ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY MOLECULAR ECOLOGY

The chicken or the egg? Adaptation to desiccation and salinity tolerance in a lineage of water beetles

Susana Pallarés[1] | Paula Arribas[2] | David T. Bilton[3] | Andrés Millán[1] | Josefa Velasco[1] | Ignacio Ribera[4]

[1]Department of Ecology and Hydrology, Facultad de Biología, University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

[2]Island Ecology and Evolution Research Group, IPNA-CSIC, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain

[3]Marine Biology and Ecology Research Centre, School of Biological and Marine Sciences, Plymouth University, Plymouth, UK

[4]Institute of Evolutionary Biology (CSIC-Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Barcelona, Spain

Correspondence
Susana Pallarés, Department of Ecology and Hydrology, Facultad de Biología, University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain.
Email: susana.pallares@um.es

Abstract

Transitions from fresh to saline habitats are restricted to a handful of insect lineages, as the colonization of saline waters requires specialized mechanisms to deal with osmotic stress. Previous studies have suggested that tolerance to salinity and desiccation could be mechanistically and evolutionarily linked, but the temporal sequence of these adaptations is not well established for individual lineages. We combined molecular, physiological and ecological data to explore the evolution of desiccation resistance, hyporegulation ability (i.e., the ability to osmoregulate in hyperosmotic media) and habitat transitions in the water beetle genus *Enochrus* subgenus *Lumetus* (Hydrophilidae). We tested whether enhanced desiccation resistance evolved before increases in hyporegulation ability or vice versa, or whether the two mechanisms evolved in parallel. The most recent ancestor of *Lumetus* was inferred to have high desiccation resistance and moderate hyporegulation ability. There were repeated shifts between habitats with differing levels of salinity in the radiation of the group, those to the most saline habitats generally occurring more rapidly than those to less saline ones. Significant and accelerated changes in hyporegulation ability evolved in parallel with smaller and more progressive increases in desiccation resistance across the phylogeny, associated with the colonization of meso- and hypersaline waters during global aridification events. All species with high hyporegulation ability were also desiccation-resistant, but not vice versa. Overall, results are consistent with the hypothesis that desiccation resistance mechanisms evolved first and provided the physiological basis for the development of hyporegulation ability, allowing these insects to colonize and diversify across meso- and hypersaline habitats.

KEYWORDS
ancestral reconstruction, aquatic insects, habitat transitions, hyporegulation ability, inland saline waters, water loss

1 | INTRODUCTION

How organisms acquire novel traits or undergo adaptive trait divergence are central questions in evolutionary ecology, as these processes facilitate niche shifts and the colonization of novel environments (Heard & Hauser, 1995; Hunter, 1998; Moczek, 2008). In the aquatic realm, the evolution of hydric and osmotic regulation mechanisms was a key innovation allowing transitions from marine to freshwater habitats in some animal groups such as fishes or crustaceans (e.g., Faria, Augusto, & McNamara, 2011; McNamara & Faria,

2012; Schultz & McCormick, 2012). Similarly, but in the opposing direction, the evolution of these mechanisms in inland aquatic lineages has allowed for transitions from fresh to saline inland waters, a recurrent phenomenon in a number of aquatic insect orders (e.g., Albers & Bradley, 2011). Most interestingly, such transitions to saline waters seem to be much more frequent in some taxa than others, with closely related genera either being entirely restricted to freshwaters, or spanning the fresh–hypersaline gradient (see, e.g., Arribas et al., 2014 for beetles; Carbonell, Millán, & Velasco, 2012 for water bugs; or Herbst, 1999 for flies). The physiological and evolutionary processes that may facilitate the colonization of extreme habitats such as saline waters remain poorly understood, however, and require the study of relevant organismal traits within a phylogenetic context (Cheng & Chen, 1999; Tobler & Plath, 2011).

In insects, the main osmoregulatory adaptations are a highly impermeable cuticle and a rectum capable of producing hyperosmotic excreta. These are ancestral characters, found in virtually all insect lineages and are clearly essential to their success on land, where desiccation is a major physiological stress factor. In contrast, tolerance to the osmotic stress produced by a saline aquatic medium seems to be a very specialized secondary adaption, only present in a few insect orders (Bradley et al., 2009). In general, insect species that show tolerance to salinities above that of seawater are efficient hyporegulators; that is, they are able to maintain the concentration of haemolymph below that of the external medium and within a narrow range regardless of the external osmotic concentration (e.g., Herbst, Conte, & Brookes, 1988; Pallarés, Arribas, Bilton, Millán, & Velasco, 2015; Tones & Hammer, 1975). Ultimately, hyporegulation has the same physiological basis as mechanisms dealing with dehydration in air, as both desiccation and hyperosmotic stress alter ionic and water balance, with similar effects at the cellular level (Bradley, 2009; Cohen, 2012; Evans, 2008). Their common physiological basis likely lies in ion transport and cell volume regulation processes (Beyenbach, 2016; Griffith, 2017), which in most insects involve the activity of excretory organs, such as Malpighian tubules and the rectum, and the control of cuticular permeability (Dow & Davies, 2006; Gibbs & Rajpurohit, 2010; Larsen et al., 2014). Given the physiological similarities between mechanisms to cope with salinity and desiccation stress and the frequent spatial and temporal co-occurrence of both stressors, tolerance to them may be evolutionarily linked in some insect lineages. In such cases, selection on the osmoregulatory system to deal with desiccation stress could have secondarily facilitated hyporegulation at high salinities, or the other way around.

The relationship between tolerance to salinity and desiccation has been mostly studied in plants (e.g., Barrieu et al., 1999; Cayuela et al., 2007; Hossain, Mostofa, & Fujita, 2013) and to a lesser extent in animal taxa (Faria, Provete, Thurman, & McNamara, 2017; Gómez-Mestre & Tejedo, 2005). Despite the relevance of such relationship, to our knowledge, no previous studies have addressed the potential evolutionary links between mechanisms to deal with salinity and desiccation. However, recent studies on salinity tolerance in aquatic insects point to their close association. First, beetle adults (Pallarés, Botella-Cruz, Arribas, Millán, & Velasco, 2017) and dipteran larvae

(Elnitsky, Benoit, Lopez-Martinez, Denlinger, & Lee, 2009) sequentially exposed to salinity and desiccation showed cross-tolerance responses (Sinclair, Ferguson, Salehipour-shirazi, & MacMillan, 2013; Todgham & Stillman, 2013), suggesting a mechanistic link between the response to both stressors. Second, a recent study reconstructing the colonization of saline waters by *Enochrus* water beetles (Hydrophilidae) suggested that salinity tolerance arose during periods of global aridification, when multiple independent transitions from fresh to saline waters apparently occurred (Arribas et al., 2014). These authors also found a positive correlation between the salinity of the preferred habitat of a species and the aridity of the region over which it is distributed. Finally, in agreement with this ecological correlation, Pallarés, Velasco, Millán, Bilton, & Arribas, (2016) revealed a positive relationship between desiccation resistance and salinity tolerance in species of *Enochrus* in the laboratory.

Despite multiple lines of evidence suggesting an evolutionary link between hyporegulation ability and desiccation resistance in water beetles, the temporal sequence of these adaptations—and hence their evolutionary origin—is still not well established. Arribas et al. (2014) hypothesized that the development of drought tolerance during periods of global aridification could have secondarily increased hyporegulation ability, facilitating the colonization of saline waters in the *Lumetus* subgenus of *Enochrus*. In this case, hyporegulation ability would represent an exaptation of increased tolerance to desiccation. The inverse exaptation sequence is also plausible, however, as the enhancement of osmoregulatory mechanisms for salinity tolerance would also facilitate aridity tolerance (Lee, Kiergaard, Gelembiuk, Eads, & Posavi, 2011). Mechanisms for tolerance to salinity and desiccation could have also evolved as a joint response to aridification, as this process typically results in a simultaneous decrease in precipitation and increase in the mineralization of surface waters.

The relationship between aridity and salinity demonstrated by Arribas et al. (2014) was based only on ecological data (species habitat occupancies and regional climates), which do not always fully reflect the potential physiological tolerance of species (Carbonell et al., 2012; Céspedes, Pallarés, Arribas, Millán, & Velasco, 2013). Mismatches between realized and fundamental niches may result when physiological tolerance evolved as a result of prior exposure to different stressors, as in such cases species may retain the ability to deal with conditions different from those in their current habitats. Disentangling the evolution of hyporegulation and desiccation resistance in organisms spanning the fresh–saline spectrum is thus not straightforward, and requires an integrative approach, based on the measurement of ecological and organismal traits within a sound phylogenetic context—something which has not been attempted to date in any lineage.

Here, we combine experimental, ecological and molecular data to track the evolution of desiccation resistance, hyporegulation ability and habitat transitions across the saline gradient in adults of the water beetle subgenus *Lumetus*. This lineage includes species in all habitat types from fresh to hypersaline waters, with differing hyporegulation abilities (Pallarés et al., 2015). We provide a comprehensive and generally well-resolved phylogeny of the subgenus,

together with experimental data on desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability across its constituent taxa, and use ancestral trait reconstruction and phylogenetic comparative methods to test the following alternative hypotheses:

1. The hyporegulation ability allowing the colonization of saline waters was co-opted from physiological mechanisms evolved originally for desiccation resistance.
2. The development of hyporegulation ability in saline waters was the primary adaptation, secondarily leading to an increase in desiccation resistance.
3. Desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability evolved in correlation.

In the first case, all species living in meso- or hypersaline waters should be efficient hyporegulators and tolerant to desiccation, but the reverse needs not to be true (i.e., there may be desiccation-resistant species with low or no hyporegulation ability). In addition, there could be species with high desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability primarily living in fresh–hyposaline waters (i.e., able to tolerate higher salinities even if they—or their ancestors—have never occupied this type of habitat). In the phylogeny, increases in hyporegulation ability may be expected to be preceded by increases in desiccation resistance.

Under the second hypothesis, the situation would be the reverse, and we could expect that all species that are resistant to desiccation will be good hyporegulators, but not necessarily vice versa (i.e., there could be hyporegulator species with low desiccation resistance). In this case, an increase in desiccation resistance should be preceded by an increase in hyporegulation ability across the phylogeny.

Finally, if desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability evolved in correlation, enhanced values of these traits should coincide phylogenetically. All species with high hyporegulation ability should then be tolerant to desiccation, and vice versa. This would still be observed under an exaptation process (hypothesis i or ii) if both tolerances are governed by essentially identical physiological mechanisms and gene pathways.

There could be a fourth possibility, namely that there was an independent evolution of desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability. There is, however, ample evidence for the association between tolerance to desiccation and salinity in Lumetus (Arribas et al., 2014; Pallarés et al., 2016, 2017), allowing this possibility to be discarded a priori.

2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 | Taxon sampling

A total of 220 specimens representing 18 of the 23 known species of the subgenus were used to obtain the phylogeny of Lumetus (Table S1). Molecular data were obtained from de novo sequencing of 64 specimens plus sequences from previous work (Arribas et al., 2012, 2014; Arribas, Andújar, Sánchez-Fernández, Abellán, & Millán,

2013). Several Enochrus species of the subgenera Methydrus, Enochrus and Hugoscottia and a related genus (Helochares) were used as outgroups, with two more distantly related genera of Hydrophilidae, Hydrobius and Arabhydrus (Short & Fikácek, 2013) used to root the tree, resulting in a phylogeny of 43 species.

Data on hyporegulation ability and desiccation resistance were obtained experimentally from adults of a representative subset of nine species (Table S2). Studied species included at least one from each of the main Lumetus clades obtained in preliminary phylogenetic analyses and one outgroup species from the subgenus Methydrus (Enochrus coarctatus).

2.2 | Phylogeny of Lumetus

DNA from the new collected specimens was extracted and sequenced following the methodology of Arribas et al. (2013, 2014). We sequenced five mitochondrial genes: two nonoverlapping fragments of the cytochrome *c* oxidase I gene corresponding to the 5′ (cox1–A) and the 3′ end (cox1–B); an internal fragment of the cytochrome *b* gene (cyt *b*); and a fragment spanning three genes (5′ end of the large ribosomal subunit plus leucine transferase and the 5′ end of NADH dehydrogenase subunit 1; rrnL + trnL + nad1). From nuclear DNA, we sequenced an internal fragment of the large ribosomal unit, 28S rRNA (LSU) and an internal fragment of the internal transcribed spacer 2 (ITS2) (Table S3).

Sequences were assembled and edited with GENEIOUS 5.5.9 (Biomatters Ltd. Auckland, New Zealand), using Ns (missing data) for ambiguous positions. Alignments were obtained with the online version of MAFFT v.7 (Katoh & Toh, 2008) using the *auto* option for protein coding and *QINS-i* for ribosomal genes, with other parameters set as defaults. For protein-coding genes, the correct translation to amino acids was checked to ensure there were no stop codons or frame shifts.

Bayesian phylogenetic analyses on the concatenated DNA matrix were implemented in BEAST 1.8.0 (Drummond, Suchard, Xie, & Rambaut, 2012) and run in the CIPRES Science Gateway (Miller, Pfeiffer, & Chwartz, 2010). The concatenated data set was divided into three partitions: the three protein-coding genes, the mitochondrial ribosomal gene and the two nuclear sequences. Analyses were conducted by applying a GTR + I + G substitution model for each partition, which was the best-fitting model previously estimated with PARTITION FINDER (Lanfear, Calcott, Ho, & Guindon, 2012). We applied a Yule speciation tree prior. To calibrate the tree, we used as a prior for the age of Lumetus (time to most recent common ancestor, tMRCA) the age distribution of this node obtained by Arribas et al. (2014)—that is, ≈45 Ma (gamma distribution shape: 56.84, scale: 0.74). An uncorrelated lognormal clock was applied for the nuclear partition, with an uniform prior distribution for the rate of substitutions set between 0.0001 and 0.01 substitutions per site per time unit (subs/s/Ma) and an initial value of 0.001, together with a strict clock for each of the mitochondrial partitions with an uniform prior distribution for the rate with 0.01 (0.001–0.1) subst/s/Ma. The ranges set as priors for the substitution rates cover the range of rates usually reported for

Coleoptera, which are faster for the mitochondrial than for the nuclear genes used in this study (e.g., Andújar, Serrano, & Gómez-Zurita, 2012; Papadopoulou, Anastasiou, & Vogler, 2010; Ribera et al., 2010).

We set two independent runs of 100 million MCMC steps each, sampling one tree every 10,000 generations. LogCombiner (Drummond et al., 2012) was used to combine trees from both runs and to obtain 1,000 randomly resampled post-burnin trees. The consensus tree was estimated with TREEANNOTATOR (Drummond et al., 2012). The 25% initial trees were discarded as a burnin fraction, after checking for convergence in TRACER v1.6 (Drummond et al., 2012).

2.3 | Ecological data, hyporegulation ability and desiccation resistance

To track habitat transitions across the salinity gradient, each *Lumetus* species was assigned a qualitative salinity category according to our field data or bibliographic data on the salinity of their most frequently occupied habitats. We followed the same criteria and categorization done by Arribas et al. (2014), with special attention to the records of populations in habitats with the highest salinities, as these may better reflect species' tolerance limits (Carbonell et al., 2012; Céspedes et al., 2013). Six categories were used as follows: freshwater (≤0.5 g/L), mineralized (0.5–5 g/L), hyposaline (5–20 g/L), mesosaline (20–40 g/L), hypersaline (40–80 g/L) and extreme hypersaline (>80 g/L).

To determine the hyporegulation ability of the nine selected species (Table S2), haemolymph osmolalities were measured in individuals exposed for 48 hr to different salinities within their specific tolerance ranges (as determined by pilot trials or previous work, Pallarés et al., 2015). All species were exposed to at least two common hyposmotic treatments (0.3 and 12 g/L) and a hyperosmotic one (35 g/L) to obtain comparable osmolality measurements. For each species, the treatment in which mortality exceeded 50% of the tested individuals was considered as the upper lethal limit (e.g., Faria et al., 2017) (Table S4). From each treatment, we obtained haemolymph samples from a minimum of three of the exposed individuals (Table S4), as pilot trails showed low intraspecific variation within salinity treatments. Osmolality of the haemolymph and the saline media were measured using a calibrated nanolitre osmometer (Otago Osmometers, Dunedin, New Zealand). For each treatment, we estimated the hyper- or hyposmotic capacity, that is, the difference between the osmotic concentration of the haemolymph and the external medium, which represents an integrated measure of the physiological ability to compensate for the osmotic gradient between internal and external media (Calosi, Ugolini, & Morritt, 2005; Charmantier, Charmantier-Daures, & Aiken, 1984). The hyposmotic capacity at 35 g/L (hyposmotic capacity hereafter) and the maximum hyposmotic capacity (i.e., that measured at the highest salinity tolerated by each species) showed the highest variation between species and were therefore used for subsequent analyses.

Controlled desiccation experiments were conducted as described by Pallarés et al. (2016). Specimens were exposed to desiccation at 20 ± 5% RH (relative humidity), 20 ± 1°C for 6 hr. For each specimen, we measured the initial and final fresh mass (i.e., specimen mass before and after desiccation treatments) as well as dry mass. From these measurements, we obtained the initial water content as the % wet mass (difference between fresh and dry mass) relative to initial fresh mass and water loss as the % of water lost relative to initial fresh mass. These variables, and in particular water loss, have previously been shown to be relevant for desiccation resistance in *Lumetus* species (Pallarés et al., 2016, 2017). Specimens were allowed to recover at freshwater conditions for 24 hr after desiccation. Mortality was assessed after both desiccation and the recovery period. These estimates were obtained for 20–30 specimens per species (Table S4).

After each experiment, specimens were sexed by examining genitalia under a Leica M165C stereomicroscope. Further details of the experimental procedures are indicated in the Appendix S1.

2.4 | Habitat transitions, evolution of desiccation resistance and osmoregulatory capacity

2.4.1 | Ancestral trait reconstruction

We tested different models of trait evolution (Brownian motion—BM and Ornstein–Uhlenbeck—OU) (Kaliontzopoulou & Adams, 2016) to reconstruct ancestral values of habitat salinity (considered as a semi-continuous variable), hyposmotic capacity and desiccation resistance traits. Intraspecific variation, missing observations and small tree size can profoundly affect the performance of such models (Boettiger, Coop, & Ralph, 2012; Cooper, Thomas, Venditti, Meade, & Freckleton, 2016). To account this, we used a Monte Carlo-based approach to assess the power of our data to distinguish between the models tested. We compared the distribution of δ (i.e., the difference in log likelihood of observing the data under the two maximum-likelihood estimate models) from Monte Carlo simulations (*n* = 1,000 replicates) using *pmc* (Phylogenetic Monte Carlo) in R (Boettiger et al., 2012). When there was insufficient power to distinguish between models, the simplest (i.e., BM) was used. Ancestral trait reconstructions were made using the R function PHYLOPARS (package RPHYLOPARS, Bruggeman, Heringa, & Brandt, 2009; Goolsby, Bruggeman, & Ane, 2017), which uses a maximum-likelihood-based method to estimate trait covariance across (phylogenetic covariance) and within species (phenotypic covariance) for data sets with missing data and multiple within-species observations (e.g., Pollux, Meredith, Springer, Garland, & Reznick, 2014). This method provides predicted trait values and variances for ancestral nodes and unmeasured extant species (Penone et al., 2014). Trees were pruned to keep one representative specimen per putative species in order to fix the species-level resolution of the physiological traits. Outgroup species with missing physiological and ecological data were excluded. Multiple trait observations per species were included to account for interindividual variation and measurement error (Bruggeman et al., 2009).

2.4.2 | Rates of evolution

Using the reconstructed ancestral values, we examined the rates of phenotypic change of each trait on individual branches across the phylogeny. For this, we regressed the absolute phenotypic change of each branch (i.e., the absolute difference between the reconstructed trait values of the corresponding initial and final node) against branch length (Ma) for each trait separately. We identified outlier branches (i.e., those above the upper 99% confidence interval of the regression line), which can be considered to show accelerated rates of evolution. Generalized linear models (GLMs) were used for this, assuming a Poisson distribution (or quasi-Poisson when overdispersion was detected) and the log link function. We also compared the global rate of evolutionary change between maximum hyposmotic capacity, water loss and water content using Adam's method (Adams, 2013). This method compares a model that allows rates to vary amongst traits to one in which the rates are constrained to be equal, using a likelihood ratio test and AICc. For simplicity, only the maximum hyposmotic capacity was used for these analyses as it was significantly positively correlated with hyposmotic capacity ($R^2 = 0.37$, $p < .001$).

2.4.3 | Phylogenetic signal

To determine whether the traits show a significant phylogenetic signal, we calculated the maximum-likelihood value of Pagel's lambda (λ; Pagel, 1999) using PHYLOSIG (R package phytools, Revell, 2012). For those species with missing data, the predicted species means estimated from ancestral reconstruction analyses were employed. We used a likelihood ratio test to compare the fitted maximum-likelihood value of λ with (i) a model assuming no phylogenetic signal, that is, an evolution of the character independent of phylogenetic relationships ($\lambda = 0$) and (ii) a model entirely in agreement with BM, that is, the probability of shared inheritance is strictly proportional to relatedness ($\lambda = 1$) (Freckleton, Harvey, & Pagel, 2002).

2.4.4 | Relationships between traits

Phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) were applied, using the R function PGLS (caper), to explore the relationships between (i) habitat salinity and hyposmotic capacity, (ii) habitat salinity and desiccation resistance, and (iii) desiccation resistance and hyposmotic capacity. Proportional data (% water content and % water loss) were arcsine-transformed, and hyposmotic capacity was log-transformed prior to analyses to improve fit to a normal distribution. Again, for simplicity, only the maximum hyposmotic capacity was used for these analyses (see above). We also traced the relative order of appearance of changes in desiccation resistance and maximum hyposmotic capacity across the entire tree (i.e., from root to the tip) for species for which data were obtained experimentally by plotting the reconstructed value of the variable at each of the nodes against the time of the node.

2.5 | Topological uncertainty

To account for topological uncertainty, the analyses for estimation of the phylogenetic signal, PGLS and comparison of rates of phenotypic change were repeated using 1,000 randomly resampled post-burnin trees from the BEAST output.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Phylogeny of *Lumetus*

We obtained a well-resolved phylogeny of the subgenus *Lumetus*, with strong support for most of the main nodes except for some internal nodes in the *Enochrus quadripunctatus* group (Figures 1 and S1). The first splits separated *Enochrus ochropterus* and *Enochrus salomonis* from the rest of the *Lumetus* species at 38 (28–49 95% confidence interval, c.i.) Ma (clade C1) and the lineage containing only *Enochrus testaceus* at 36 (26–46 c.i.) Ma (clade C2). Within the remaining *Lumetus* species, the next split, at 32 (23–42 c.i.) Ma, separated a clade of saline species (the *Enochrus bicolor* group, clade C3) from one including three subclades of Nearctic and Palaearctic species (clades C4–C6). Within these groups, both short branches and node age estimations suggest rapid diversification in the Oligocene–Miocene, around 27–5 Ma. The *E. quadripunctatus* group (clade C6) was formed of six recently diverged lineages (the *E. quadripunctatus* complex) with well-characterized geographical distributions. These included (i) a coastal Mediterranean clade; (ii) another containing a single specimen from Canada; two Eurasian clades; one (iii) widely distributed and another (iv) restricted to Bulgaria and Turkey; (v) a clade apparently restricted to Italy; and (vi) an Ibero-Moroccan clade. Sequence length, number of variable sites and the estimated substitution rates for each partition are provided in Table S5.

3.2 | Hyporegulation ability and desiccation resistance

All species were hyper-regulators at salinities below the isosmotic point. Under hyperosmotic conditions, all the species showed hyporegulation ability within specific salinity ranges, except for one freshwater species, *Enochrus salomonis*, which did not survive exposure to hyperosmotic conditions (>35 g/L) (Fig. S2a, Table S4). In desiccation experiments, *Enochrus halophilus* was the least desiccation-resistant species (highest mortality and lowest recovery capacity), followed by *E. coarctatus* and *E. salomonis*, all living in fresh–mineralized waters. Amongst the remaining species, most exposed specimens survived and were able to recover after desiccation (Fig. S2b). No significant mortality was observed in control (nondesiccated) individuals. Survival under desiccation was highly correlated with water loss but not with water content (Fig. S2c).

## 3.3 | Habitat transitions, evolution of desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability

3.3.1 | Ancestral traits reconstruction and rates of evolution

For all traits studied, the distributions of δ under BM and OU models showed a high degree of overlap, indicating limited power to distinguish between evolutionary models (Fig. S3). Ancestral state reconstruction was therefore made assuming the simplest model, that is, BM. All measures of absolute phenotypic change (shown in Table S6) were significantly related to branch length ($p < .05$), except for water loss ($p = .07$). Accelerated rates of phenotypic evolution of all traits were identified in several branches across the tree (Figures 2 and S4).

The ancestor of *Lumetus* was inferred to be a species which lived in mineralized waters (Figures 2a and S5) with some degree of hyposmotic capacity (423 mOsmol/kg at 35 g/L, Figures 2b and S5), but within a limited salinity range (maximum estimated hyposmotic capacity of 1,000 mOsmol/kg, Figures 2c and S5). A rapid, direct transition to mesosaline waters took place at the origin of the *E. bicolor* group, as well as other independent transitions to hyposaline waters (e.g., at the

FIGURE 2 Ancestral reconstruction of desiccation and osmoregulation traits. The warmer (red) colours indicate higher resistance to desiccation or salinity than cooler (blue) colours. Branches where significantly accelerated increases or decreases in the rate of phenotypic change were identified (see Fig. S4) are indicated by asterisks. Species for which ecological or experimental data were available are indicated in bold. See reconstructed values in Fig. S5

origin of *Enochrus diffusus*–*Enochrus hamiltoni* or *Enochrus politus*) and accelerated reversions to freshwater habitats in the Nearctic–Palaearctic clades (Figure 2a). In the *E. bicolor* group, transitions to meso and hypersaline waters were preceded by rapid increases in hyposmotic capacity, whilst a shift to freshwater habitats in *E. salomonis* was associated with the loss of hyporegulation ability.

The reconstructed ancestral values of water loss and water content varied little across *Lumetus* (13.6%–16.5% of fresh mass and 61.7%–66.2% of water to fresh mass, respectively, Fig. S5). Water loss progressively decreased after the split of *E. testaceus* and within the *E. bicolor* group, alongside occupation of meso- and hypersaline waters. In the clades occupying fresh to hyposaline waters, desiccation rates remained almost constant, although some accelerated changes were identified within these, mostly on terminal branches (Figure 2d). Water content showed accelerated increases on several branches, in some cases coinciding with rapid increases in hyposmotic capacity and transition to saline waters (*E. bicolor* group) and also accelerated and significant decreases in the *E. quadripunctatus* group (Figure 2e).

Likelihood ratio tests indicated that the global rate of evolution for maximum hyposmotic capacity was significantly higher than for water loss and water content. These same results were consistently recovered when analysing the 1,000 post-burnin resampled trees (Table 1).

3.3.2 | Phylogenetic signal

For all traits, except for water loss, estimates of Pagel's λ were close to 1 in all the resampled trees (although for habitat salinity λ was <1 in 14% of trees) and significantly better than those obtained when the phylogenetic structure was erased (λ = 0), indicating a significant phylogenetic signal (Table 2). For hyposmotic capacity and water content, estimated λs were also better than those from a model in which the distribution of trait values across the phylogeny was as expected under BM (i.e., λ = 1) in all resampled trees. Water loss was the only trait consistently showing no phylogenetic signal in all the analysed trees (Table 2).

3.3.3 | Relationships between traits

In PGLS analyses (Table S7), habitat salinity showed no significant relationships either with maximum hyposmotic capacity or desiccation traits (Figure 3a–c) in any of the analysed trees. Variability in

TABLE 2 Ranges of the estimated Pagel's λ (for the randomized sample of 1,000 post-burnin trees) and p-values for the likelihood ratio test comparing estimated λ with a model assuming λ = 0 or λ = 1 (for the consensus tree)

Variable	Pagel's λ	p (λ = 0)	p (λ = 1)
Habitat salinity	0.96–1.13	<.001	.697
Hyposmotic capacity	1.07–1.14	<.001	<.001
Max. hyposmotic capacity	1.04–1.13	<.001	.051
Water loss	<.001	1	<.001
Water content	1.07–1.14	<.001	<.001

maximum hyposmotic capacity and desiccation traits was higher amongst freshwater species than saline ones (i.e., mineralized–hypersaline taxa). In saline species, hyposmotic capacity and desiccation resistance tended to increase with habitat salinity (Figure 3a–c).

Maximum hyposmotic capacity was negatively related to water loss in 100% of the resampled trees and with water content in 58% of the trees. However, these relationships were strongly influenced by the outlier values that one species, *E. salomonis*, showed for these variables. After removing this species from PGLS, the relationship with water loss was not significant and the relationship with water content became stronger and significantly positive for all the analysed trees (Table S7, Figure 3d,e).

When the relative order of appearance of changes in desiccation resistance and maximum hyposmotic capacity was traced across individual branches of the phylogeny (Figures 4 and 5), increases in hyposmotic capacity were not clearly preceded by increases in desiccation resistance nor vice versa. Amongst the species with the highest hyporegulation ability (*E. testaceus*, *E. bicolor* and *Enochrus jesusarribasi*), the increase in hyposmotic capacity along their evolutionary path was coupled with parallel decreases in water loss and increases in water content, suggesting an associated increase in dessication resistance. On the contrary, increases in desiccation resistance were not always associated with an increase in hyposmotic capacity, as in, for example, *E. ochopterus* and *E. quadripunctatus* in Figure 4, or *E. salomonis* in Figure 5.

4 | DISCUSSION

The reconstruction of habitat transitions, desiccation and osmoregulatory traits in *Lumetus* species suggest that hyporegulation ability,

TABLE 1 Comparison of evolutionary rates (log scale) for maximum hyposmotic capacity (Max. HC), water loss (WL) and water content (WC). AIC_C scores refer to the comparison of a model allowing rates to vary amongst traits (observed, "obs") and a model constraining rates of evolution to be equal amongst traits (constrained, "cons"); LRT refers to likelihood ratio tests for pairwise comparisons of evolutionary rates between trait pairs. The ranges in parameter values reflect the range of variation in the analyses of 1,000 post-burnin tress

Trait	σ^2	Pairwise comparison	$LRT_{df=1}$	p	AICc
Max. HC	0.021–0.049				
WL	0.001–0.004	Max. HC vs. WLR	27.4–36.4	<.001	Obs = 54.2–67.4 Cons = 82.5–100.9
WC	0.00003–0.00007	Max. HC vs. WC	121.1–125.5	<.001	Obs = −40.3 to −25.2 Cons = 78.8–97.9

FIGURE 3 Relationships between habitat salinity, hyposmotic capacity and desiccation traits. Regression lines are shown for significant relationships in PGLS (see Table S6). Dashed line for regressions excluding *Enochrus salomonis* (indicated by arrow). Max. HC, maximum hyposmotic capacity; WL, water loss; WC, water content

an essential trait for the colonization of hyperosmotic media by aquatic insects, arose as a mechanism derived from those originally developed to deal with desiccation stress in this lineage, in agreement with our first hypothesis.

The ancestral reconstruction of water loss suggests that the most common recent ancestor of *Lumetus* had similar desiccation resistance to extant species of the subgenus. Water loss did not change abruptly through the evolutionary history of the lineage, but had instead apparently remained relatively stable, as suggested by the lack of phylogenetic signal in this trait. The control of water loss has been previously reported as essential for survival in some *Lumetus* species (Pallarés et al., 2016), which show comparable water loss rates to those reported for the highly desiccation-resistant aquatic beetle *Peltodytes muticus* (Arlian & Staiger, 1979). The hypersaline *E. jesusarribasi* has much lower water loss rates and higher resistance to desiccation than hypersaline diving beetles studied to date (Pallarés et al., 2017), which seem to have more permeable cuticles than *Enochrus* species (Botella-Cruz et al., 2017). Our data suggest a high resistance to desiccation in the whole *Lumetus* subgenus, something which could be a plesiomorphic character present in the wider genus *Enochrus*, or even the Hydrophilidae itself. Despite the lack of data on desiccation resistance of other hydrophilids, the unusually frequent transitions between terrestrial and aquatic environments within this family (Bernhard, Schmidt, Korte, Fritzsch, & Beutel, 2006; Short & Fikácek, 2013) would be in agreement with this hypothesis.

The ancestor of *Lumetus* was inferred to have lived in mineralized waters, and to have had moderate hyporegulation ability. In contrast to the low variation in water loss, hyporegulation ability underwent large and, in some cases, accelerated changes trough the

evolutionary history of *Lumetus*, most of these being associated with habitat transitions across the salinity gradient. Arribas et al. (2014) found that transitions to saline habitats in the *E. bicolor* group occurred at a higher rate than habitat transitions in the rest of the lineage. In agreement with this result, we found that transitions from fresh–mineralized to mesosaline waters and the subsequent diversification of these beetles in saline habitats were associated with rapid increases in the their hyporegulation ability.

Species living in the most saline conditions showed high hyposmotic capacity, but also an increased desiccation resistance (i.e., lower water loss). In the case of species living in fresh to hyposaline waters, we found (i) some species with comparable or even higher desiccation resistance than their saline water relatives, but relatively low hyposmotic capacity (e.g., *E. ochropterus*) and (ii) species which had both high desiccation resistance and hyposmotic capacity. For example, *E. testaceus* and *E. politus* were able to hyporegulate at salinities well above those encountered by these beetles in nature. According to the ancestral reconstruction of habitat salinity, neither *E. testaceus* nor *E. politus* had saline ancestors, something that is only compatible with the first of our proposed hypotheses, that is, that hyporegulation ability was co-opted from desiccation resistance mechanisms. A lack of association between habitat salinity and osmoregulatory ability has also been reported in some crustaceans (e.g., Faria et al., 2017; McNamara & Faria, 2012). Grapsid and ocypodid crabs present an example of how selection on mechanisms to reduce water loss under aerial desiccation (gill function in this case) indirectly has improved underwater osmoregulation ability, meaning desiccation resistance and osmoregulation capacities are positively associated (Faria et al., 2017; Takeda, Matsumasa, Kikuchi,

FIGURE 4 Values of water loss and maximum hyposmotic capacity through the full evolutionary path of the *Lumetus* species used in desiccation and osmoregulation experiments

Poovachiranon, & Murai, 1996). In the case of water beetles, selection on mechanisms such as those involved in ion transport, cell volume regulation or cuticle permeability for the control of water loss under desiccation might have resulted in enhanced hyporegulation ability.

Overall, our findings are consistent with an evolutionary sequence in which improved desiccation resistance in *Lumetus* provided the physiological basis for the development of efficient hyporegulation mechanisms, which in some cases allowed them to colonize and diversify in the meso- and hypersaline habitats. The accelerated increases of hyposmotic capacity in some parts of the phylogeny are consistent with the hypothesis that such capacity is based on a derived mechanism (i.e., in agreement with our first hypothesis). Accelerated evolution of complex mechanisms such as those involved

FIGURE 5 Values of water content and maximum osmotic capacity trough the full evolutionary path of the *Lumetus* species used in desiccation and osmoregulation experiments

in hyporegulation (Bradley, 2009) is more likely to occur when such a mechanistic basis is already present (Barrett & Schluter, 2008; Roesti, Gavrilets, Hendry, Salzburger, & Berner, 2014).

Our assumption of a Brownian motion model of evolution for ancestral trait reconstruction constrains reconstructed values to within the range of measured variation of each trait (Finarelli & Goswami, 2013). This could underestimate the real interspecific variation of some traits in *Lumetus*. However, the water contents of the

species studied were close to typical values seen in most beetles (i.e., 60% of body mass, Hadley, 1994) and hyposmotic capacity covered the full physiological range (i.e., from no hyporegulation ability to a very high capacity under extreme hyperosmotic conditions). Species that inhabit the most extreme hypersaline habitats (e.g., *Enochrus quadrinotatus* and *Enochrus falcarius*), for which no experimental data were available, may possess higher hyporegulation abilities than those inferred in our ancestral reconstructions. Such high

hyporegulation ability would result from accelerated evolution of this trait in some branches within the *E. bicolor* clade, providing additional weight to our conclusions.

Due to the high ancestral tolerance to desiccation in the subgenus *Lumetus*, it was not possible to reconstruct the hypothesized increase in desiccation resistance preceding any improvements in hyposmotic capacity. Rapid increases in hyposmotic capacity were associated with parallel weak decreases in water loss and increases in water content across the evolutionary path of the strongest hyporegulator species. Despite these parallel changes, a correlated evolution of both tolerances, constrained by identical genes and mechanisms (genetic correlation sensu Kellermann, Overgaard, Loeschcke, Kristensen, & Hoffmann, 2013;—i.e., our third hypothesis), is incompatible with the occurrence of species resistant to desiccation but with reduced hyporegulation ability, such as *E. ochropterus*. Nevertheless, further research identifying potential gene expression pathways related with either desiccation (e.g., Lopez-Martinez et al., 2009) or salinity stress (e.g., Uyhelji, Cheng, & Besansky, 2016), as well as those common to both stressors, would be needed to shed light on the degree of mechanistic overlap between desiccation and salinity tolerances.

Parallel increases in desiccation resistance and salinity tolerance could have been strengthened instead as a response to aridification during the radiation of *Lumetus*. According to Arribas et al. (2014), and in agreement with our results, desiccation resistance and hyporegulation ability in the *E. bicolor* group started to increase in parallel in the Late Eocene, a period of global aridification (Bosboom et al., 2014; Mosbrugger, Utescher, & Dilcher, 2005). Temporary habitats were presumably more abundant during such arid periods, which, together with an increase in the mineralization of the surface waters in some populations of these *Lumetus* species, could have posed a strong selective pressure on a further development of existing mechanisms to deal with saline stress and periodic exposure to desiccation. Other studies have proposed that global aridification events promoted diversification of several aquatic taxa (e.g., Dorn, Musilová, Platzer, Reichwald, & Cellerino, 2014; Pinceel et al., 2013). Aridification, by enhancing the linked tolerance of desiccation and salinity, could have also been a key driver in the diversification of *Lumetus*.

Euryhalinity is also an important source of evolutionary diversity (Brauner, Gonzales, & Wilson, 2013; Schultz & McCormick, 2012). However, the process of adaption to saline inland waters seems to be a unidirectional path, likely reflecting trade-offs between competitive ability and tolerance to osmotic stress (Dunson & Travis, 1991; Herbst, 2001; Latta, Weider, Colbourne, & Pfrender, 2012). In general, species of *Lumetus* (and other beetle genera) typical of hypersaline waters are almost absent from freshwater habitats, despite been able to hyper-regulate (Céspedes et al., 2013; Pallarés et al., 2015; Tones, 1977)—although *E. bicolor* is regularly found in low mineralized waters in northern localities of Europe. Such a situation also holds for saline Hemiptera (corixids, Tones & Hammer, 1975), coastal and estuarine decapods (Faria et al., 2017; McNamara & Faria, 2012) and fish (Schultz & McCormick, 2012). The maintenance of hyper-regulation ability despite the apparent loss of its ecological role may reflect positive pleiotropies or functional correlations between hypo- and hyper-regulatory mechanisms (e.g., Smith, VanEkeris, Okech, Harvey, & Linser, 2008; Smith, Raymond, Valenti, Smith, & Linser, 2010), but may also be just due to the low cost of maintaining functional osmoregulatory responses outside conditions commonly encountered in nature (Divino et al., 2016).

The fundamental salinity tolerance niche of some fresh–hyposaline species was also found to be much broader than their realized niches (e.g., in *E. testaceus*), something which supports the view that hyporegulation arose as a co-opted mechanism. The osmoregulatory physiology of water beetles is still poorly explored, so it is not known whether euryhalinity is common in freshwater species of other genera, but at least two dytiscid species of the genus *Nebrioporus* typical of freshwater habitats are unable to osmoregulate at salinities above their isosmotic point (Pallarés et al., 2015). The absence of species of *Lumetus* which able to osmoregulate in saline habitats may be due to multiple factors, amongst them biological interactions, ecological requirements of juvenile stages, or physiological traits other than osmoregulation (e.g., Dowse, Palmer, Hills, Torpy, & Kefford, 2017).

Our results demonstrate how a combination of ecological, experimental and phylogenetic data can offer powerful insights into the origin and evolution of traits underlying ecological transitions and the diversification of lineages into previously unavailable areas of niche space. Further research is still needed to understand why only some insect taxa have colonized the naturally stressful inland saline waters, but we show here that the linked evolution of stress resistance traits could have been key for developing tolerance to extreme salinities.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

All sequences generated have been deposited in the EMBL database (accession numbers shown in Table S1). Sequence alignments are available via Dryad at https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.2j3c8, and all data obtained in desiccation and osmoregulation experiments can be found in the Supporting Information.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

ORCID

Susana Pallarés [ORCID] http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8677-7475

REFERENCES

Adams, D. C. (2013). Comparing evolutionary rates for different phenotypic traits on a phylogeny using likelihood. *Systematic Biology*, *62*, 181–192.

Albers, M. A., & Bradley, T. J. (2011). On the evolution of saline tolerance in the larvae of mosquitoes in the genus *Ochlerotatus*. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, *84*, 258–267.

Andújar, C., Serrano, J., & Gómez-Zurita, J. (2012). Winding up the molecular clock in the genus *Carabus* (Coleoptera: Carabidae): Assessment of methodological decisions on rate and node age estimation. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *12*, 40.

Arlian, L., & Staiger, T. (1979). Water balance in the semiaquatic beetle, *Peltodytes muticus*. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*, *62A*, 1041–1047.

Arribas, P., Andújar, C., Abellán, P., Velasco, J., Millán, A., & Ribera, I. (2014). Tempo and mode of the multiple origins of salinity tolerance in a water beetle lineage. *Molecular Ecology*, *23*, 360–373.

Arribas, P., Andújar, C., Sánchez-Fernández, D., Abellán, P., & Millán, A. (2013). Integrative taxonomy and conservation of cryptic beetles in the Mediterranean region (Hydrophilidae). *Zoologica Scripta*, *42*, 182–200.

Arribas, P., Velasco, J., Abellán, P., Sánchez-Fernández, D., Andújar, C., Calosi, P., . . . Bilton, D. T. (2012). Dispersal ability rather than ecological tolerance drives differences in range size between lentic and lotic water beetles (Coleoptera: Hydrophilidae). *Journal of Biogeography*, *39*, 984–994.

Barrett, R. D., & Schluter, D. (2008). Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *23*, 38–44.

Barrieu, F., Marty-Mazars, D., Thomas, D., Chaumont, F., Charbonnier, M., & Marty, F. (1999). Desiccation and osmotic stress increase the abundance of mRNA of the tonoplast aquaporin BobTIP26-1 in cauliflower cells. *Planta*, *209*, 77–86.

Bernhard, D., Schmidt, C., Korte, A., Fritzsch, G., & Beutel, R. G. (2006). From terrestrial to aquatic habitats and back again – Molecular insights into the evolution and phylogeny of Hydrophiloidea (Coleoptera) using multigene analyses. *Zoologica Scripta*, *35*, 597–606.

Beyenbach, K. W. (2016). The plasticity of extracellular fluid homeostasis in insects. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *219*, 2596–2607.

Boettiger, C., Coop, G., & Ralph, P. (2012). Is your phylogeny informative? Measuring the power of comparative methods. *Evolution*, *66*, 2240–2251.

Bosboom, R. E., Abels, H. A., Hoorn, C., van den Berg, B. C. J., Guo, Z., & Dupont-Nivet, G. (2014). Aridification in continental Asia after the Middle Eocene Climatic Optimum (MECO). *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *389*, 34–42.

Botella-Cruz, M., Villastrigo, A., Pallarés, S., López-Gallego, E., Millán, A., & Velasco, J. (2017). Cuticle hydrocarbons in saline aquatic beetles. *PeerJ*, *5*, e3562.

Bradley, T. J. (2009). *Animal osmoregulation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bradley, T. J., Briscoe, A. D., Brady, S. G., Contreras, H. L., Danforth, B. N., Dudley, R., . . . Yanoviak, S. P. (2009). Episodes in insect evolution. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *49*, 590–606.

Brauner, C. J., Gonzales, R. J., & Wilson, J. M. (2013). Extreme environments; hypersaline, alkaline and ion poor waters. In S. D. McCormick, A. P. Farrell, & C. J. Brauner (Eds.), *Fish physiology*, *vol. 32, Euryhaline Fishes* (pp. 433–474). New York, NY: Elsevier.

Bruggeman, J., Heringa, J., & Brandt, B. W. (2009). PHYLOPARS: Estimation of missing parameter values using phylogeny. *Nucleic Acids Research*, *37*, 179–184.

Calosi, P., Ugolini, A., & Morritt, D. (2005). Physiological responses to hyposmotic stress in the supralittoral amphipod *Talitrus saltator* (Crustacea: Amphipoda). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A*, *142*, 267–275.

Carbonell, J. A., Millán, A., & Velasco, J. (2012). Concordance between realised and fundamental niches in three Iberian *Sigara* species (Hemiptera: Corixidae) along a gradient of salinity and anionic composition. *Freshwater Biology*, *57*, 2580–2590.

Cayuela, E., Muñoz-Mayor, A., Vicente-Agulló, F., Moyano, E., Garcia-Abellan, J. O., Estañ, M. T., & Bolarín, M. C. (2007). Drought pretreatment increases the salinity resistance of tomato plants. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, *170*, 479–484.

Céspedes, V., Pallarés, S., Arribas, P., Millán, A., & Velasco, J. (2013). Water beetle tolerance to salinity and anionic composition and its relationship to habitat occupancy. *Journal of Insect Physiology*, *59*, 1076–1084.

Charmantier, G., Charmantier-Daures, M., & Aiken, D. E. (1984). Variation des capacités osmoreégulatrices des larves et postlarves de *Homarus americanus* Milnes-Edwards, 1837 (Crustacea, Decapoda). *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, *299*, 863–866.

Cheng, C. H. C., & Chen, L. (1999). Evolution of an antifreeze glycoprotein. *Nature*, *401*, 463–464.

Cohen, E. (2012). Roles of aquaporins in osmoregulation, desiccation and cold hardiness in insects. *Entomology, Ornithology and Herpetology*, *S1*, 1–17.

Cooper, N., Thomas, G. H., Venditti, C., Meade, A., & Freckleton, R. P. (2016). A cautionary note on the use of Ornstein Uhlenbeck models in macroevolutionary studies. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *118*, 64–77.

Divino, J. N., Monette, M. Y., Mccormick, S. D., Yancey, P. H., Flannery, K. G., Bell, M. A, . . . Schultz, E. T. (2016). Osmoregulatory physiology and rapid evolution of salinity tolerance in threespine stickleback recently introduced to fresh water. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, *17*, 179–201.

Dorn, A., Musilová, Z., Platzer, M., Reichwald, K., & Cellerino, A. (2014). The strange case of East African annual fishes: Aridification correlates with diversification for a savannah aquatic group? *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *14*, 210.

Dow, J. A. T., & Davies, S. A. (2006). The Malpighian tubule: Rapid insights from post–genomic biology. *Journal of Insect Physiology*, *52*, 365–378.

Dowse, R., Palmer, C. G., Hills, K., Torpy, F., & Kefford, B. J. (2017). The mayfly nymph *Austrophlebioides pusillus* Harker defies common osmoregulatory assumptions. *Royal Society Open Science*, *4*, 160520.

Drummond, A. J., Suchard, M. A., Xie, D., & Rambaut, A. (2012). Bayesian phylogenetics with BEAUTI and the BEAST 1.7. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *29*, 1969–1973.

Dunson, W. A., & Travis, J. (1991). The role of abiotic factors in community organization. *The American Naturalist*, *138*, 1067–1091.

Elnitsky, M. A., Benoit, J. B., Lopez-Martinez, G., Denlinger, D. L., & Lee, R.E. Jr (2009). Osmoregulation and salinity tolerance in the Antarctic midge, *Belgica antarctica*: Seawater exposure confers enhanced tolerance to freezing and dehydration. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *212*, 2864–2871.

Evans, D. H. (2008). *Osmotic and ionic regulation: Cells and animals*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Faria, S. C., Augusto, A. S., & McNamara, J. C. (2011). Intra- and extracellular osmotic regulation in the hololimnetic *Caridea* and *Anomura*: A phylogenetic perspective on the conquest of fresh water by the decapod Crustacea. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B, 181,* 175–186.

Faria, S. C., Provete, D. B., Thurman, C. L., & McNamara, J. C. (2017). Phylogenetic patterns and the adaptive evolution of osmoregulation in fiddler crabs (Brachyura, *Uca*). *PLoS ONE, 12,* e0171870.

Finarelli, J. A., & Goswami, A. (2013). Potential pitfalls of reconstructing deep time evolutionary history with only extant data, a case study using the Canidae (Mammalia, Carnivora). *Evolution, 67,* 3678–3685.

Freckleton, R. P., Harvey, P. H., & Pagel, M. (2002). Phylogenetic analysis and comparative data: A test and review of evidence. *The American Naturalist, 160,* 712–726.

Gibbs, A. G., & Rajpurohit, S. (2010). Cuticular lipids and water balance. In G. J. Blomquist, & A. G. Bagnères (Eds.), *Insect hydrocarbons: Biology, biochemistry, and chemical ecology* (pp. 100–120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gómez-Mestre, I., & Tejedo, M. (2005). Adaptation or exaptation? An experimental test of hypotheses on the origin of salinity tolerance in *Bufo calamita*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 18,* 847–855.

Goolsby, E. W., Bruggeman, J., & Ane, C. (2017). RPHYLOPARS: Fast multivariate phylogenetic comparative methods for missing data and within-species variation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 8,* 22–27.

Griffith, M. B. (2017). Toxicological perspective on the osmoregulation and ionoregulation physiology of major ions by freshwater animals: Teleost fish, crustacea, aquatic insects, and mollusca. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 36,* 576–600.

Hadley, N. F. (1994). *Water relations of terrestrial arthropods*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Heard, S. B., & Hauser, D. L. (1995). Key evolutionary innovations and their ecological mechanisms. *Historical Biology, 10,* 151–173.

Herbst, D. B. (1999). Biogeography and physiological adaptations of the brine fly genus *Ephydra* (Diptera: Ephydridae) in saline waters of the Great Basin. *Great Basin Naturalist, 59,* 127–135.

Herbst, D. B. (2001). Gradients of salinity stress, environmental stability and water chemistry as a template for defining habitat types and physiological strategies in inland salt waters. *Hydrobiologia, 466,* 209–219.

Herbst, D. B., Conte, F. P., & Brookes, V. J. (1988). Osmoregulation in an alkaline salt lake insect, *Ephydra* (Hydropyrus) hians Say (Diptera: Ephydridae) in relation to water chemistry. *Journal of Insect Physiology, 34,* 903–909.

Hossain, M. A., Mostofa, M. G., & Fujita, M. (2013). Cross protection by cold-shock to salinity and drought stress-induced oxidative stress in mustard (*Brassica campestris* L.) seedlings. *Molecular Plant Breeding, 4,* 50–70.

Hunter, J. P. (1998). Key innovations and the ecology of macroevolution. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 13,* 31–36.

Kaliontzopoulou, A., & Adams, D. C. (2016). Phylogenies, the comparative method, and the conflation of tempo and mode. *Systematic Biology, 65,* 1–15.

Katoh, K., & Toh, H. (2008). Recent developments in the MAFFT multiple sequence alignment program. *Briefings in Bioinformatics, 9,* 286–298.

Kellermann, V., Overgaard, J., Loeschcke, V., Kristensen, T. N., & Hoffmann, A. A. (2013). Trait associations across evolutionary time within a *Drosophila* phylogeny: Correlated selection or genetic constraint? *PLoS ONE, 8,* e72072.

Lanfear, R., Calcott, B., Ho, S. Y., & Guindon, S. (2012). PARTITION FINDER: Combined selection of partitioning schemes and substitution models for phylogenetic analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution, 29,* 1695–1701.

Larsen, E. H., Deaton, L. E., Onken, H., O'Donnell, M., Grosell, M., Dantzler, W. H., & Weihrauch, D. (2014). Osmoregulation and excretion. *Comprehensive Physiology, 4,* 405–573.

Latta, L. C., Weider, L. J., Colbourne, J. K., & Pfrender, M. E. (2012). The evolution of salinity tolerance in *Daphnia*: A functional genomics approach. *Ecology Letters, 15,* 794–802.

Lee, C. E., Kiergaard, M. G., Gelembiuk, W., Eads, B. D., & Posavi, M. (2011). Pumping ions: Rapid parallel evolution of ionic regulation following habitat invasions. *Evolution, 65,* 2229–2244.

Lopez-Martinez, G., Benoit, J. B., Rinehart, J. P., Elnitsky, M. A., Lee, R. E. Jr, & Denlinger, D. L. (2009). Dehydration, rehydration, and overhydration alter patterns of gene expression in the Antarctic midge, *Belgica antarctica*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B, 179,* 481–491.

McNamara, J., & Faria, S. (2012). Evolution of osmoregulatory patterns and gill ion transport mechanisms in the decapod Crustacea: A review. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B, 182,* 997–1014.

Miller, M.A., Pfeiffer, W., & Chwartz, T. (2010). Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees. In *Proceedings of the Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE), 14 November 2010* (pp. 1–8). New Orleans, LA.

Moczek, A. P. (2008). On the origins of novelty in development and evolution. *BioEssays, 30,* 432–447.

Mosbrugger, V., Utescher, T., & Dilcher, D. L. (2005). Cenozoic continental climatic evolution of Central Europe. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 102,* 14964–14969.

Pagel, M. (1999). Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature, 401,* 877–884.

Pallarés, S., Arribas, P., Bilton, D. T., Millán, A., & Velasco, J. (2015). The comparative osmoregulatory ability of two water beetle genera whose species span the fresh-hypersaline gradient in inland waters (Coleoptera: Dytiscidae, Hydrophilidae). *PLoS ONE, 10,* e0124299.

Pallarés, S., Botella-Cruz, M., Arribas, P., Millán, A., & Velasco, J. (2017). Aquatic insects in a multistress environment: cross-tolerance to salinity and desiccation. *Journal of Experimental Biology, 220,* 1277–1286.

Pallarés, S., Velasco, J., Millán, A., Bilton, D. T., & Arribas, P. (2016). Aquatic insects dealing with dehydration: Do desiccation resistance traits differ in species with contrasting habitat preferences? *PeerJ, 4,* e2382.

Papadopoulou, A., Anastasiou, I., & Vogler, A. P. (2010). Revisiting the insect mitochondrial molecular clock: The mid-Aegean trench calibration. *Molecular Biology and Evolution, 27,* 1659–1672.

Penone, C., Davidson, A. D., Shoemaker, K. T., Di Marco, M., Rondinini, C., Brooks, T. M., ... Costa, G. C. (2014). Imputation of missing data in life-history datasets: Which approach performs the best? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 5,* 961–970.

Pinceel, T., Brendonck, L., Larmuseau, M. H. D., Vanhove, M. P. M. Timms, B. V., & Vanschoenwinkel, B. (2013). Environmental change as a driver of diversification in temporary aquatic habitats: Does the genetic structure of extant fairy shrimp populations reflect historic aridification? *Freshwater Biology, 58,* 1556–1572.

Pollux, B. J. A., Meredith, R. W., Springer, M. S., Garland, T., & Reznick, D. N. (2014). The evolution of the placenta drives a shift in sexual selection in live bearing fish. *Nature, 513,* 233–236.

Revell, L. J. (2012). PHYTOOLS: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 3,* 217–223.

Ribera, I., Fresneda, J., Bucur, R., Izquierdo, A., Vogler, A. P., Salgado, J. M., & Cieslak, A. (2010). Ancient origin of a Western Mediterranean radiation of subterranean beetles. *BMC Evolutionary Biology, 10,* 29.

Roesti, M., Gavrilets, S., Hendry, A. P., Salzburger, W., & Berner, D. (2014). The genomic signature of parallel adaptation from shared genetic variation. *Molecular Ecology, 23,* 3944–3956.

Schultz, E. T., & McCormick, S. D. (2012). Euryhalinity in an evolutionary context. *Fish Physiology, 32,* 477–533.

Short, A. E. Z., & Fikáček, M. (2013). Molecular phylogeny, evolution and classification of the Hydrophilidae (Coleoptera). *Systematic Entomology, 38,* 723–752.

Sinclair, B. J., Ferguson, L. V., Salehipour-shirazi, G., & MacMillan, H. A. (2013). Cross-tolerance and cross-talk in the cold: Relating low temperatures to desiccation and immune stress in insects. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *53*, 545–556.

Smith, K. E., Raymond, S. L., Valenti, M. L., Smith, P. J. S., & Linser, P. J. (2010). Physiological and pharmacological characterizations of the larval *Anopheles albimanus* rectum support a change in protein distribution and/or function in varying salinities. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A*, *157*, 55–62.

Smith, K. E., VanEkeris, L. A., Okech, B. A., Harvey, W. R., & Linser, P. J. (2008). Larval anopheline mosquito recta exhibit a dramatic change in localization patterns of ion transport proteins in response to shifting salinity: A comparison between anopheline and culine larvae. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *211*, 3067–3076.

Takeda, S., Matsumasa, M., Kikuchi, S., Poovachiranon, S., & Murai, M. (1996). Variation in the branchial formula of semiterrestrial crabs (Decapoda: Brachyura: Grapsidae and Ocypodidae) in relation to physiological adaptations to the environment. *Journal of Crustacean Biology*, *16*, 472–486.

Tobler, M., & Plath, M. (2011). Living in extreme habitats. In J. Evans, A. Pilastro, & I. Schlupp (Eds.), *Ecology and evolution of Poeciliid fishes* (pp. 120–127). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Todgham, A. E., & Stillman, J. H. (2013). Physiological responses to shifts in multiple environmental stressors: Relevance in a changing world. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *53*, 539–544.

Tones, P. I. (1977). Osmoregulation in adults and larvae of *Hygrotus salinarius* Wallis (Coleoptera, Dytiscidae). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A*, *60*, 247–250.

Tones, P. I., & Hammer, U. T. (1975). Osmoregulation in *Trichocorixa verticalis interiores* Sailer (Hemiptera. Corixidae) – An inhabitant of Saskatchewan saline lakes, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *53*, 1207–1212.

Uyhelji, H. A., Cheng, C., & Besansky, N. J. (2016). Transcriptomic differences between euryhaline and stenohaline malaria vector sibling species in response to salinity stress. *Molecular Ecology*, *25*, 2210–2225.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.