread among mitochondria and outcompete wild-type copies within each organelle [70]. This is in contrast to the apparent lack of regular fusion in many plastids and younger endosymbionts, which traps genome copies inside a single organelle or bacterium.

A third mechanism of selfish replication may take place at the organelle level rather than the genome level. Some of the earliest ideas about intracellular competition among organelles were developed based on observations of plastids rather than mitochondria [27,29]. In particular, in the evening primrose (*Oenothera*) certain plastid genotypes are known to consistently outcompete others when they are present in a heteroplasmic state. In one recent study, specific variants in plastid-encoded genes were implicated in a mechanism for preferential replication of these ‘strong’ plastids [72]. The authors did not detect differences in genome copy number across plastid types, suggesting that rates of DNA replication were not a primary driver. Instead, variation in the plastid-encoded subunit of the

acetyl-CoA carboxylase (*accD*) was shown to correlate with plastid competitive success and underlie variation in fatty acid production, which the authors hypothesize is rate-determining for plastid membrane growth and plastid division. Although there is no evidence that rapid plastid division is inherently harmful to organismal fitness, these strong plastids are able to spread even when introduced onto genetically incompatible nuclear backgrounds, resulting in loss of photosynthetic function. Thus, they clearly create opportunities for conflicting levels of selection.

Three other mechanisms of selfish replication that have received less attention include mitochondrial epigenetic modifications, organelle-level inheritance bias, and ‘warfare’ among organelles. It has been proposed in mammals that mtDNA is epigenetically tagged. Some evidence suggests that tagging can direct the fate of a genome copy to either replication or transcription of mtDNA, but not both [73,74]. In cytoplasmic hybrids of the marine copepod *Tigriopus californicus*, mitochondrial transcription and DNA copy number are negatively correlated [75], possibly supporting this mechanistic tradeoff. In this context, mitochondrial genome copies that are preferentially tagged for replication will spread, but will not be transcribed, and therefore are less likely to be screened for functionality. Meiotic drive, in which certain alleles subvert Mendel’s laws of inheritance and are preferentially transmitted to the next generation, is generally considered only in the context of heterozygous nuclear genes because mitochondria do not undergo meiosis. However, an analogous process of inheritance bias could exist among organelles if particular mitochondria have the ability to move into germline cells during development. Recent evidence in molluscs provides a possible mechanism as mitochondrial-encoded genetic products were suggested to affect microtubule motors [76], and cytoskeletal elements play a role in partitioning mitochondria during cell division [77]. Finally, warfare could occur among organelles. Many bacteria are characterized by toxin-antitoxin systems, which themselves can be selfish genetic elements [78]. Endosymbionts could encode similar systems to destroy competing endosymbionts, possibly at the expense of organismal function. To our knowledge, no examples of such systems have been described in organelles, but we would predict them to occur more frequently in young endosymbionts that retain larger genomic repertoires. They may also be possible in some lineages where ‘non-functional’ (and putatively selfish) mtDNA is common.

Interestingly, recent studies in heteroplasmic mice found deleterious effects even though individuals that were homoplasmic for either mitochondrial variant showed no such effects (i.e., underdominance) [79]. To put it differently, mitochondrial genomes that are seemingly fine in isolation can be deleterious in combination. One possible explanation is that active competition between the variants through one or more of the mechanisms described above causes reduced organismal fitness.

Nuclear Responses to Suppress Selfish Replicators

Selfish replication in mitochondrial genomes is curtailed by several mechanisms, six of which we outline here (Table 1). First is the transfer of the majority of mitochondrial genes and control of mitochondrial functions to the nucleus during the billions of years since the endosymbiotic origin of eukaryotes [19]. While nuclear gene transfer is often thought to be adaptive because

nuclear genes benefit from sexual recombination while mitochondrial genes do not [65], there are also neutral reasons why gene transfer should be asymmetrical between the genomes [64], and this remains an active area of research [22,23]. Ironically, according to the logic described in the previous section, selfish replication in mitochondrial genomes may also predispose genes to nuclear transfer [66]. Regardless of the cause, nuclear gene transfer likely provided the nucleus with a novel set of genes that may have played roles in combating selfish mitochondrial replication, while stripping mitochondrial genomes of most of their weapons for selfish replication. Perhaps most importantly, the machinery that actually controls mtDNA replication is nuclear-encoded in all eukaryotes [1]. The ability to selfishly replicate is presumably more limited in a genome that does not control its own replication. There is also recent evidence that nuclear control over dNTP levels may act to regulate selfish mitochondrial genomes in yeast [80].

Secondly, mitochondria may be ‘screened’ to eliminate poor-performing organelles that possess selfish genomes [6,81–83]. Mitophagy, which was once thought to be largely random, is now known to selectively eliminate underperforming mitochondria, likely as a form of quality control [84–86]. Fusion/fission cycles also act to segregate underperforming organelles with lowered membrane potential from the rest of the mitochondrial population [70,87], allowing them to be selectively eliminated via mitophagy.

Thirdly, the entire cell can be vetted based on the performance of its mitochondria, which may be especially important during germline development [88]. For example, in a 20-week old human female fetus, ~7 million ovarian follicles are present, but only a few hundred will eventually undergo ovulation [89] — amounting to a very effective potential selective sieve during this process (known as atresia). Importantly, recent studies suggest mitochondrial function is especially important during early primordial germ cell development [90,91] and may also be under selection during later stages of egg development [92]. The central role of mitochondria in apoptosis across cell types also suggests that cells with poor performing mitochondria will be effectively eliminated [93]. Indeed, the role of mitochondria in apoptosis may have initially evolved as a mechanism to regulate poorly functioning and selfish mitochondria.

Fourthly, one advantage of sexual reproduction may be to counteract the physiological consequences of selfish mitochondrial genomes. Eukaryotic sex is often viewed as an adaptation to respond to changing environments or parasites [94,95], and selfish mitochondrial replication can be viewed as a form of parasitism [96]. It was recently proposed that sexual recombination provided the genetic variation for early eukaryotes to respond to mitochondrial mutations [4], and a logical extension is that sex allowed a more efficient response to selfish mitochondrial replication. Several related hypotheses have suggested a role for mitochondria in the evolution of eukaryotic sexual reproduction [97–99]. Interestingly, one modeling study came to an opposite conclusion regarding selfish mitochondrial replication. It suggested that selfish endosymbionts may actually spread under sexual reproduction, leading to the conclusion that selfish mitochondria were brought under control before the evolution of sex [32], not as a result of it.




Figure 2. Variation in mitochondrial inheritance.

(A) Representations of different modes of mitochondrial inheritance, including the doubly uniparental inheritance system in some bivalve molluscs [194,195]. (B) Summary of studies of mitochondrial inheritance in major eukaryotic groups. (Left) Phylogenetic relationships of major eukaryotic clades as summarized by [1] and [196]. (Right) Grid of four columns (1–4, left to right) displaying information about our knowledge of mitochondrial inheritance in each group. (Col. 1) The number of studies pertaining to mitochondrial inheritance in each group. *Few*: 1–10 studies; *Many*: >> 10 studies. (Col. 2) The most common pattern of inheritance in each group based on current literature. Multiple colors per box indicate uncertainty about which pattern is most common. (Col. 3) Alternative patterns observed in the group. *Strictly Uni.*: Inheritance was found to be strictly uniparental and maternal; *Bi. observed*: Rare (<1% of individuals) cases of biparental inheritance were observed; *Bi. common*: biparental inheritance was observed in >1% of individuals. (Col. 4) A non-exhaustive list of references for mitochondrial inheritance in each group [110,194,197–234]. (C) Non-maternal organelle inheritance in vascular plants. (Left) Phylogenetic relationships of major vascular plant clades as summarized by [235]. The double line for conifers represents possible non-monophyly [236]. (Right) Cases of mitochondria and plastid inheritance that depart from strictly maternal transmission including selected examples of genera in which these observations were made. Blank boxes indicate strict maternal inheritance. 'No data' indicates groups in which plastid/mitochondrial transmission is unknown. Modes of inheritance are abbreviated: P, paternal; PL, paternal leakage (similar to *Bi. observed* in panel B); B, biparental. References used to populate (C) include [27,96,117,215,237–246].

The final two mechanisms of nuclear suppression both act to limit the amount of mitochondrial heteroplasmy and, thus, the opportunity for intracellular competition. Germline bottlenecks in females may serve to reduce variation among mitochondrial genome copies. Primordial germ cells in human females undergo a massive bottleneck in the number of mitochondrial genomes per cell, dropping to 10 or fewer mitochondria and ~200 or fewer mitochondrial genome copies during germ line development [100,101]. Somatic cells induced to form pluripotent stem cells that mimic primordial germ cells also show a large reduction in mtDNA copy number [102,103]. The mitochondrial genomes that survive this bottleneck then undergo a rapid expansion to ~200,000 copies per mature oocyte [104]. Such bottlenecking reduces heteroplasmy in the mature oocyte and embryo, thus restricting the possibility for intracellular competition early in development. Enforcing small inoculum sizes during transmission of younger endosymbionts may serve the same purpose [105,106]. It is important to note that any selfish mitochondrial genomes that survive such bottlenecks could lead to drastic heteroplasmy after subsequent proliferation of mitochondrial genomes.

Finally, one of the most widely hypothesized mechanisms to bring selfish mitochondrial replication under control is the evolution of uniparental inheritance [27–29,96]. If mitochondria are transmitted through only a single parent (Figure 2A), it is much more likely that offspring will receive a homogenous population

of mitochondrial genomes, reducing the opportunity for intracellular selection. Widespread observations of maternal inheritance in plants and animals have motivated this hypothesis. Uniparental inheritance occurs via many active and often redundant mechanisms that ensure paternal mtDNA is excluded during fertilization or is destroyed shortly thereafter, including prezygotic exclusion/degradation of mitochondria in sperm, prevention of paternal organelles from entering the developing zygote, and degradation of paternal organelles in the zygote [96,107]. In *Drosophila*, when a second, deleterious mitochondrial genome was introduced to compete with the native genome, the deleterious genome prevailed only when the two genomes were distantly related [40]. This suggests that heteroplasmy arising via mutation within an individual may be relatively harmless compared to the possible divergent heteroplasmies created via biparental inheritance [40]. However, it is important to note that it is an oversimplification to assume that uniparental inheritance of mitochondrial genomes is standard. Indeed, for many of the major eukaryotic lineages, there are few or no studies of mitochondrial inheritance (Figure 2B). Moreover, studies of cytoplasmic inheritance in well-sampled groups (e.g., vascular plants) have revealed that it is a strikingly labile trait, with many independent lineages showing evidence of at least episodic biparental inheritance (Figure 2C). In such taxa, mitochondria may have selfishly escaped the mechanisms that ensure uniparental inheritance. Even in species such as humans, biparental

	Male killing, harming, and sterility	Parthenogenesis	Feminization	Cytoplasmic incompatibility
Mitochondria	Across metazoans <i>Drosophila</i>, <i>Homo</i>, others [26,121–122,126–130] Across angiosperms CMS in hundreds of species [114–116]	?	?	?
Plastids	Angiosperms - ? Implicated in peas and evening primrose [157–160]	?	?	?
Younger endosymbionts	<i>Wolbachia</i> Diverse arthropods [31] <i>Rickettsia</i> Coleoptera [247] Others - (e.g., <i>Spiroplasma</i>, <i>Microsporidia</i>, <i>Arsenophonus</i>) [249–252]	<i>Wolbachia</i> Diverse arthropods [31] <i>Rickettsia</i> Hymenoptera [247] Others (e.g., <i>Cardinium</i>) [248,252]	<i>Wolbachia</i> Diverse arthropods [31] <i>Cardinium</i> Acari [248] <i>Microsporidia</i> Crustaceans [252]	<i>Wolbachia</i> Diverse arthropods [31] <i>Cardinium</i> Diverse arthropods [248,253]

Current Biology

Figure 3. Mechanisms of reproductive manipulation in cytoplasmic genomes.

Four mechanisms of reproductive parasitism of arthropods have been described in younger endosymbionts such as *Wolbachia*: male killing/harm eliminates or reduces male functions, parthenogenesis results in asexual production of exclusively females, feminization causes males to develop as females, and cytoplasmic incompatibility prevents males with the selfish variant from mating with wild-type females [247–253]. However, mitochondrial genomes have only been documented to cause male harm/killing (not the other mechanisms), and evidence for plastids causing reproductive manipulation is scarce.

inheritance may be more common than previously appreciated [108–110].

Antagonistic Sexual Selection Due to Uniparental Inheritance

“In males, cytoplasmic genes in outbreeding species will have no selection on them at all to function properly.” Cosmides and Tooby 1981 [28]

Although uniparental inheritance may have evolved to reduce the spread of selfish mitochondrial haplotypes, it results in a new arena for conflict between the cytoplasmic and nuclear genomes. Whereas nuclear genes are usually inherited through both sexes, mitochondrial genes are often inherited through the maternal lineage (Figure 2). In these cases, males acquire mitochondria from their mothers, but they do not pass them on to succeeding generations. This uniparental inheritance has two consequences. First, it invokes cytonuclear genetic conflict over sex determination [28,111] due to active selection on cytoplasmic elements to distort sex determination and sex ratios towards females. Second, because mitochondria are not actively selected to maintain functions in males, variants that reduce male fitness can increase in frequency within populations [28,112,113]. We briefly outline these concepts in the next two sections.

Cytonuclear Conflict and Reproductive Manipulation

Mitochondrial variants (as well as plastids and heritable microbes) that increase the number or fitness of females by reducing the number or fitness of males will be selectively favored, and nuclear suppressors of such ‘rogue’ elements will be selected for, resulting in cytonuclear conflict. Among the best examples of this are cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS) in plants [114,115] and sex ratio distorting cytoplasmic microorganisms in many animals [31,111].

CMS can result in gynodioecy (i.e., the presence of both hermaphroditic and female individuals) in natural populations of flowering plants and can be revealed through crosses [116]. In these systems, mitochondrial genomic variants cause hermaphrodites to become male-sterile (see [114–116] for reviews). At least in some cases, suppression of male function can increase female fitness either through resource reallocation to female functions [117–119], or through improved offspring quality via forced outcrossing [120].

Processes of reproductive manipulation include male-killing (or harming), parthenogenesis, feminization of males, and cytoplasmic incompatibility (CI) — all of which can potentially increase the abundance/fitness of females [31,111] (Figure 3). All of these processes have been demonstrated in a class of bacterial endosymbionts known as reproductive manipulators — epitomized by

Wolbachia, a group of intracellular Alphaproteobacteria found in numerous arthropod and nematode species [31]. Mitochondria may have a more restricted range of mechanisms for reproductive manipulation. They have only been clearly shown to induce male harm/sterility. One recent example from a book louse suggests that certain highly divergent mitochondrial variants may cause only daughters to be produced [26]. This could represent a case of mitochondrial-induced sex ratio distortion, but the precise mechanism has not been worked out, and there is as yet no conclusive evidence of mitochondrial involvement. To our knowledge, there are no identified cases of mitochondrial-mediated parthenogenesis, feminization or CI. Evidence for plastid-mediated reproductive manipulation is even more limited (Figure 3). Therefore, beyond CMS in plants, clear cases of reproductive manipulation by organelles remain to be established.

Mother's Curse

Transmitting mitochondrial genomes through a single sex or mating type will limit the effects of natural selection to that parent. For example, maternal inheritance results in natural selection being 'blind' to mitochondrial variation that is male-specific in its effect on phenotype. Mitochondrial variants that do not incur costs to females, or which augment female fitness, can therefore spread in a population, even if those variants are deleterious to males. This concept has been expressed in the literature for nearly 40 years [28,112] and is often referred to as 'mother's curse' [113].

There is an important distinction to make regarding the role of female fitness effects in mother's curse. In a 'weak form' of mother's curse, a mitochondrial mutation with substantial deleterious effects on males may be neutral or nearly neutral in females. In this scenario, the lack of selection on males permits the mitochondrial variant to accumulate to appreciable frequencies under mutation-selection balance and potentially to be fixed by genetic drift [112]. One such example is an identified mutation in cytochrome c oxidase 2 (*COX2*) in *Drosophila* that impairs male fertility with no apparent harm to female viability or fertility [121]. In contrast, a 'strong form' of mother's curse involves sexually antagonistic mitochondrial variants that harm males but have beneficial effects in females and, thus, would actively spread by positive selection. One such example is a *CYTB* mutation identified in *Drosophila* that increases in frequency during experimental evolution trials due to increasing female fitness, and in spite of decreasing male fertility [122–124]. Only the strong form of mother's curse would be considered true selfish conflict, with the extreme example being the spread of a mitochondrial variant that entirely eliminates male function but nonetheless spreads because it confers just a slight fitness advantage for females. In contrast, a nuclear-encoded variant with comparable effects on male fitness would only be maintained by selection if it increased female fitness at least two-fold [125].

Individual mitochondrial mutations resulting in male-specific harm have been documented in humans [126,127], fruit flies [121,122,128], mice [129], hares [130], and flowering plants [114–116]. Moreover, mitochondrial variation was shown to affect the expression of nearly 10% of all nuclear genes in male *Drosophila* with few effects on gene expression in females [131]. However, in many of these cases it is unclear whether these male-harming variants are beneficial to females (i.e., the strong

form of mother's curse). Recent studies in *Drosophila* have addressed this shortcoming by measuring both male and female fitness conferred by mitochondrial variants and documenting sexually antagonistic effects on trait expression associated with particular mitochondrial variants [132], or across whole mtDNA haplotypes [123]. These studies indicate that mitochondrial mutations with male-harming effects may have spread due to beneficial female effects (sexual antagonism), not simply due to a lack of selection in males.

Mechanisms of Male Fitness Reduction by Mitochondria

The physiological mechanisms underpinning how mitochondrial variants can specifically harm male function without impairing female fitness (or even while increasing it) are largely unknown. Two possible mechanisms may act as common explanations shared across multiple lineages. First, sperm are highly active, and sperm motility may be particularly sensitive to ATP production. Mitochondrial variants that only slightly compromise mitochondrial function may therefore show negative effects in sperm, but not other tissues [15]. Some evidence in humans and *Drosophila* supports this hypothesis, as certain mitochondrial haplotypes confer reduced sperm motility leading to reduced fertility, but no other obvious phenotypes [132,133]. Second, the number of mtDNA copies in sperm is very limited compared with eggs. As mentioned earlier, mature mammalian oocytes contain ~200,000 mtDNA copies, which must pass through a selective sieve. In contrast, mammalian sperm may contain fewer than 100 mtDNA copies, which are not subject to a selective sieve. The quantity of mitochondrial genomes in sperm may therefore be limiting, resulting in mitochondrial variants that produce mild phenotypes being detrimental only to sperm function. Detailed quantification of mtDNA copy number in sperm versus eggs of other eukaryotes can test the generality of this possibility.

Both of these hypotheses assume that sperm or their precursors are dependent on oxidative phosphorylation, because while it is possible that mitochondrial genomic variants might affect other mitochondrial functions, all protein-coding genes in mammalian mtDNA are components of the oxidative phosphorylation machinery. Contrary to this assumption, there is now general agreement that glycolysis provides the main source of ATP in mammalian sperm while oxidative phosphorylation plays a secondary role, if any [134–136]. Therefore, these two mechanisms may serve as null or complementary hypotheses when investigating additional mechanisms.

Although CMS in angiosperms is both widespread and agriculturally important [114], the physiological mechanisms underlying reduced male fitness are still unclear, even though the genetic variation leading to it is well-characterized. In most cases of CMS, the mitochondrial gene responsible for CMS (often a chimeric open reading frame) is expressed in all tissues, whereas phenotypic effects are confined to the anthers [116]. One proposed explanation for these tissue-specific effects is that pollen production is one of the most energetically expensive organ-ismal functions [137,138], and mitochondrial variants that only slightly diminish energetic efficiency might therefore only affect pollen production [139]. However, this explanation has not been explicitly tested. Some evidence in *Nicotiana* suggests that CMS individuals do show altered mitochondrial function but that mitochondrial deficiencies may not affect phenotypes

overall due to compensating nuclear factors [140]. If this is the case, it is unclear why male phenotypes escape nuclear compensation.

In many CMS species, dysfunction is thought to originate in the tapetum — the specialized tissue surrounding the developing pollen grain [114]. In sunflowers, the death of tapetal cells and meiocytes associated with CMS has been shown to be due to the initiation of a programmed cell death (PCD) pathway [139]. Given the importance of mitochondria in PCD [94] and the precise patterns of PCD necessary during pollen development [141], it is possible that mitochondrial-mediated PCD could specifically target developing pollen but few other tissues, possibly by interacting with anther-specific proteases found across angiosperms [139,142]. Investigating such targeted mechanisms [143] in comparison and contrast with the more general mechanisms outlined above should be a focus of future studies of sexually antagonistic mitonuclear coevolution.

Detailed mechanisms of male-specific harm are beginning to be examined in younger endosymbionts. For example, recent work on *Spiroplasma* endosymbionts in *Drosophila* found a single locus in the endosymbiont (*Spaid*) that causes male-killing by targeting the dosage compensation machinery on the male X chromosome [144]. Recent studies of *Wolbachia* also identified genes underlying cytoplasmic incompatibility (Figure 3), with some evidence suggesting similar mechanisms in both lineages [145–147]. Identifying how endosymbionts and mitochondria induce sex-specific phenotypes remains a key arena for future research.

The Relatively Limited Repertoire of Organelles as Reproductive Manipulators

In theory, mitochondrial and plastid genomes should benefit from any form of reproductive manipulation that enhances female fitness, so why have many of these mechanisms only been found in younger endosymbionts such as *Wolbachia* (Figure 3)? One answer may simply be that similar mechanisms are common in mitochondria and plastids but have largely eluded detection. For example, CMS in plants is often uncovered in crosses between populations or lines, when the sterilizing mitochondria and suppressing nuclear genotypes become decoupled [148]. Other forms of genetic conflict that involve antagonistic coevolution of selfish genetic elements and suppressors are also often uncovered in interpopulation crosses [149].

Another possibility is that mitochondrial and plastid genomes have been domesticated (e.g., genome reduction) to such an extent that the possibilities for reproductive manipulation are limited compared with younger endosymbionts [26]. The prevalence of CMS in angiosperms may serve as an example of how genome architecture and content can dictate which pathways are available. Unlike in animals, angiosperm mitochondrial genomes regularly undergo intragenomic recombination, generating structural rearrangements that act as the genetic fuel for reproductive manipulation [114,115]. In bilaterian animals, the mitochondrial genome is more streamlined and may have less mutational fuel (i.e., structural variation) for selection to act on [13]. Testing ideas about why reproductive manipulation is more diverse in younger endosymbionts will require examining cases that represent exceptions to these typical patterns. For example, could reproductive manipulation via mitochondrial genomes be more common in nonbilaterian animals, which can

possess radically different mitochondrial genomes than are typical in bilaterians [48]?

Whereas studies of CMS in angiosperms have provided extensive insight into sexual antagonism, it is less clear if and how mitochondrial variation affects reproduction in hermaphroditic animals. Previous studies of mother's curse in animals have focused solely on species with separate sexes. Hermaphroditic nematodes show mitonuclear epistasis [150,151], maternal mitochondrial inheritance [152], differences in lifespan between males and hermaphrodites, and variation in lifespan due to mitonuclear interactions [153], making them an underutilized study system to investigate mother's curse [154]. In addition, examining sexual antagonism in organisms with paternal mitochondrial transmission would provide a corollary to mother's curse in which a 'father's curse' would be expected (or by examining isogamous species in which mitochondrial transmission is linked to one mating type) [155,156].

Comparing and contrasting the biology of mitochondria with plastids may help us better understand sexual antagonism. For example, in land plants, plastid genomes tend to be more stable than mitochondrial genomes, undergoing fewer rearrangements and thereby limiting the generation of selfish variants. In addition, plastid function may also constrain the possibilities for sexual antagonism compared to mitochondrial genomes. The major role of the most abundant type of plastids, chloroplasts, is to perform photosynthesis, which is not critical in male reproductive tissues. Mitochondrial respiration plays a more general role for most male functions, including pollen production. It may therefore not be surprising that sexual antagonism has rarely been described in plastid–nuclear interactions, despite uniparental inheritance being common in both mitochondria and plastids (Figure 2C). Interestingly, the few plastid genes that have been implicated in cytonuclear conflict play roles outside of photosynthesis [157–160]. Such genes are also often implicated as targets of positive selection [161]. In all of these cases, however, the role of plastids in selfish reproductive manipulation remain speculative or incomplete.

Nuclear Responses to Sexual Antagonism

When sexually antagonistic and male-harming mitochondrial variants spread to high frequency within a population, it is expected to create strong selection for nuclear responses that counteract these effects. For example, there is a large body of literature describing the nuclear restorer-of-fertility genes that offset CMS caused by mitochondrial variants, including evidence of strong positive selection on these nuclear loci that implies an arms-race model of mitonuclear conflict [116,162–164].

Another potential consequence of sexual antagonism is the evolution of tissue-specific paralogs, which have arisen repeatedly for metazoan nuclear-encoded oxidative phosphorylation genes, particularly those in cytochrome c oxidase [165]. These duplicate genes can be highly divergent from each other and often show testis-specific expression. Although optimization in response to tissue-specific metabolic demands may explain the retention of these gene duplicates, one intriguing possibility is that testis-specific paralogs are under positive selection to counteract male-harming mitochondrial variants. Some evidence for this hypothesis comes from *Drosophila*, in which duplicates of mitochondrial-targeted genes preferentially show testis-specific expression [166]. These duplicates often relocate

far away from the parent gene and are underrepresented on the X chromosome. Duplicates with testis-specific expression are also frequently involved in energy production (e.g., oxidative phosphorylation genes), are older than other duplicates in the *Drosophila* genome, and have higher d_N/d_S ratios than other gene duplicates (which can indicate positive selection) [166]. However, in humans, duplicated mitochondrial-targeted genes do not exhibit this same enrichment in testis function and are younger than other duplicates [167]. Testis-specific genes in general have also been inferred to be evolving under relaxed selection in humans [168]. An obvious area for future research is to determine why nuclear-encoded oxidative phosphorylation gene duplicates with testis-specific expression evolve under relaxed or positive selection in different lineages, with the latter being expected if their evolution has been shaped by selection for counteracting mitochondrial variants that harm male-specific functions.

Many studies investigate the additive effects of mitochondrial variants on male function by placing variable mitochondrial genomes from different populations on a common nuclear background [123,131,132,169–173]. However, this precludes examining whether nuclear genomes in local populations have responded to selection to counteract male-harming mitochondrial variants (i.e., by examining the extent of mitochondrial male harm in ‘home’ versus ‘away’ nuclear backgrounds). Recent studies in *Drosophila* [174–177] and *Callosobruchus* seed beetles [178,179] have included multiple nuclear backgrounds as well, with some results indicating sex-specific effects as predicted under mother’s curse and others showing more complicated interactions. It is clear from these studies that environment also plays a role in mediating sex-specific mitonuclear effects (i.e., $G \times G \times E$ $\times$ sex effects). However, these studies are in their infancy and more work is needed to understand the generality of mother’s curse and the frequency of counteracting nuclear mutations.

Summary and Future Outlook

Although mitochondria are beneficial endosymbionts that have played key roles in shaping eukaryotic evolution (Box 1), the persistence of mitochondrial genomes across eukaryotes creates conflicting levels of selection on organismal function and mitochondrial genome replication (Figure 1). Nuclear mechanisms have evolved to counter the spread of selfish mitochondrial variants. However, what has been argued to be one of the most widespread countermeasures, uniparental inheritance, also creates the opportunity for sexual antagonism in mitochondrial genomes. Here, we have indicated several lines of future research in cytonuclear conflict, including investigating underexplored mechanisms of selfish replication (Table 1), the role for selfish mitochondrial genomes during nuclear gene transfer, the prevalence of uniparental inheritance across the majority of eukaryotic diversity (Figure 2), the reasons why mitochondrial and plastid genomes appear to have a limited repertoire for reproductive manipulation (Figure 3), and the physiological and genetic mechanisms that organelle genomes use to induce sex-specific harm. Importantly, studies investigating selfishness in younger endosymbionts can provide key insights into mitonuclear conflict [105,180].

Mitonuclear conflict also has applied importance for agriculture and health. CMS in crop species is an important tool for breeding

[114,115,181–183]. Determining how mitochondrial variants cause male-specific harm in CMS could allow for the genetic design of mitochondrial genomes that would cause CMS in species of interest, possibly via new mitochondrial genomic engineering techniques [184,185]. Such systems could also be harnessed in metazoans to control pest species [124,186]. Mitochondrial replacement therapy is an emerging germline treatment for mitochondrial diseases in which the cytoplasm of an egg from a patient with the disease is replaced by the cytoplasm of a healthy donor, resulting in an offspring that does not inherit the mitochondrial disease [187,188]. However, recent studies have shown that replacement can be imperfect, resulting in a heteroplasmic population of healthy and afflicted mitochondria [189]. Moreover, the mitochondrial variant responsible for the disease can rise to fixation after replacement therapy, and drift has been implicated as the primary cause [189]. Determining the role of selfish replication in such dynamics could play a role in improving the efficacy of this therapy and contribute to a broader understanding of the role of selfish genetic conflict in human health.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank many researchers that provided notes and citations on uniparental inheritance across eukaryotes, Jeff Palmer for providing input on models of gene transfer, and the Kirkpatrick Lab for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by NIH F32GM116361 to J.C.H., NSF DGE-1321845 to A.M.W., NSF MCB 1412260 to D.B.S., NSF IOS 1456233 to J.H.W., and ARC FT160100022 and DP170100165 to D.K.D.

REFERENCES

1. Roger, A.J., Munoz-Gomez, S.A., and Kamikawa, R. (2017). The origin and diversification of mitochondria. *Curr. Biol.* 27, R1177–R1192.
2. Lane, N. (2014). Bioenergetic constraints on the evolution of complex life. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 6, a015982.
3. Hill, G.E. (2015). Mitonuclear ecology. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32, 1917–1927.
4. Havird, J.C., Hall, M.D., and Dowling, D.K. (2015). The evolution of sex: A new hypothesis based on mitochondrial mutational erosion. *Bioessays* 37, 951–958.
5. Burton, R.S., and Barreto, F.S. (2012). A disproportionate role for mtDNA in Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities? *Mol. Ecol.* 21, 4942–4957.
6. Radzvilavicius, A.L., Hadjivasiliou, Z., Pomiankowski, A., and Lane, N. (2016). Selection for mitochondrial quality drives evolution of the germline. *PLoS Biol.* 14, e2000410.
7. Bendich, A.J. (2010). Mitochondrial DNA, chloroplast DNA and the origins of development in eukaryotic organisms. *Biol. Direct* 5, 42.
8. Hadjivasiliou, Z., Pomiankowski, A., Seymour, R.M., and Lane, N. (2012). Selection for mitonuclear co-adaptation could favour the evolution of two sexes. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 279, 1865–1872.
9. Lane, N. (2011). Mitonuclear match: Optimizing fitness and fertility over generations drives ageing within generations. *Bioessays* 33, 860–869.
10. Martin, W., and Koonin, E.V. (2006). Introns and the origin of nucleus-cytosol compartmentalization. *Nature* 440, 41–45.
11. Lane, N., and Martin, W. (2010). The energetics of genome complexity. *Nature* 467, 929–934.
12. Burton, R.S., Pereira, R.J., and Barreto, F.S. (2013). Cytonuclear genomic interactions and hybrid breakdown. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 44, 281–302.

13. Dobler, R., Rogell, B., Budar, F., and Dowling, D.K. (2014). A meta-analysis of the strength and nature of cytoplasmic genetic effects. *J. Evol. Biol.* 27, 2021–2034.
14. Sloan, D.B., Havird, J.C., and Sharbrough, J. (2017). The on-again, off-again relationship between mitochondrial genomes and species boundaries. *Mol. Ecol.* 26, 2212–2236.
15. Burt, A., and Trivers, R. (2006). Selfish mitochondrial DNA. In *Genes in Conflict: the Biology of Selfish Genetic Elements*, A. Burt, and R. Trivers, eds. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap press of Harvard University Press).
16. Gray, M.W. (2012). Mitochondrial evolution. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 4, a011403.
17. Adams, K.L., and Palmer, J.D. (2003). Evolution of mitochondrial gene content: gene loss and transfer to the nucleus. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 29, 380–395.
18. Sloan, D.B., Warren, J.M., Williams, A.M., Wu, Z., Abdel-Ghany, S.E., Chicco, A.J., and Havird, J.C. (2018). Cytonuclear integration and co-evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 19, 635–648.
19. Timmis, J.N., Ayliffe, M.A., Huang, C.Y., and Martin, W. (2004). Endosymbiotic gene transfer: organelle genomes forge eukaryotic chromosomes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 5, 123–135.
20. Hjort, K., Goldberg, A.V., Tsaousis, A.D., Hirt, R.P., and Embley, T.M. (2010). Diversity and reductive evolution of mitochondria among microbial eukaryotes. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 365, 713–727.
21. Santos, H.J., Makiuchi, T., and Nozaki, T. (2018). Reinventing an organelle: The reduced mitochondrion in parasitic protists. *Trends Parasitol.* 34, 1038–1055.
22. Allen, J.F. (2015). Why chloroplasts and mitochondria retain their own genomes and genetic systems: Colocation for redox regulation of gene expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 112, 10231–10238.
23. Bjorkholm, P., Harish, A., Hagstrom, E., Ernst, A.M., and Andersson, S.G. (2015). Mitochondrial genomes are retained by selective constraints on protein targeting. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 112, 10154–10161.
24. Daley, D.O., and Whelan, J. (2005). Why genes persist in organelle genomes. *Genome Biol.* 6, 6.
25. Race, H.L., Herrmann, R.G., and Martin, W. (1999). Why have organelles retained genomes? *Trends Genet.* 15, 364–370.
26. Perlman, S.J., Hodson, C.N., Hamilton, P.T., Opit, G.P., and Gowen, B.E. (2015). Maternal transmission, sex ratio distortion, and mitochondria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 112, 10162–10168.
27. Greiner, S., Sobanski, J., and Bock, R. (2015). Why are most organelle genomes transmitted maternally? *Bioessays* 37, 80–94.
28. Cosmides, L.M., and Tooby, J. (1981). Cytoplasmic inheritance and intra-genomic conflict. *J. Theor. Biol.* 89, 83–129.
29. Grun, P. (1976). *Cytoplasmic Genetics and Evolution* (Columbia University Press).
30. Haig, D. (2016). Intracellular evolution of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) and the tragedy of the cytoplasmic commons. *Bioessays* 38, 549–555.
31. Werren, J.H., Baldo, L., and Clark, M.E. (2008). Wolbachia: master manipulators of invertebrate biology. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 6, 741–751.
32. Radzvilavicius, A.L., and Blackstone, N.W. (2015). Conflict and cooperation in eukaryogenesis: implications for the timing of endosymbiosis and the evolution of sex. *J. R. Soc. Interface* 12, 20150584.
33. Bianconi, E., Piovesan, A., Facchin, F., Beraudi, A., Casadei, R., Frabetti, F., Vitale, L., Pelleri, M.C., Tassani, S., Piva, F., *et al.* (2013). An estimation of the number of cells in the human body. *Ann. Hum. Biol.* 40, 463–471.
34. Reis, R.J.S., and Goldstein, S. (1983). Mitochondrial DNA in mortal and immortal human cells - Genome number, integrity, and methylation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 258, 9078–9085.
35. Blank, R., Hauptmann, E., and Arnold, C.G. (1980). Variability of mitochondrial population in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. *Planta* 150, 236–241.
36. Gallaher, S.D., Fitz-Gibbon, S.T., Strenkert, D., Purvine, S.O., Pellegrini, M., and Merchant, S.S. (2018). High-throughput sequencing of the chloroplast and mitochondrion of *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* to generate improved de novo assemblies, analyze expression patterns and transcript speciation, and evaluate diversity among laboratory strains and wild isolates. *Plant J.* 93, 545–565.
37. Rand, D.M. (2001). The units of selection on mitochondrial DNA. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 32, 415–448.
38. Birky, C.W., Jr. (1973). On the origin of mitochondrial mutants: Evidence for intracellular selection of mitochondria in the origin of antibiotic-resistant cells in yeast. *Genetics* 74, 421–432.
39. Kirk, J.T.O., and Tilney-Bassett, R.A.E. (1967). *The Plastids: their Chemistry, Structure, Growth and Inheritance* (London: W. H. Freeman).
40. Ma, H., Gutierrez, N.M., Morey, R., Van Dyken, C., Kang, E.J., Hayama, T., Lee, Y., Li, Y., Tippner-Hedges, R., Wolf, D.P., *et al.* (2016). Incompatibility between nuclear and mitochondrial genomes contributes to an interspecies reproductive barrier. *Cell Metab.* 24, 283–294.
41. Hardin, G. (1968). Tragedy of commons. *Science* 162, 1243–1248.
42. James, A.C., and Ballard, J.W.O. (2003). Mitochondrial genotype affects fitness in *Drosophila simulans*. *Genetics* 164, 187–194.
43. Larsson, N.G. (2010). Somatic mitochondrial DNA mutations in mammalian aging. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* 79, 683–706.
44. Payne, B.A.I., and Chinnery, P.F. (2015). Mitochondrial dysfunction in aging: Much progress but many unresolved questions. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta Bioenerg.* 1847, 1347–1353.
45. Payne, B.A.I., Wilson, I.J., Yu-Wai-Man, P., Coxhead, J., Deehan, D., Horvath, R., Taylor, R.W., Samuels, D.C., Santibanez-Koref, M., and Chinnery, P.F. (2013). Universal heteroplasmy of human mitochondrial DNA. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* 22, 384–390.
46. Brown, W.M., George, M., and Wilson, A.C. (1979). Rapid evolution of animal mitochondrial-DNA. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 76, 1967–1971.
47. Smith, D.R., Hua, J.M., Lee, R.W., and Keeling, P.J. (2012). Relative rates of evolution among the three genetic compartments of the red alga *Porphyra* differ from those of green plants and do not correlate with genome architecture. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 65, 339–344.
48. Lavrov, D.V., and Pett, W. (2016). Animal mitochondrial DNA as we do not know it: mt-genome organization and evolution in nonbilaterian lineages. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 8, 2896–2913.
49. Mower, J.P., Touzet, P., Gummow, J.S., Delph, L.F., and Palmer, J.D. (2007). Extensive variation in synonymous substitution rates in mitochondrial genes of seed plants. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 7, 135.
50. Stewart, J.B., and Chinnery, P.F. (2015). The dynamics of mitochondrial DNA heteroplasmy: implications for human health and disease. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 16, 530–542.
51. Phillips, W.S., Coleman-Hulbert, A.L., Weiss, E.S., Howe, D.K., Ping, S., Wernick, R.I., Estes, S., and Denver, D.R. (2015). Selfish mitochondrial DNA proliferates and diversifies in small, but not large, experimental populations of *Caenorhabditis briggsae*. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 7, 2023–2037.
52. Jasmin, J.N., and Zeyl, C. (2014). Rapid evolution of cheating mitochondrial genomes in small yeast populations. *Evolution* 68, 269–275.
53. Taylor, D.R., Zeyl, C., and Cooke, E. (2002). Conflicting levels of selection in the accumulation of mitochondrial defects in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 99, 3690–3694.
54. Clark, K.A., Howe, D.K., Gafner, K., Kusuma, D., Ping, S., Estes, S., and Denver, D.R. (2012). Selfish little circles: Transmission bias and evolution of large deletion-bearing mitochondrial DNA in *Caenorhabditis briggsae* nematodes. *PLoS One* 7, 8.
55. Hicks, K.A., Howe, D.K., Leung, A., Denver, D.R., and Estes, S. (2012). In vivo quantification reveals extensive natural variation in mitochondrial form and function in *Caenorhabditis briggsae*. *PLoS One* 7, e43837.

56. Howe, D.K., Baer, C.F., and Denver, D.R. (2010). High rate of large deletions in *Caenorhabditis briggsae* mitochondrial genome mutation processes. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 2, 29–38.
57. Chen, X.J., and Clark-Walker, G.D. (2000). The petite mutation in yeasts: 50 years on. *Int. Rev. Cytol.* 194, 197–238.
58. Chen, X.J., and Clark-Walker, G.D. (2018). Unveiling the mystery of mitochondrial DNA replication in yeasts. *Mitochondrion* 38, 17–22.
59. MacAlpine, D.M., Kolesar, J., Okamoto, K., Butow, R.A., and Perlman, P.S. (2001). Replication and preferential inheritance of hypersuppressive petite mitochondrial DNA. *EMBO J.* 20, 1807–1817.
60. Rand, D.M. (2011). Population genetics of the cytoplasm and the units of selection on mitochondrial DNA in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetica* 139, 685–697.
61. David, V., Flegontov, P., Gerasimov, E., Tanifuji, G., Hashimi, H., Logacheva, M.D., Maruyama, S., Onodera, N.T., Gray, M.W., Archibald, J.M., et al. (2015). Gene loss and error-prone RNA editing in the mitochondrion of *Perkinsela*, an endosymbiotic kinetoplastid. *MBio* 6, e01498–15.
62. Lukeš, J., Wheeler, R., Jirsová, D., David, V., and Archibald, J.M. (2018). Massive mitochondrial DNA content in diplomid and kinetoplastid protists. *IUBMB Life* 70, 1267–1274.
63. Adams, K.L., Song, K., Roessler, P.G., Nugent, J.M., Doyle, J.L., Doyle, J.J., and Palmer, J.D. (1999). Intracellular gene transfer in action: dual transcription and multiple silencings of nuclear and mitochondrial *cox2* genes in legumes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 96, 13863–13868.
64. Doolittle, W.E. (1998). You are what you eat: a gene transfer ratchet could account for bacterial genes in eukaryotic nuclear genomes. *Trends Genet.* 14, 307–311.
65. Blanchard, J.L., and Lynch, M. (2000). Organellar genes - why do they end up in the nucleus? *Trends Genet.* 16, 315–320.
66. Berg, O.G., and Kurland, C.G. (2000). Why mitochondrial genes are most often found in nuclei. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 17, 951–961.
67. Gitschlag, B.L., Kirby, C.S., Samuels, D.C., Gangula, R.D., Mallal, S.A., and Patel, M.R. (2016). Homeostatic responses regulate selfish mitochondrial genome dynamics in *C. elegans*. *Cell Metab.* 24, 91–103.
68. Capps, G.J., Samuels, D.C., and Chinnery, P.F. (2003). A model of the nuclear control of mitochondrial DNA replication. *J. Theor. Biol.* 221, 565–583.
69. Chinnery, P.F., and Samuels, D.C. (1999). Relaxed replication of mtDNA: A model with implications for the expression of disease. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 64, 1158–1165.
70. Tam, Z.Y., Gruber, J., Halliwell, B., and Gunawan, R. (2015). Context-dependent role of mitochondrial fusion-fission in clonal expansion of mtDNA mutations. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 11, e1004183.
71. van der Bliek, A.M., Shen, Q.F., and Kawajiri, S. (2013). Mechanisms of mitochondrial fission and fusion. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 5, 16.
72. Sobanski, J., Giavalisco, P., Fischer, A., Kreiner, J.M., Walther, D., Schoettler, M.A., Pellizzer, T., Golczyk, H., Obata, T., Bock, R., et al. (2019). Chloroplast competition is controlled by lipid biosynthesis in evening primroses. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 116, 5665–5674.
73. Wolf, D.P., Hayama, T., and Mitalipov, S. (2017). Mitochondrial genome inheritance and replacement in the human germline. *EMBO J.* 36, 2177–2181.
74. Milenkovic, D., Matic, S., Kuhl, I., Ruzzenente, B., Freyer, C., Jemt, E., Park, C.B., Falkenberg, M., and Larsson, N.G. (2013). TWINKLE is an essential mitochondrial helicase required for synthesis of nascent D-loop strands and complete mtDNA replication. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* 22, 1983–1993.
75. Ellison, C.K., and Burton, R.S. (2010). Cytonuclear conflict in interpopulation hybrids: the role of RNA polymerase in mtDNA transcription and replication. *J. Evol. Biol.* 23, 528–538.
76. Pozzi, A., Plazzi, F., Milani, L., Ghiselli, F., and Passamonti, M. (2017). SmithRNAs: Could mitochondria “bend” nuclear regulation? *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34, 1960–1973.
77. Mishra, P., and Chan, D.C. (2014). Mitochondrial dynamics and inheritance during cell division, development and disease. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 15, 634–646.
78. Van Melderden, L., and Saavedra De Bast, M. (2009). Bacterial toxin-antitoxin systems: More than selfish entities? *PLoS Genet.* 5, e1000437.
79. Sharpley, M.S., Marciniak, C., Eckel-Mahan, K., McManus, M., Crimi, M., Waymire, K., Lin, C.S., Masubuchi, S., Friend, N., Koike, M., et al. (2012). Heteroplasmy of mouse mtDNA is genetically unstable and results in altered behavior and cognition. *Cell* 151, 333–343.
80. Bradshaw, E., Yoshida, M., and Ling, F. (2017). Regulation of small mitochondrial DNA replicative advantage by ribonucleotide reductase in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *G3 (Bethesda)* 7, 3083–3090.
81. Stewart, J.B., Freyer, C., Elson, J.L., and Larsson, N.G. (2008). Purifying selection of mtDNA and its implications for understanding evolution and mitochondrial disease. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 9, 657–662.
82. Stewart, J.B., Freyer, C., Elson, J.L., Wredenberg, A., Cansu, Z., Trifunovic, A., and Larsson, N.G. (2008). Strong purifying selection in transmission of mammalian mitochondrial DNA. *PLoS Biol.* 6, 63–71.
83. Fan, W.W., Waymire, K.G., Narula, N., Li, P., Rocher, C., Coskun, P.E., Vannan, M.A., Narula, J., MacGregor, G.R., and Wallace, D.C. (2008). A mouse model of mitochondrial disease reveals germline selection against severe mtDNA mutations. *Science* 319, 958–962.
84. Narendra, D., Tanaka, A., Suen, D.F., and Youle, R.J. (2008). Parkin is recruited selectively to impaired mitochondria and promotes their autophagy. *J. Cell Biol.* 183, 795–803.
85. Narendra, D.P., Jin, S.M., Tanaka, A., Suen, D.F., Gautier, C.A., Shen, J., Cookson, M.R., and Youle, R.J. (2010). PINK1 is selectively stabilized on impaired mitochondria to activate parkin. *PLoS Biol.* 8, e1000298.
86. Youle, R.J., and Narendra, D.P. (2011). Mechanisms of mitophagy. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 12, 9–14.
87. Twig, G., Elorza, A., Molina, A.J.A., Mohamed, H., Wikstrom, J.D., Walzer, G., Stiles, L., Haigh, S.E., Katz, S., Las, G., et al. (2008). Fission and selective fusion govern mitochondrial segregation and elimination by autophagy. *EMBO J.* 27, 433–446.
88. Hill, G.E., Havird, J.C., Sloan, D.B., Burton, R.S., Greening, C., and Dowling, D.K. (2018). Assessing the fitness consequences of mitonuclear interactions in natural populations. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, In press. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12493>.
89. Visser, J.A., Durlinger, A.L.L., Peters, I.J.J., van den Heuvel, E.R., Rose, U.M., Kramer, P., de Jong, F.H., and Themmen, A.P.N. (2007). Increased oocyte degeneration and follicular atresia during the estrous cycle in anti-Müllerian hormone null mice. *Endocrinology* 148, 2301–2308.
90. Hayashi, Y., Otsuka, K., Ebina, M., Igarashi, K., Takehara, A., Matsumoto, M., Kanai, A., Soga, T., and Matsui, Y. (2017). Distinct requirements for energy metabolism in mouse primordial germ cells and their reprogramming to embryonic germ cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 114, 8289–8294.
91. Ge, H.S., Tollner, T.L., Hu, Z., Dai, M.M., Li, X.H., Guan, H.Q., Shan, D., Zhang, X.J., Lv, J.Q., Huang, C.J., et al. (2012). The importance of mitochondrial metabolic activity and mitochondrial DNA replication during oocyte maturation in vitro on oocyte quality and subsequent embryo developmental competence. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.* 79, 392–401.
92. De Fanti, S., Vicario, S., Lang, M., Simone, D., Magli, C., Luiselli, D., Gianaroli, L., and Romeo, G. (2017). Intra-individual purifying selection on mitochondrial DNA variants during human oogenesis. *Hum. Reprod.* 32, 1100–1107.
93. Desagher, S., and Martinou, J.C. (2000). Mitochondria as the central control point of apoptosis. *Trends Cell Biol.* 10, 369–377.
94. Hamilton, W.D., Axelrod, R., and Tanese, R. (1990). Sexual reproduction as an adaptation to resist parasites (a review). *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 87, 3566–3573.

95. Lively, C.M. (1987). Evidence from a New-Zealand snail for the maintenance of sex by parasitism. *Nature* 328, 519–521.
96. Birky, C.W. (1995). Uniparental inheritance of mitochondrial and chloroplast genes - mechanisms and evolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 92, 11331–11338.
97. Garg, S.G., and Martin, W.F. (2016). Mitochondria, the cell cycle, and the origin of sex via a syntactical eukaryote common ancestor. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 8, 1950–1970.
98. Nedelcu, A.M. (2005). Sex as a response to oxidative stress: stress genes co-opted for sex. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 272, 1935–1940.
99. Horandl, E., and Speijer, D. (2018). How oxygen gave rise to eukaryotic sex. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 285, 9.
100. Jenuth, J.P., Peterson, A.C., Fu, K., and Shoubridge, E.A. (1996). Random genetic drift in the female germline explains the rapid segregation of mammalian mitochondrial DNA. *Nat. Genet.* 14, 146–151.
101. Cree, L.M., Samuels, D.C., Lopes, S., Rajasimha, H.K., Wonnapijit, P., Mann, J.R., Dahl, H.H.M., and Chinnery, P.F. (2008). A reduction of mitochondrial DNA molecules during embryogenesis explains the rapid segregation of genotypes. *Nat. Genet.* 40, 249–254.
102. Folmes, C.D.L., Martinez-Fernandez, A., Perales-Clemente, E., Li, X., McDonald, A., Oglesbee, D., Hrstka, S.C., Perez-Terzic, C., Terzic, A., and Nelson, T.J. (2013). Disease-causing mitochondrial heteroplasmy segregated within induced pluripotent stem cell clones derived from a patient with MELAS. *Stem Cells* 31, 1298–1308.
103. Prigione, A., Fauler, B., Lurz, R., Lehrach, H., and Adjaye, J. (2010). The senescence-related mitochondrial/oxidative stress pathway is repressed in human induced pluripotent stem cells. *Stem Cells* 28, 721–733.
104. Reynier, P., May-Panloup, P., Chretien, M.F., Morgan, C.J., Jean, M., Savagner, F., Barriere, P., and Malthiery, Y. (2001). Mitochondrial DNA content affects the fertilizability of human oocytes. *Mol. Hum. Reprod.* 7, 425–429.
105. Bennett, G.M., and Moran, N.A. (2015). Heritable symbiosis: The advantages and perils of an evolutionary rabbit hole. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 112, 10169–10176.
106. Rispe, C., and Moran, N.A. (2000). Accumulation of deleterious mutations in endosymbionts: Muller's ratchet with two levels of selection. *Am. Nat.* 156, 425–441.
107. Yu, Z.S., O'Farrell, P.H., Yakubovich, N., and DeLuca, S.Z. (2017). The mitochondrial DNA polymerase promotes elimination of paternal mitochondrial genomes. *Curr. Biol.* 27, 1033–1039.
108. Luo, S.Y., Valencia, C.A., Zhang, J.L., Lee, N.C., Slone, J., Gui, B.H., Wang, X.J., Li, Z., Dell, S., Brown, J., et al. (2018). Biparental inheritance of mitochondrial DNA in humans. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 115, 13039–13044.
109. Pyle, A., Hudson, G., Wilson, I.J., Coxhead, J., Smertenko, T., Herbert, M., Santibanez-Koref, M., and Chinnery, P.F. (2015). Extreme-depth resequencing of mitochondrial DNA finds no evidence of paternal transmission in humans. *PLoS Genet.* 11, 11.
110. Schwartz, M., and Vissing, J. (2002). Paternal inheritance of mitochondrial DNA. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 347, 576–580.
111. Werren, J.H., and Beukeboom, L.W. (1998). Sex determination, sex ratios, and genetic conflict. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 29, 233–261.
112. Frank, S.A., and Hurst, L.D. (1996). Mitochondria and male disease. *Nature* 383, 224.
113. Gemmell, N.J., Metcalf, V.J., and Allendorf, F.W. (2004). Mother's curse: the effect of mtDNA on individual fitness and population viability. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19, 238–244.
114. Schnable, P.S., and Wise, R.P. (1998). The molecular basis of cytoplasmic male sterility and fertility restoration. *Trends Plant Sci.* 3, 175–180.
115. Kim, Y.J., and Zhang, D.B. (2018). Molecular control of male fertility for crop hybrid breeding. *Trends Plant Sci.* 23, 53–65.
116. Budar, F., Touzet, P., and De Paepe, R. (2003). The nucleo-mitochondrial conflict in cytoplasmic male sterilities revisited. *Genetica* 117, 3–16.
117. McCauley, D.E. (2013). Paternal leakage, heteroplasmy, and the evolution of plant mitochondrial genomes. *New Phytol.* 200, 966–977.
118. McCauley, D.E., Olson, M.S., Emery, S.N., and Taylor, D.R. (2000). Population structure influences sex ratio evolution in a gynodioecious plant. *Am. Nat.* 155, 814–819.
119. Loussaert, D., DeBruin, J., San Martin, J.P., Schussler, J., Pape, R., Clapp, J., Mongar, N., Fox, T., Albertsen, M., Trimnell, M., et al. (2017). Genetic male sterility (Ms44) Increases maize grain yield. *Crop Sci.* 57, 2718–2728.
120. Lewis, D. (1941). Male sterility in natural populations of hermaphrodite plants: The equilibrium between females and hermaphrodites to be expected with different types of inheritance. *New Phytol.* 40, 56–63.
121. Patel, M.R., Miriyala, G.K., Littleton, A.J., Yang, H.K., Trinh, K., Young, J.M., Kennedy, S.R., Yamashita, Y.M., Pallanck, L.J., and Malik, H.S. (2016). A mitochondrial DNA hypomorph of cytochrome oxidase specifically impairs male fertility in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Elife* 5, e16923.
122. Clancy, D.J., Hime, G.R., and Shirras, A.D. (2011). Cytoplasmic male sterility in *Drosophila melanogaster* associated with a mitochondrial CYTB variant. *Heredity* 107, 374–376.
123. Camus, M.F., and Dowling, D.K. (2018). Mitochondrial genetic effects on reproductive success: signatures of positive intrasexual, but negative intersexual pleiotropy. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 285, pii: 20180187.
124. Wolff, J.N., Gemmell, N.J., Tompkins, D.M., and Dowling, D.K. (2017). Introduction of a male-harming mitochondrial haplotype via 'Trojan Females' achieves population suppression in fruit flies. *Elife* 6, e23551.
125. Jacobs, M.S., and Wade, M.J. (2003). A synthetic review of the theory of gynodioecy. *Am. Nat.* 161, 837–851.
126. Wallace, D.C., Singh, G., Lott, M.T., Hodge, J.A., Schurr, T.G., Lezza, A.M., Elsas, L.J., and Nikoskelainen, E.K. (1988). Mitochondrial DNA mutation associated with Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy. *Science* 242, 1427–1430.
127. Milot, E., Moreau, C., Gagnon, A., Cohen, A.A., Brais, B., and Labuda, D. (2017). Mother's curse neutralizes natural selection against a human genetic disease over three centuries. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 1400–1406.
128. Xu, H., DeLuca, S.Z., and O'Farrell, P.H. (2008). Manipulating the meta-zoan mitochondrial genome with targeted restriction enzymes. *Science* 321, 575–577.
129. Nakada, K., Sato, A., Yoshida, K., Morita, T., Tanaka, H., Inoue, S.I., Yonekawa, H., and Hayashi, J.I. (2006). Mitochondria-related male infertility. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 103, 15148–15153.
130. Smith, S., Turbill, C., and Suchentrunk, F. (2010). Introducing mother's curse: low male fertility associated with an imported mtDNA haplotype in a captive colony of brown hares. *Mol. Ecol.* 19, 36–43.
131. Innocenti, P., Morrow, E.H., and Dowling, D.K. (2011). Experimental evidence supports a sex-specific selective sieve in mitochondrial genome evolution. *Science* 332, 845–848.
132. Camus, M.F., Wolf, J.B.W., Morrow, E.H., and Dowling, D.K. (2015). Single nucleotides in the mtDNA sequence modify mitochondrial molecular function and are associated with sex-specific effects on fertility and aging. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 2717–2722.
133. Ruiz-Pesini, E., Lapena, A.C., Diez-Sanchez, C., Perez-Martos, A., Montoya, J., Alvarez, E., Diaz, M., Urrieis, A., Montoro, L., Lopez-Perez, M.J., et al. (2000). Human mtDNA haplogroups associated with high or reduced spermatozoa motility. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 67, 682–696.
134. du Plessis, S.S., Agarwal, A., Mohanty, G., and van der Linde, M. (2015). Oxidative phosphorylation versus glycolysis: what fuel do spermatozoa use. *Asian J. Androl.* 17, 230–235.
135. Mukai, C., and Okuno, M. (2004). Glycolysis plays a major role for adenosine triphosphate supplementation in mouse sperm flagellar movement. *Biol. Reprod.* 71, 540–547.

136. Nascimento, J.M., Shi, L.Z., Tam, J., Chandsawangbhuwana, C., Durrant, B., Botvinick, E.L., and Berns, M.W. (2008). Comparison of glycolysis and oxidative phosphorylation as energy sources for mammalian sperm motility, using the combination of fluorescence imaging, laser tweezers, and real-time automated tracking and trapping. *J. Cell. Physiol.* **217**, 745–751.
137. Zabaleta, E., Heiser, V., Grohmann, L., and Brennicke, A. (1998). Promoters of nuclear-encoded respiratory chain Complex I genes from *Arabidopsis thaliana* contain a region essential for anther/pollen-specific expression. *Plant J.* **15**, 49–59.
138. Lee, S.L.J., and Warmke, H.E. (1979). Organelle size and number in fertile and t-cytoplasmic male-sterile corn. *Am. J. Bot.* **66**, 141–148.
139. Balk, J., and Leaver, C.J. (2001). The PET1-CMS mitochondrial mutation in sunflower is associated with premature programmed cell death and cytochrome c release. *Plant Cell* **13**, 1803–1818.
140. Sabar, M., De Paepe, R., and de Kouchkovsky, Y. (2000). Complex I impairment, respiratory compensations, and photosynthetic decrease in nuclear and mitochondrial male sterile mutants of *Nicotiana sylvestris*. *Plant Physiol.* **124**, 1239–1249.
141. Wu, H.M., and Cheung, A.Y. (2000). Programmed cell death in plant reproduction. *Plant Mol. Biol.* **44**, 267–281.
142. Walden, A.R., Walter, C., and Gardner, R.C. (1999). Genes expressed in *Pinus radiata* male cones include homologs to anther-specific and pathogenesis response genes. *Plant Physiol.* **121**, 1103–1116.
143. Flavell, R. (1974). A model for the mechanism of cytoplasmic male sterility in plants, with special reference to maize. *Plant Sci. Lett.* **3**, 259–263.
144. Harumoto, T., and Lemaitre, B. (2018). Male-killing toxin in a bacterial symbiont of *Drosophila*. *Nature* **557**, 252–255.
145. Beckmann, J.F., and Fallon, A.M. (2013). Detection of the *Wolbachia* protein WP10282 in mosquito spermathecae: Implications for cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Insect. Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **43**, 867–878.
146. Beckmann, J.F., Ronau, J.A., and Hochstrasser, M. (2017). A *Wolbachia* deubiquitylating enzyme induces cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2**, 17007.
147. LePage, D.P., Metcalf, J.A., Bordenstein, S.R., On, J.M., Perlmutter, J.I., Shropshire, J.D., Layton, E.M., Funkhouser-Jones, L.J., and Beckmann, J.F. (2017). Prophage WO genes recapitulate and enhance *Wolbachia*-induced cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Nature* **543**, 243–247.
148. Roux, F., Mary-Huard, T., Barillot, E., Wenes, E., Botran, L., Durand, S., Villoutreix, R., Martin-Magniette, M.L., Camilleri, C., and Budar, F. (2016). Cytonuclear interactions affect adaptive traits of the annual plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* in the field. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 3687–3692.
149. Hurst, G.D.D., and Werren, J.H. (2001). The role of selfish genetic elements in eukaryotic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **2**, 597–606.
150. Ross, J.A., Koboldt, D.C., Staisch, J.E., Chamberlin, H.M., Gupta, B.P., Miller, R.D., Baird, S.E., and Haag, E.S. (2011). *Caenorhabditis briggsae* recombinant inbred line genotypes reveal inter-strain incompatibility and the evolution of recombination. *PLoS Genet.* **7**, e1002174.
151. Chang, C.C., Rodriguez, J., and Ross, J. (2016). Mitochondrial-nuclear epistasis impacts fitness and mitochondrial physiology of interpopulation *Caenorhabditis briggsae* hybrids. *G3 (Bethesda)* **6**, 209–219.
152. Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., Chen, L.W., Liang, Q., Yin, X.M., Miao, L., Kang, B.H., and Xue, D. (2016). Kinetics and specificity of paternal mitochondrial elimination in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12569.
153. Zhu, Z.B., Lu, Q., Zeng, F.F., Wang, J.J., and Huang, S. (2015). Compatibility between mitochondrial and nuclear genomes correlates with the quantitative trait of lifespan in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 17303.
154. Ancell, H., and Pires-DaSilva, A. (2017). Sex-specific lifespan and its evolution in nematodes. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* **70**, 122–129.
155. Neale, D.B., Marshall, K.A., and Sederoff, R.R. (1989). Chloroplast and mitochondrial DNA are paternally inherited in *Sequoia sempervirens* D. Don Endl. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **86**, 9347–9349.
156. Nakamura, S. (2010). Paternal inheritance of mitochondria in *Chlamydomonas*. *J. Plant Res.* **123**, 163–170.
157. Bogdanova, V.S., Zaytseva, O.O., Mglinets, A.V., Shatskaya, N.V., Kosterin, O.E., and Vasiliev, G.V. (2015). Nuclear-cytoplasmic conflict in pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) is associated with nuclear and plastidic candidate genes encoding acetyl-CoA carboxylase subunits. *PLoS One* **10**, e0119835.
158. Stubbe, W., and Steiner, E. (1999). Inactivation of pollen and other effects of genome-plastome incompatibility in *Oenothera*. *Plant Syst. Evol.* **217**, 259–277.
159. Erixon, P., and Oxelman, B. (2008). Whole-gene positive selection, elevated synonymous substitution rates, duplication, and indel evolution of the chloroplast *clpP1* gene. *PLoS One* **3**, e1386.
160. Rockenbach, K., Havird, J.C., Monroe, J.G., Triant, D.A., Taylor, D.R., and Sloan, D.B. (2016). Positive selection in rapidly evolving plastid-nuclear enzyme complexes. *Genetics* **204**, 1507–1522.
161. Bock, D.G., Andrew, R.L., and Rieseberg, L.H. (2014). On the adaptive value of cytoplasmic genomes in plants. *Mol. Ecol.* **23**, 4899–4911.
162. Fujii, S., Bond, C.S., and Small, I.D. (2011). Selection patterns on restorer-like genes reveal a conflict between nuclear and mitochondrial genomes throughout angiosperm evolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 1723–1728.
163. Gaborieau, L., Brown, G.G., and Mireau, H. (2016). The propensity of pentatricopeptide repeat genes to evolve into restorers of cytoplasmic male sterility. *Front. Plant Sci.* **7**, 1816.
164. Touzet, P., and Budar, F. (2004). Unveiling the molecular arms race between two conflicting genomes in cytoplasmic male sterility? *Trends Plant Sci.* **9**, 568–570.
165. Sinkler, C.A., Kalpage, H., Shay, J., Lee, I., Malek, M.H., Grossman, L.I., and Huttemann, M. (2017). Tissue- and condition-specific isoforms of mammalian cytochrome c oxidase subunits: from function to human disease. *Oxid. Med. Cell. Longev.* **2017**, 1534056.
166. Gallach, M., Chandrasekaran, C., and Betran, E. (2010). Analyses of nuclearly encoded mitochondrial genes suggest gene duplication as a mechanism for resolving intralocus sexually antagonistic conflict in *Drosophila*. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **2**, 835–850.
167. Eslamieh, M., Williford, A., and Betran, E. (2017). Few nuclear-encoded mitochondrial gene duplicates contribute to male germline-specific functions in humans. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **9**, 2782–2790.
168. Pierron, D., Razafindrazaka, H., Rocher, C., Letellier, T., and Grossman, L.I. (2014). Human testis-specific genes are under relaxed negative selection. *Mol. Genet. Genomics* **289**, 37–45.
169. Camus, M.F., Clancy, D.J., and Dowling, D.K. (2012). Mitochondria, maternal inheritance, and male aging. *Curr. Biol.* **22**, 1717–1721.
170. Tourmente, M., Hirose, M., Ibrahim, S., Dowling, D.K., Tompkins, D.M., Roldan, E.R.S., and Gemmell, N.J. (2017). mtDNA polymorphism and metabolic inhibition affect sperm performance in conplastic mice. *Reproduction* **154**, 341–354.
171. Aw, W.C., Correa, C.C., Clancy, D.J., and Ballard, J.W.O. (2011). Mitochondrial DNA variants in *Drosophila melanogaster* are expressed at the level of the organismal phenotype. *Mitochondrion* **11**, 756–763.
172. Latorre-Pellicer, A., Moreno-Loshuertos, R., Lechuga-Vieco, A.V., Sanchez-Cabo, F., Torroja, C., Acin-Perez, R., Calvo, E., Aix, E., Gonzalez-Guerra, A., Logan, A., et al. (2016). Mitochondrial and nuclear DNA matching shapes metabolism and healthy ageing. *Nature* **535**, 561–565.
173. Yu, X., Gimsa, U., Wester-Rosenlof, L., Kanitz, E., Otten, W., Kunz, M., and Ibrahim, S.M. (2009). Dissecting the effects of mtDNA variations on complex traits using mouse conplastic strains. *Genome Res.* **19**, 159–165.
174. Mossman, J.A., Tross, J.G., Li, N., Wu, Z.J., and Rand, D.M. (2016). Mitochondrial-nuclear interactions mediate sex-specific transcriptional profiles in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **204**, 613–630.

175. Mossman, J.A., Biancani, L.M., Zhu, C.T., and Rand, D.M. (2016). Mitonuclear epistasis for development time and its modification by diet in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* 203, 463–484.
176. Mossman, J.A., Tross, J.G., Jourjine, N.A., Li, N., Wu, Z.J., and Rand, D.M. (2017). Mitonuclear interactions mediate transcriptional responses to hypoxia in *Drosophila*. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34, 447–466.
177. Yee, W.K.W., Sutton, K.L., and Dowling, D.K. (2013). In vivo male fertility is affected by naturally occurring mitochondrial haplotypes. *Curr. Biol.* 23, R55–R56.
178. Immonen, E., Collet, M., Goenaga, J., and Arnqvist, G. (2016). Direct and indirect genetic effects of sex-specific mitonuclear epistasis on reproductive ageing. *Heredity* 116, 329–338.
179. Đorđević, M., Stojković, B., Savković, U., Immonen, E., Tucić, N., Lazarević, J., and Arnqvist, G. (2017). Sex-specific mitonuclear epistasis and the evolution of mitochondrial bioenergetics, ageing, and life history in seed beetles. *Evolution* 71, 274–288.
180. Chong, R.A., and Moran, N.A. (2016). Intraspecific genetic variation in hosts affects regulation of obligate heritable symbionts. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 113, 13114–13119.
181. Bohra, A., Jha, U.C., Adhimooolam, P., Bisht, D., and Singh, N.P. (2016). Cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS) in hybrid breeding in field crops. *Plant Cell Rep.* 35, 967–993.
182. Chen, L.T., and Liu, Y.G. (2014). Male sterility and fertility restoration in crops. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* 65, 579–606.
183. Saxena, R.K., Saxena, K.B., Pazhamala, L.T., Patel, K., Parupalli, S., Sameerkumar, C.V., and Varshney, R.K. (2015). Genomics for greater efficiency in pigeonpea hybrid breeding. *Front. Plant Sci.* 6, 793.
184. Bacman, S.R., Kauppi, J.H.K., Pereira, C.V., Nissanka, N., Miranda, M., Pinto, M., Williams, S.L., Larsson, N.G., Stewart, J.B., and Moraes, C.T. (2018). MitoTALEN reduces mutant mtDNA load and restores tRNA. *Nat. Med.* 24, 1696–1700.
185. Gammage, P.A., Viscomi, C., Simard, M.L., Costa, A.S.H., Gaude, E., Powell, C.A., Van Haute, L., McCann, B.J., Rebelo-Guimar, P., Cerutti, R., et al. (2018). Genome editing in mitochondria corrects a pathogenic mtDNA mutation in vivo. *Nat. Med.* 24, 1691–1695.
186. Gemmell, N.J., Jalilzadeh, A., Didham, R.K., Soboleva, T., and Tompkins, D.M. (2013). The Trojan female technique: a novel, effective and humane approach for pest population control. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 280, 20132549.
187. Kang, E.J., Wu, J., Gutierrez, N.M., Koski, A., Tippner-Hedges, R., Agaronyan, K., Platero-Luengo, A., Martinez-Redondo, P., Ma, H., Lee, Y., et al. (2016). Mitochondrial replacement in human oocytes carrying pathogenic mitochondrial DNA mutations. *Nature* 540, 270–275.
188. Hyslop, L.A., Blakeley, P., Craven, L., Richardson, J., Fogarty, N.M.E., Fragouli, E., Lamb, M., Wamaitha, S.E., Prathalingam, N., Zhang, Q., et al. (2016). Towards clinical application of pronuclear transfer to prevent mitochondrial DNA disease. *Nature* 534, 383–386.
189. Yamada, M., Emmanuele, V., Sanchez-Quintero, M.J., Sun, B., Lallios, G., Paull, D., Zimmer, M., Pagett, S., Prosser, R.W., Sauer, M.V., et al. (2016). Genetic drift can compromise mitochondrial replacement by nuclear transfer in human oocytes. *Cell Stem Cell* 18, 749–754.
190. Diaz, F., Bayona-Bafaluy, M.P., Rana, M., Mora, M., Hao, H., and Moraes, C.T. (2002). Human mitochondrial DNA with large deletions repopulates organelles faster than full-length genomes under relaxed copy number control. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 30, 4626–4633.
191. Russell, O.M., Fruh, I., Rai, P.K., Marcellin, D., Doll, T., Reeve, A., Germain, M., Bastien, J., Rygiel, K.A., Cerino, R., et al. (2018). Preferential amplification of a human mitochondrial DNA deletion in vitro and in vivo. *Sci. Rep.* 8, 1799.
192. Hill, G.E. (2016). Mitonuclear coevolution as the genesis of speciation and the mitochondrial DNA barcode gap. *Ecol. Evol.* 6, 5831–5842.
193. Hill, G.E., and Johnson, J.D. (2013). The mitonuclear compatibility hypothesis of sexual selection. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 280, 20131314.
194. Zouros, E. (2013). Biparental inheritance through uniparental transmission: the doubly uniparental inheritance (DUI) of mitochondrial DNA. *Evol. Biol.* 40, 1–31.
195. Gusman, A., Lecomte, S., Stewart, D.T., Passamonti, M., and Breton, S. (2016). Pursuing the quest for better understanding the taxonomic distribution of the system of doubly uniparental inheritance of mtDNA. *PeerJ* 4, 27.
196. Burki, F. (2014). The eukaryotic tree of life from a global phylogenomic perspective. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 6, a016147.
197. Alexander, M., Ho, S.Y.W., Molak, M., Barnett, R., Carlborg, Ö., Dorshorst, B., Honaker, C., Besnier, F., Wahlberg, P., Dobney, K., et al. (2015). Mitogenomic analysis of a 50-generation chicken pedigree reveals a rapid rate of mitochondrial evolution and evidence for paternal mtDNA inheritance. *Biol. Lett.* 11, 10–13.
198. Zhao, X., Li, N., Guo, W., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Gong, G., Wang, A., Feng, J., and Wu, C. (2004). Further evidence for paternal inheritance of mitochondrial DNA in the sheep (*Ovis aries*). *Heredity (Edinb)* 93, 399–403.
199. Nunes, M.D.S., Dolezal, M., and Schlötterer, C. (2013). Extensive paternal mtDNA leakage in natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Mol. Ecol.* 22, 2106–2117.
200. Gyllenstein, U., Wharton, D., Josefsson, A., and Wilson, A.C. (1991). Paternal inheritance of mitochondrial-DNA in mice. *Nature* 352, 255–257.
201. Kvist, L., Martens, J., Nazarenko, A.A., and Orell, M. (2003). Paternal leakage of mitochondrial DNA in the great tit (*Parus major*). *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 20, 243–247.
202. Barr, C.M., Neiman, M., and Taylor, D.R. (2005). Inheritance and recombination of mitochondrial genomes in plants, fungi and animals. *New Phytol.* 168, 39–50.
203. Solieri, L. (2010). Mitochondrial inheritance in budding yeasts: Towards an integrated understanding. *Trends Microbiol.* 18, 521–530.
204. Yan, Z., Hull, C.M., Sun, S., Heitman, J., and Xu, J. (2007). The mating type-specific homeodomain genes SX11 α and SX12 α coordinately control uniparental mitochondrial inheritance in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. *Curr. Genet.* 51, 187–195.
205. Yaffe, M.P. (1991). Organelle inheritance in the yeast cell cycle. *Trends Cell Biol.* 1, 160–164.
206. Xu, J. (2005). The inheritance of organelle genes and genomes: patterns and mechanisms. *Genome* 48, 951–958.
207. Basse, C.W. (2014). Mitochondrial inheritance in fungi. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta Bioenerg.* 1837, 1039–1046.
208. Seitz-Mayr, G., Wolf, K., and Kaudewitz, F. (1978). Extrachromosomal inheritance in *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*. VII. Studies by zygote clone analysis on transmission, segregation, recombination, and uniparental inheritance of mitochondrial markers conferring resistance to antimycin, chloramphenicol, and ery. *Mol. Gen. Genet.* 164, 309–320.
209. Mirfakhrai, M., Tanaka, Y., and Yanagisawa, K. (1990). Evidence for mitochondrial DNA polymorphism and uniparental inheritance in the cellular slime mold *Polysphondylium pallidum*: effect of intraspecific mating on mitochondrial DNA transmission. *Genetics* 124, 607–613.
210. Silliker, M.E., Liles, J.L., and Monroe, J.A. (2002). Patterns of mitochondrial inheritance in the myxogastrid *Didymium iridis*. *Mycologia* 94, 939–946.
211. Moriyama, Y., and Kawano, S. (2003). Rapid, selective digestion of mitochondrial DNA in accordance with the matA hierarchy of multiallelic mating types in the mitochondrial inheritance of *Physarum polycephalum*. *Genetics* 164, 963–975.
212. Reboud, X., and Zeyl, C. (1994). Organelle inheritance in plants. *Heredity (Edinb)* 72, 132–140.
213. Corriveau, J.L., and Coleman, A.W. (2016). Rapid screening method to detect potential biparental inheritance of plastid DNA and results for over 200 angiosperm species. *Am. J. Bot.* 75, 1443–1458.
214. Whatley, J.M. (1982). Ultrastructure of plastid inheritance: green algae to angiosperms. *Biol. Rev.* 57, 527–569.

215. Hu, Y., Zhang, Q., Rao, G., and Sodmergen. (2008). Occurrence of plastids in the sperm cells of caprifoliaceae: Biparental plastid inheritance in angiosperms is unilaterally derived from maternal inheritance. *Plant Cell Physiol.* 49, 958–968.
216. Zhang, Q., Liu, Y., and Sodmergen. (2003). Examination of the cytoplasmic DNA in male reproductive cells to determine the potential for cytoplasmic inheritance in 295 angiosperm species. *Plant Cell Physiol.* 44, 941–951.
217. Hagemann, R. (2004). The sexual inheritance of plant organelles. In *Molecular Biology and Biotechnology of Plant Organelles*, H. Daniell, and C. Chase, eds. (Dordrecht: Springer).
218. Zuccarello, G.C., and West, J.A. (2011). Insights into evolution and speciation in the red alga *Bostrychia*: 15 years of research. *Algae* 26, 21–32.
219. Zuccarello, G.C., West, J.A., Kamiya, M., and King, R.J. (1999). A rapid method to score plastid haplotypes in red seaweeds and its use in determining parental inheritance of plastids in the red alga *Bostrychia* (Ceramiales). *Hydrobiologia* 401, 207–214.
220. Zuccarello, G.C., Burger, G., West, J.A., and King, R.J. (1999). A mitochondrial marker for red algal intraspecific relationships. *Mol. Ecol.* 8, 1443–1447.
221. Choi, S.J., Park, E.J., Endo, H., Kitade, Y., and Saga, N. (2008). Inheritance pattern of chloroplast and mitochondrial genomes in artificial hybrids of *Porphyra yezoensis* (Rhodophyta). *Fish. Sci.* 74, 822–829.
222. Chong, J., Jackson, C., Kim, J.I., Yoon, H.S., and Reyes-Prieto, A. (2014). Molecular markers from different genomic compartments reveal cryptic diversity within glaucophyte species. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 76, 181–188.
223. Bendif, E.M., Probert, I., Carmichael, M., Romac, S., Hagino, K., and de Vargas, C. (2014). Genetic delineation between and within the widespread coccolithophore morpho-species *Emiliania huxleyi* and *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* (Haptophyta). *J. Phycol.* 50, 140–148.
224. Motomura, T., Nagasato, C., and Kimura, K. (2010). Cytoplasmic inheritance of organelles in brown algae. *J. Plant Res.* 123, 185–192.
225. Nagasato, C., Motomura, T., and Ichimura, T. (2000). Spindle formation in karyogamy-blocked zygotes of the isogamous brown alga *Scytosiphon lomentaria* (Scytosiphonales, Phaeophyceae). *Eur. J. Phycol.* 35, 339–347.
226. Peters, A.F., Scornet, D., Müller, D.G., Kloareg, B., and Cock, J.M. (2004). Inheritance of organelles in artificial hybrids of the isogamous multicellular chromist alga *Ectocarpus siliculosus* (Phaeophyceae). *Eur. J. Phycol.* 39, 235–242.
227. Brawley, S.H., Quatrano, R.S., and Wetherbee, R. (1977). Fine-structural studies of the gametes and embryo of *Fucus vesiculosus* L. (Phaeophyta). III. Cytokinesis and the multicellular embryo. *J. Cell Sci.* 24, 275–294.
228. Hurst, L.D. (1995). Selfish genetic elements and their role in evolution: the evolution of sex and some of what that entails. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 349, 321–332.
229. Nishi, M., Hu, K., Murray, J.M., and Roos, D.S. (2008). Organellar dynamics during the cell cycle of *Toxoplasma gondii*. *J. Cell Sci.* 121, 1559–1568.
230. Ferguson, D.J.P., Henriquez, F.L., Kirisits, M.J., Muench, S.P., Prigge, S.T., Rice, D.W., Roberts, C.W., and McLeod, R.L. (2005). Maternal inheritance and stage-specific variation of the apicoplast in the intermediate and definitive host. *Eukaryot. Cell* 4, 814–826.
231. Ferguson, D.J.P., Campbell, S.A., Henriquez, F.L., Phan, L., Mui, E., Richards, T.A., Muench, S.P., Allary, M., Lu, J.Z., Prigge, S.T., et al. (2007). Enzymes of type II fatty acid synthesis and apicoplast differentiation and division in *Eimeria tenella*. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 37, 33–51.
232. Ramírez, J.D., Guhl, F., Messenger, L.A., Lewis, M.D., Montilla, M., Cucunuba, Z., Miles, M.A., and Llewellyn, M.S. (2012). Contemporary cryptic sexuality in *Trypanosoma cruzi*. *Mol. Ecol.* 21, 4216–4226.
233. Gibson, W. (2001). Sex and evolution in trypanosomes. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 31, 643–647.
234. Gibson, W., and Garside, L. (1990). Kinetoplast DNA minicircles are inherited from both parents in genetic crosses of *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Parasitol. Res.* 83, 483–488.
235. Davis, C.C., Xi, Z.X., and Mathews, S. (2014). Plastid phylogenomics and green plant phylogeny: almost full circle but not quite there. *BMC Biol.* 12, 4.
236. Zhu, A., Fan, W., Adams, R.P., and Mower, J.P. (2018). Phylogenomic evidence for ancient recombination between plastid genomes of the *Cupressus-Juniperus-Xanthocyparis* complex (Cupressaceae). *BMC Evol. Biol.* 18, 137.
237. Crosby, K., and Smith, D.R. (2012). Does the mode of plastid inheritance influence plastid genome architecture? *PLoS One* 7, 1–8.
238. Guzzo, F., Baldan, B., Bracco, F., and Mariani, P. (1994). Pollen development in *Liriodendron tulipifera* - some unusual features. *Can. J. Bot.* 72, 352–358.
239. Mogensen, H.L. (1996). The hows and whys of cytoplasmic inheritance in seed plants. *Am. J. Bot.* 83, 383–404.
240. Yao, J., Cohen, D., and Rowland, R.E. (1994). Plastid DNA inheritance and plastome-genome incompatibility in interspecific hybrids of *Zantedeschia* (Araceae). *Theor. Appl. Genet.* 255–260.
241. Snijder, R.C., Brown, F.S., and Tuyl, Jm. (2007). The role of plastome-genome incompatibility and biparental plastid inheritance in interspecific hybridization in the genus *Zantedeschia* (Araceae). *Flor. Orn. Biotechnol.* 1, 150–157.
242. Barnard-Kubow, K.B., McCoy, M.A., and Galloway, L.F. (2017). Biparental chloroplast inheritance leads to rescue from cytonuclear incompatibility. *New Phytol.* 213, 1466–1476.
243. Levsen, N., Bergero, R., Charlesworth, D., and Wolff, K. (2016). Frequent, geographically structured heteroplasmy in the mitochondria of a flowering plant, ribwort plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*). *Heredity* (Edinb) 117, 1–7.
244. McCauley, D.E., Sundby, A.K., Bailey, M.F., and Welch, M.E. (2007). Inheritance of chloroplast DNA is not strictly maternal in *Silene vulgaris* (Caryophyllaceae): Evidence from experimental crosses and natural populations. *Am. J. Bot.* 94, 1333–1337.
245. Renzaglia, K.S., Renzaglia, K.S., Bernhard, D.L., Bernhard, D.L., Garbary, D.J., and Garbary, D.J. (1999). Developmental ultrastructure of the male gamete of *Selaginella*. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 160, 14–28.
246. Zhong, Z.R., Li, N., Qian, D., Jin, J.H., and Chen, T. (2011). Maternal inheritance of plastids and mitochondria in *Cycas* L. (Cycadaceae). *Mol. Genet. Genomics* 286, 411–416.
247. Perlman, S.J., Hunter, M.S., and Zchori-Fein, E. (2006). The emerging diversity of *Rickettsia*. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 273, 2097–2106.
248. Duron, O., Bouchon, D., Boutin, S., Bellamy, L., Zhou, L., Engelstädter, J., and Hurst, G.D. (2008). The diversity of reproductive parasites among arthropods: *Wolbachia* do not walk alone. *BMC Biol.* 6, 27.
249. Andreadis, T.G. (1985). Experimental transmission of a microsporidian pathogen from mosquitoes to an alternate copepod host. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 82, 5574–5577.
250. Werren, J.H., Skinner, S.W., and Huger, A.M. (1986). Male-killing bacteria in a parasitic wasp. *Science* 231, 990–992.
251. Hurst, G.D., and Jiggins, F.M. (2000). Male-killing bacteria in insects: mechanisms, incidence, and implications. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 6, 329–336.
252. Bandi, C., Dunn, A.M., Hurst, G.D., and Rigaud, T. (2001). Inherited microorganisms, sex-specific virulence and reproductive parasitism. *Trends Parasitol.* 17, 88–94.
253. Nguyen, D.T., Morrow, J.L., Spooner-Hart, R.N., and Riegler, M. (2017). Independent cytoplasmic incompatibility induced by *Cardinium* and *Wolbachia* maintains endosymbiotic coinfections in haplodiploid thrips populations. *Evolution* 71, 995–1008.