

1 TITLE: Interfertile oaks in an island environment. II. Limited hybridization between  
2 *Quercus alnifolia* Poech and *Q. coccifera* L. in a mixed stand.

3

4 AUTHORS: Charalambos Neophytou\*<sup>1,2</sup>, Filippos A. Aravanopoulos<sup>2</sup>, Siegfried Fink<sup>3</sup>,  
5 Aikaterini Dounavi<sup>1</sup>

6

7 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

8 Charalambos Neophytou

9 Forest Research Institute of Baden-Württemberg

10 Department of Forest Ecology

11 Wonnhaldestr. 4

12 D-79100 Freiburg

13 Germany

14

15 E-mail address: [Charalambos.Neophytou@forst.bwl.de](mailto:Charalambos.Neophytou@forst.bwl.de)

16 Current e-mail address: [chneophytou@gmail.com](mailto:chneophytou@gmail.com)

17 Telephone: +49 / 761 / 40 18 159

18 Fax: +49 / 761 / 40 18 133

19

20 The final publication is available at:

21 <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10342-010-0454-4#page-1>

22

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Forest Ecology, Forest Research Institute of Baden-Württemberg, Wonnhaldestr. 4, D-79100, Freiburg, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Laboratory of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding, Faculty of Forestry and Natural Environment, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, P.O. Box 238, Thessaloniki, Greece

<sup>3</sup> Chair of Forest Botany, Faculty of Forest and Environmental Sciences, Albert-Ludwigs University of Freiburg, Bertoldstr. 17, 79085, Freiburg, Germany

1 ABSTRACT

2

3 Hybridization and introgression between *Quercus alnifolia* Poech and *Q. coccifera* L.  
4 is studied by analyzing morphological traits, nuclear and chloroplast DNA markers.  
5 The study site is a mixed stand on Troodos Mountains (Cyprus) and the analyzed  
6 material includes both adult trees and progenies of specific mother trees.  
7 Multivariate analysis of morphological traits shows that the two species can be well  
8 distinguished using simple leaf morphometric parameters. A lower genetic diversity  
9 in *Q. alnifolia* than in *Q. coccifera* and a high interspecific differentiation between the  
10 two species are supported by an analysis of nuclear and chloroplast microsatellites.  
11 The intermediacy of the four designated hybrids is verified by both leaf  
12 morphometric and genetic data. Analysis of progeny arrays provides evidence that  
13 interspecific crossings are rare. This finding is further supported by limited  
14 introgression of chloroplast genomes. Reproductive barriers (e.g. asynchronous  
15 phenology, post-zygotic incompatibilities) might account for this result. A  
16 directionality of interspecific gene flow is indicated by a genetic assignment analysis  
17 of effective pollen clouds with *Q. alnifolia* acting as pollen donor. Differences in  
18 flowering phenology and species distribution in the stand may have influenced the  
19 direction of gene flow and the genetic differentiation among effective pollen clouds  
20 of different mother trees within species.

21

22 KEY WORDS: *Quercus alnifolia*, *Quercus coccifera*, microsatellites, cpDNA haplotypes,  
23 hybridization, introgression, male gametic contribution.

24

1 INTRODUCTION

2

3 *Quercus alnifolia* and *Quercus coccifera* are the two representatives of sclerophyllous  
4 oaks in Cyprus. They are interfertile and there is no genetic evidence that they  
5 hybridize with the phylogenetically distant *Q. infectoria* ssp. *veneris*, the third oak  
6 species which is present on the island (Neophytou et al. 2008). Recent studies were  
7 stimulated by observations of individuals with intermediate morphology, well known  
8 among local people. Intermediates have been morphologically described (Hand  
9 2006) and leaf morphometric traits of the two species and their potential hybrids  
10 have been surveyed at the population level (Neophytou et al. 2007). More recently,  
11 molecular differentiation between these species was studied at a large scale  
12 indicating that the two species constitute two well separated units in terms of  
13 nuclear DNA differentiation. In addition, analysis of several populations indicated  
14 that they widely share their chloroplast genomes (Neophytou et al. 2010a). Here, we  
15 seek to analyze hybridization patterns in a mixed stand intensively, by surveying both  
16 morphological and genetic differentiation.

17

18 Leaf morphology has been widely used to distinguish between related oak species.  
19 Several different approaches have been used, varying from simple observation of  
20 diagnostic traits to univariate and multivariate methods (see Rushton 1993 for a  
21 review). In general, multivariate analyses have been established as a powerful and  
22 easily applicable tool for studying differentiation and hybridization in the Fagaceae,  
23 e.g. in oaks (Kremer et al. 2002) and chestnut (Aravanopoulos 2005). For *Q. alnifolia*  
24 and *Q. coccifera*, multivariate analysis with use of simple leaf measures has been  
25 efficiently used to discriminate between the two parental species and to detect  
26 introgressed forms (Neophytou et al. 2007). However, conclusions based only on  
27 morphology are limited. This is more difficult when hybrids of the second or higher  
28 generations are involved. Backcrossed individuals often regain the morphological  
29 identity of the parental species (Rubio de Casas et al. 2007). Moreover, phenotypic  
30 plasticity can lead to a higher morphological variability. This can lead to an  
31 overestimation of the gene pool or to phenotypic overlapping that is not connected  
32 with genetic introgression (Jimenez et al. 2004).

33

34 The development of several molecular markers in the last two decades has opened  
35 new perspectives in the study area of hybridization and introgression in oaks.  
36 Research has largely focused on economically important species, like *Q. petraea* and  
37 *Q. robur* in Europe. Two large categories of DNA markers have been used to answer  
38 different questions. On one hand, nuclear DNA markers – mainly highly variable  
39 microsatellites – have been applied to study genetic differentiation, genetic  
40 structures and gene flow between related species (e.g. Muir et al. 2000; Gugerli et al.  
41 2007; Lepais et al. 2009; Neophytou et al. 2010b). On the other hand, plastid DNA

1 markers – mostly from the chloroplast genome – have been used for studying  
2 phylogeny, postglacial recolonization patterns and historic genetic introgression (e.g.  
3 Petit et al. 2002; Finkeldey and Matyás 2003). Results have provided important  
4 insights into the issue of hybridization in oaks and at the same time revealed the  
5 complexity of this phenomenon. For example, it has been shown that rate and  
6 directionality of interspecific gene flow vary strongly depending among others on the  
7 phylogenetic affinity of the studied oak species (Rushton 1993), the presence of  
8 reproductive barriers (Boavida et al. 2001), the variability of ecological site  
9 conditions leading to adaptive barriers (Dodd and Afzal-Rafii 2004), the relative  
10 abundance of each hybridizing species (Lepais et al. 2009) etc.

11

12 A contrasting pattern between nuclear and chloroplastic differentiation has been  
13 shown between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in Cyprus. On one hand, the high levels  
14 of nuclear differentiation (e.g. multilocus interspecific  $F_{ST}$  between 0.310 and 0.364)  
15 support a limited degree of hybridization. On the other hand, shared chloroplast  
16 DNA (cpDNA) structures which are regionally distributed suggest that the two  
17 species have exchanged their chloroplast genomes through hybridization and  
18 backcrosses. The aforementioned results are presented in a companion paper, which  
19 investigates genetic differentiation between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* at a large  
20 scale by comparing pure populations of the two species, as well as one mixed stand  
21 (Neophytou et al. 2010a). In the present communication, we aim to elucidate the  
22 extent of contemporary hybridization between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in  
23 sympatry by explicitly focusing on the mixed stand included in Neophytou et al.  
24 (2010a). For this purpose, we combine data from leaf morphology, nuclear and  
25 chloroplast DNA of all adult trees of the stand. Additionally, we analyze the effective  
26 pollen clouds of known maternal trees representing both species and intermediates,  
27 in order to investigate the degree and directionality of interspecific gene flow.

28

29

## 30 MATERIALS AND METHODS

31

### 32 *The study species*

33

34 *Quercus alnifolia* is an evergreen shrub or a much branched wide-crowned small tree  
35 up to 10 m, exceptionally reaching 14 m under optimal conditions (Meikle 1977,  
36 Knopf 2006). It is characterized by its dark green glabrous leaves with their golden  
37 tomentous lower surface. *Quercus alnifolia* grows exclusively on the igneous rock  
38 formations of the Troodos Mountains in Cyprus in altitudes between 400 and 1800  
39 m. Flowering occurs between the end of April and the beginning of June, depending  
40 on the altitude. Acorns display an annual maturation cycle (Knopf 2006).

41

1 *Quercus coccifera* is an evergreen shrub or small tree up to 10 m, occasionally  
2 attaining large heights up to 20 m (Meikle 1977; Chatziphilippidis 2006). Its leaves  
3 are leathery with serrate margins and glabrous or thinly stellate pubescent lower  
4 surface. In Cyprus, it can be found in a wide variety of ecosystems occurring in  
5 altitudes from near sea level up to 1400 m. Flowering takes place between April and  
6 May. Acorn maturation is predominantly biennial, although more complex  
7 reproductive cycles involving also annual acorn maturation have been observed  
8 (Bianco and Schirone 1985).

### 9 10 *Sampling*

11  
12 A mixed stand of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in the western part of the Troodos  
13 Mountains was selected. The stand is located east of the village of Kambos, on a  
14 west exposed slope at an altitude of 700-800 m (coordinates: 35°02'N, 32°44'E). The  
15 geological substrate consists of diabasic rocks, belonging to the ophiolite geological  
16 formation of Troodos. The area had been partly used agriculturally until the early 80s  
17 and had been subjected to intensive grazing by goats until 60s. Today, recovering  
18 natural vegetation forms open woodland mainly dominated by *Q. alnifolia* and to a  
19 lesser extent by *Q. coccifera*. Additionally, scarce *Arbutus andrachne* and *Pinus brutia*  
20 individuals are present. Some gaps with remnants from former vineyards still exist.

21  
22 In total, 207 mature individuals of *Q. alnifolia*, 66 *Q. coccifera*, and four individuals  
23 with intermediate morphological characteristics (designated hybrids) were collected  
24 from within an area of circa 5 ha (Figure 1). The sampling was exhaustive. Full-grown  
25 leaves were collected from the east side of the crown of each plant at a height of  
26 1.50 m. Additionally, a total of 290 acorns were used for DNA analysis. These were  
27 sampled in autumn 2005 from nine maternal trees (three *Q. alnifolia*, one  
28 intermediate form and five *Q. coccifera*), which were randomly distributed within the  
29 population and partly occurred within clumping groups (Figure 1).

### 30 31 *Analysis of morphological data*

32  
33 Discriminative leaf traits were chosen based on botanical descriptions (Meikle 1977).  
34 The protocol of leaf morphology assessment was based upon Neophytou et al.  
35 (2007), where the importance of a larger set of leaf morphological variables for  
36 hybridization studies was evaluated. Two counted variables (teeth number (TE), side  
37 vein number (UN)) and three leaf size variables (lamina length (LL), lamina width (LW),  
38 petiole length (PL) measured in cm) were assessed. All assessed variables are illustrated  
39 in Figure 2. Additionally, the following two leaf shape variables were calculated: lamina  
40 width / lamina length (LW/LL), petiole length / lamina length (PL/LL). These ratios,

1 which form independent shape variables, have been extensively used in leaf  
2 morphometrics (Dickinson et al. 1987). Ten leaves from each plant were measured.

3  
4 Multivariate analysis was employed using the statistical package R, in order to examine  
5 the simultaneous contribution of all leaf parameters in discriminating between species  
6 groups. Logarithmic transformation ( $\log_{10}$ ) was successfully employed when variables  
7 did not follow the normal distribution. Normality of the data was tested by performing  
8 Shapiro-Wilk tests for each original variable.

9  
10 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed in order to observe the ordination  
11 of groups of variables in principal space. The original variables were transformed to  
12 new uncorrelated variables (principal components). Discriminant Analysis was  
13 performed based on Fisher (1936), in order to verify if field assignments to taxonomic  
14 groups were in agreement with the leaf morphometric data. In particular, we aimed to  
15 classify individuals with minimum probability of misclassification. The percentage of  
16 return to original groups after the ordination in discriminant space (of their leaf data) is  
17 a measure of the true relationship of leaf variables to the taxonomic or genetic groups  
18 of plants (Pimentel 1979).

#### 19 20 *DNA analysis*

21  
22 Leaf material was first dried in vacuum and then DNA was extracted using the  
23 DNeasy 96 extraction kit (Qiagen). Subsequently, PCR was carried out for the  
24 amplification of four nuclear and seven chloroplast DNA (cpDNA) microsatellites  
25 (SSRs). Nuclear SSR locus QpZAG9 was first described in *Q. petraea* (Steinkellner et  
26 al. 1997) and loci QrZAG11, 96 and 112 in *Q. robur* (Kampfer et al. 1998). PCR  
27 programs included an initial denaturation step at 95°C lasting 8 min, 10 s of 94°C for  
28 15 s, an annealing step lasting 15 s at 50°C (for loci QrZAG11 and QrZAG112) or 57°C  
29 (for loci QpZAG9 and QrZAG96), an elongation step at 72°C for 15 s and 23 additional  
30 cycles with reduced denaturation temperature (89°C). No final elongation was  
31 performed. The aforementioned nuclear loci were chosen after testing several SSR  
32 primer pairs from *Q. petraea* and *Q. robur* (Neophytou et al. 2010a). With regards to  
33 the cpDNA SSR loci, primers for ccmp2 were initially developed in *Nicotiana tabacum*  
34 (Weising and Gardner 1999), and for  $\mu$ cd4,  $\mu$ cd7,  $\mu$ dt1,  $\mu$ dt3 and  $\mu$ kk3 in *Q. petraea*  
35 and *Q. robur* (Deguilloux et al. 2003). Allele scoring was carried out by means of  
36 capillary electrophoresis using an ABI PRISM 3100 genetic analyzer (Applied  
37 Biosystems).

#### 38 39 *Genetic diversity and differentiation based on nuclear DNA*

40

1 Measures of extant genetic diversity were calculated for both adult trees and male  
2 gametic contributions to each one of the analyzed maternal progeny arrays (effective  
3 pollen clouds). In the analysis of progenies, maternal and paternal contributions were  
4 first defined. In some cases, maternal and paternal gametic contributions were  
5 ambiguous, since mother trees and offspring shared the same heterozygous genotype.  
6 In these cases, male gametic frequency within each progeny array was estimated using  
7 a maximum likelihood method according to Gillet (1997). Subsequently, the software  
8 Rarefac (Petit et al. 1997a) was used to calculate allelic richness and gene diversity. For  
9 allelic richness rarefaction size was set to eight, corresponding to our smallest sample  
10 size. For the calculation of gene diversity, the unbiased estimator  $H_k$  of Nei (1987) was  
11 used. This portion provides an estimation of the expected heterozygosity, when diploid  
12 individuals are examined. Additional measures of genetic diversity (observed  
13 heterozygosity, expected heterozygosity and null alleles at each locus) in populations of  
14 *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* including the study stand are presented in Neophytou et al.  
15 (2010a).

16  
17 Additionally, genetic differentiation among adult trees was analyzed using a  
18 multivariate approach. Factorial Correspondence Analysis (FCA; Benzécri and Bellier  
19 1973) was used as an explorative method in order to distinguish individual grouping  
20 based on their multilocus nuclear genotypes by using the software Genetix (Belkhir et  
21 al. 2004). For the analysis, each adult genotype was converted into a three state matrix  
22 for each allele of each locus (absence of an allele is marked with 0, presence in  
23 heterozygous state is marked with 1 and presence in homozygous state is marked with  
24 2). Independent eigenvectors of the matrix were found and individuals were placed in  
25 the factorial space.

26  
27 Furthermore, male gamete heterogeneity was analyzed by means of a TwoGener  
28 analysis (Smouse et al. 2001) using the GenALEx 6.3 software (Peakall and Smouse  
29 2005).  $\Phi_{ft}$ , an analogue of Wright's  $F_{ST}$ , was calculated.  $\Phi_{ft}$  values were computed for  
30 each pairwise comparison among effective pollen clouds of different maternal trees  
31 and their significance was tested using a non-parametric permutation procedure  
32 (10,000 permutations of male gametes between each pair of pollen clouds were  
33 applied). Analyses were carried out locus by locus and by a multilocus approach.

34  
35 Finally, in order to provide a measure of the individual assignment of male gamete  
36 contributions, Bayesian analysis of genetic structures was implemented using the  
37 Structure 2.2 software (Pritchard et al. 2000). A paternity analysis was not possible  
38 with the given marker set, since paternity exclusion probability was low and  
39 assignments were ambiguous (results not shown). For the Structure analysis, allelic  
40 data of male gametic contributions to each offspring individual were used calculating  
41 posterior probabilities of membership to two assumed subpopulations or groups,

1 without prior information of the progeny array they belonged to. In the ambiguous  
2 cases (when offspring possessed the same heterozygous genotype as the maternal  
3 tree at one locus), we assigned each allele as paternal randomly, based on the  
4 calculated frequencies in the effective pollen cloud according to the method of Gillet  
5 (1997). One-hundred-thousand burn-in periods and 100,000 Markov Chain Monte  
6 Carlo simulations were performed assuming admixture and correlated allele  
7 frequencies. Proportions of membership to the two assumed groups for each  
8 individual and population were then calculated as the means among ten runs. Two  
9 thresholds of membership proportion,  $P(X|K) = 0.8$  and  $P(X|K) = 0.95$ , were  
10 empirically used to detect admixed haplotypes.

11

### 12 *Analysis of chloroplast DNA diversity and differentiation*

13

14 Chloroplast DNA haplotypes were defined as different combinations of allelic variants  
15 at the six analyzed cpDNA loci. Chlorotype nomenclature is introduced in the  
16 companion paper of Neophytou et al. (2010a) and is followed here as well. Haplotypic  
17 diversity was calculated using the software Rarefac (Petit et al. 1997a). In order to  
18 examine the degree of cpDNA sharing between the two species in our stand,  
19 introgression ratio (IG) between the two species according to Belahbib et al. (2001)  
20 was calculated. The introgression ratio was calculated as the ratio between the  
21 interspecific genetic identity and the mean of the intraspecific genetic identities. The  
22 intraspecific genetic identity equals the sum of squares of the frequencies of all  
23 haplotypic variants within each species and the interspecific one is defined as the sum  
24 of products of each haplotypic variant between species. This is described by the  
25 following formula:  $IG = 2J_{12k} / (J_{1k} + J_{2k})$ , where  $J_{12k}$  = interspecific genetic identity,  $J_{1k}$ ,  
26  $J_{2k}$  = intraspecific genetic identities. An IG score equal to zero indicates total absence  
27 of introgression between the two examined demes (in our case the two species),  
28 whereas an IG score equal to one means that all the variation is shared between  
29 them.

30

31

## 32 RESULTS

33

### 34 *Multivariate analysis of morphological data*

35

36 By employing Principal Component Analysis based on morphological traits, we  
37 received seven new uncorrelated synthetic variables (principal components). Among  
38 them, the first three were highly explanatory. Particularly, the first principal  
39 component explained 62.0% of the total variation, while the respective percentages  
40 were 18.2% for the second and 10.0% for the third principal component. In total, the  
41 first three principal components accounted for 90.2% of the total variation. All of



1 them were bipolar. In terms of the first principal component the two species could  
2 be well separated. No overlapping was observed when comparing the values of the  
3 first principal component in each species. The four designated hybrids took a median  
4 position between the parental species (Figure 3). Regarding the correlation of the  
5 original variables to the synthetic ones, all leaf size variables and ratios contributed  
6 to the first principal component with loading values between 0.380 and 0.457, while  
7 the two counted variables demonstrated negative correlations (results not shown).

8  
9 Using Discriminant Analysis we assigned each individual to one of the three  
10 morphological groups, corresponding to *Q. alnifolia*, *Q. coccifera* and hybrids.  
11 Percentage of return to morphological groups according to field assignment was  
12 used as a criterion for classification. All designated *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*  
13 individuals were assigned to the respective parental morphological groups.  
14 Percentages of return to the respective morphological group were high for both  
15 species. Five designated *Q. alnifolia* individuals (2.4%) showed a percentage of return  
16 to their own morphological group lower than 0.80. For these individuals, group  
17 membership to the hybrid group varying between 0.17 and 0.40 was found. Their  
18 membership to the morphological group of *Q. coccifera* was 0.05 or less (Figure 4).  
19 Further five *Q. alnifolia* individuals presented a percentage of return to their own  
20 morphological group between 0.80 and 0.95 (result not shown). Regarding the  
21 designated *Q. coccifera* individuals, only one displayed a percentage of return to its  
22 own morphological group lower than 0.80. Two more showed a percentage between  
23 0.80 and 0.95 (result not shown). Three designated hybrids presented a higher  
24 morphological affinity to the *Q. alnifolia* group, whilst one (individual 371) showed a  
25 higher similarity to the *Q. coccifera* group (Figure 4).

#### 26 27 *Analysis of nuclear microsatellite data*

28  
29 Large allele frequency differences between species at nuclear microsatellite loci  
30 QrZAG11 and QrZAG112 were observed. For instance, at locus QrZAG112 allele '86'  
31 was prevalent in both adults and pollen clouds of *Q. coccifera*, while allele '88'  
32 showed a very high frequency in *Q. alnifolia*. Differences of the most common alleles  
33 at each locus are presented in Figure 5. These allele frequency patterns are reflected  
34 into the diversity parameters calculated for the respective loci. Thus, in all  
35 interspecific comparisons diversity ( $H_k$ ) was significantly different (Table 1). On the  
36 other hand, we found no significant differences between adults and pollen clouds  
37 within the same species for any of the studied loci, which supports that interspecific  
38 pollinations might be very limited. Interestingly, in the case of the hybrid mother  
39 tree, male gametes showed a high affinity to *Q. alnifolia*. Diversity was not  
40 significantly different between the pooled pollen clouds of *Q. alnifolia* progenies and  
41 the pollen cloud of the hybrid progeny for any of the studied loci. In contrast, it was

1 significantly different in comparison to the pollen clouds of the *Q. coccifera*  
2 progenies for all loci (Table 1).

3  
4 By employing Factorial Correspondence Analysis on genotypic data, we received four  
5 new uncorrelated synthetic variables (factors). 61.85% of the total explained  
6 variation was found in the first two factors. Species could be well distinguished in  
7 factorial space and overlapping was very limited (Figure 6). *Q. alnifolia* formed a  
8 markedly more tightly bulked group, which reflects its lower genetic variation in  
9 comparison to *Q. coccifera*. The four designated hybrids were positioned between  
10 the parental species (Figure 6). A high relative contribution to the first factor was  
11 observed among all diagnostic alleles. In particular, allele '88' of locus QrZAG112  
12 showed the highest relative contribution followed by alleles '251' of locus QrZAG11  
13 and '86' of locus QrZAG112 (results not shown).

#### 14 15 *cpDNA diversity and differentiation*

16  
17 Analysis of cpDNA microsatellites confirmed low levels of introgression between the  
18 two species. In total, six cpDNA haplotypes (chlorotypes) were observed in the mixed  
19 stand and were named according to Neophytou et al. (2010a). *Quercus alnifolia* was  
20 markedly less diverse than *Q. coccifera* ( $H_k= 0.136$  versus  $H_k= 0.651$  respectively;  
21 Table 2). Among the three observed chlorotypes of *Q. alnifolia*, the most common,  
22 chlorotype 7, occurred in 93% of the individuals and chlorotype 6 had a frequency of  
23 7% in this species (Figure 7). Chloroplast DNA sharing was very low. Chlorotype 7 was  
24 found in 13% of *Q. coccifera* trees and chlorotype 6 was found in just one *Q.*  
25 *coccifera* tree (1.5%). The remaining chlorotypes were species-specific. In particular,  
26 chlorotypes 5, 11 and 12 were confined to *Q. coccifera* and chlorotype 13 was a rare  
27 variant observed in only one *Q. alnifolia* individual (Figure 7). Finally, the  
28 introgression ratio (IG) was limited to 0.026 reflecting the low degree of cytoplasmic  
29 sharing between the two species.

#### 30 31 *Comparison of genetic and morphological assignments*

32  
33 In order to compare the morphological and genetic admixture among adult  
34 individuals, results of a Structure assignment analysis of genotypes carried out in the  
35 companion paper of Neophytou et al. (2010a) were additionally used. Individuals  
36 were chosen, which possessed membership proportion lower than 0.80 to their own  
37 species group either based on the Discriminant Analysis (morphological assignment)  
38 of on Structure Analysis (genetic assignment). A comparison was made between  
39 genetic and morphological assignments of these individuals (Figure 4). The four  
40 designated hybrids were also included to this comparison. Finally, chlorotypes were  
41 given for all aforementioned individuals.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

None of the designated parental species individuals displayed both morphological and genetic admixture. In particular, morphologically admixed *Q. alnifolia* individuals displayed  $P(X|K)$  higher than 0.97, whilst the single morphologically admixed *Q. coccifera* individual showed  $P(X|K) = 0.91$  to its own species cluster. In contrast, all genetically admixed parental species individuals presented a high percentage of return (at least 0.99) to their own species, based on the Discriminant Analysis. Two designated hybrids showed admixed morphology and genotypes (individuals 293 and 371), and two of them showed morphological affinity to *Q. alnifolia*, but genetic affinity to *Q. coccifera* (individuals 348 and 352). None of the individuals with admixed morphological or genotypic assignment possessed a heterospecific chlorotype (Figure 4). Designated hybrids possessed chlorotype 5 (typical in *Q. coccifera*) in three cases and chlorotype 7 (typical in *Q. alnifolia*) in one (Figure 4). Use of 0.95 as a threshold of membership proportion did not change the outcome of this comparison, since morphological and genetic admixture did not coincide (results not shown).

*Genetic differentiation among effective pollen clouds*

High differentiation among male gametes of interspecific progeny arrays was observed. Multilocus  $\Phi_{ft}$  values varied between 0.306 and 0.453 and were all highly significant ( $P < 0.001$ ; Table 3). The corresponding values for the comparisons within species were much lower: 0.053-0.094 among pollen clouds of *Q. alnifolia* mother trees and 0.000-0.137 among pollen clouds of *Q. coccifera* mother trees. Most of the comparisons were significant at the  $P < 0.05$  or  $P < 0.01$  level. The higher differentiation values in *Q. coccifera* were due to the progeny array of mother tree C349 which differed significantly from all other intraspecific mothers in terms of male gametic diversity. By removing this progeny array,  $\Phi_{ft}$ s in *Q. coccifera* reached a maximum of 0.047 being of the same magnitude as in *Q. alnifolia* (Table 3). A further aspect of genetic differentiation among pollen clouds is the genetic structure within species, which seems to be linked with mother tree location. For instance, male gametes that pollinated neighbouring mother trees C282 and C283 (both *Q. coccifera*; Figure 1) do not differ from each other significantly. In general, results for both species reveal genetic structures due to heterogeneous male contributions among mother trees with  $\Phi_{ft}$  values among groups being significant (results not shown). The pollen cloud of the hybrid mother tree showed a much higher affinity to *Q. alnifolia*. Two out of three comparisons to *Q. alnifolia* were non-significant, whilst all comparisons to *Q. coccifera* were highly significant (Table 3).

Genetic assignment analysis using the software Structure provided further insights into differentiation patterns within and between effective pollen clouds. Effective

1 pollen clouds of *Q. alnifolia* mother trees were highly homogeneous with  
2 membership proportion to the respective species cluster ( $P(X|K)$ ) varying between  
3 0.942 and 0.970 (Table 4). Individual membership proportions were high. Male  
4 gametes of 70 progenies out of 71 were sorted to the *Q. alnifolia* cluster with  
5  $P(X|K) > 0.8$ . Fifty-seven of them showed  $P(X|K) > 0.95$ . In one case, the paternal tree  
6 displayed a higher degree of admixture ( $0.5 < P(X|K) < 0.8$ ), but no male gamete was  
7 assigned to the *Q. coccifera* cluster. Among *Q. coccifera* progeny arrays results were  
8 more heterogeneous. Male gametes of 165 progenies out of 176 were sorted to the  
9 *Q. coccifera* cluster with  $P(X|K) > 0.8$ . Among them, 53 possessed membership  
10 proportions between 0.8 and 0.95. As revealed by  $P(X|K)$ , for *Q. coccifera* maternal  
11 tree C349 among 14 male gametes, four were assigned to *Q. alnifolia* (two with  
12  $0.95 > P(X|K) > 0.8$  and two with  $P(X|K) > 0.95$ ; Table 4). Another similar case was  
13 observed in *Q. coccifera* maternal tree C367 (one male gamete was assigned to the  
14 *Q. alnifolia* cluster with  $0.95 > P(X|K) > 0.8$ ). Regarding the hybrid progeny array, group  
15 membership proportion of male gametes to the derived *Q. alnifolia* cluster was  
16 0.884 indicating a prevalence of *Q. alnifolia* within the effective pollen cloud. Out of  
17 43 analyzed male gametes, 38 were sorted to the *Q. alnifolia* cluster with  $P(X|K) > 0.8$   
18 and two were sorted to the *Q. coccifera* cluster with  $0.95 > P(X|K) > 0.8$  (Table 4).

19

20

## 21 DISCUSSION

22

23 The present study aimed to focus on the analysis of intra- and interspecific  
24 differentiation and gene flow in a single sympatric population of *Quercus alnifolia*  
25 and *Quercus coccifera*, by using various statistical approaches. Results widely agree  
26 that hybridization between the two species is very limited. In a total of 277 adult  
27 individuals, 273 were recognized as 'pure' *Q. alnifolia* or *Q. coccifera* in the field (207  
28 *Q. alnifolia* and 66 *Q. coccifera*). Some of them were assigned as intermediate by the  
29 morphological analysis and some of them possessed an admixed genotype as  
30 revealed by a previous Structure analysis (Neophytou et al. 2010a). However, none  
31 of them could be characterized as an intermediate by both analyses. The two species  
32 were also well separated in terms of chloroplast DNA haplotypes. The notion of very  
33 limited hybridization is further supported by analysis of male gametic contributions  
34 to the progenies of selected maternal trees (effective pollen clouds) which reveals  
35 that levels of successful interspecific crossings are very low.

36

37 The multivariate analysis of morphological traits has been proved once again to be a  
38 powerful tool for distinguishing between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. Results from  
39 the mixed stand of the present study agree to a large extent with past findings  
40 including pure populations and transects with sympatric stands from Troodos  
41 Mountains (Neophytou et al. 2007). Although we used a reduced number of original

1 variables, based on leaf morphometric traits, we received an even higher percentage  
2 of explained variation by the first three principal components, which exceeded 90%.  
3 This confirms the validity of the chosen morphological traits for discriminating  
4 between the two species. Even using only the first principal component, we received  
5 a clear-cut separation between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. Both in the present  
6 study and in Neophytou et al. (2007) the two species are well distinguished and  
7 overlapping is limited, supporting that introgression is low, at least arising from  
8 morphological traits. A further result which agrees with the previous findings is that  
9 hybrids show a closer morphological affinity to *Q. alnifolia*. None of the four  
10 intermediate individuals in our study occurs within the cluster of *Q. coccifera*. On the  
11 scatter plot of the PCA, three of them appear within the *Q. alnifolia* cluster and one  
12 possesses a median position between the two species' clusters.

13

14 Results from the analyses of nuclear microsatellites provided further evidence that  
15 interspecific introgression is low. Additionally, multilocus estimates of genetic  
16 variation at nuclear SSRs, as well as cpDNA haplotype diversity were lower in *Q.*  
17 *alnifolia*. This is probably due to the different evolutionary history of the two species.  
18 Toumi and Lumaret (2001) in an alloenzyme study including *Q. alnifolia*, *Q. coccifera*  
19 and other related sclerophyllous oak species found that *Q. alnifolia* possessed the  
20 lowest diversity values among all species studied and attributed this to a founder  
21 effect. On one hand, *Q. coccifera* has a wide distribution across the Mediterranean.  
22 This species and its ancestral species, *Q. mediterranea*, had a strong presence in this  
23 area at least during the Oligocene (Palamarev 1989). On the other hand, *Q. alnifolia*  
24 is endemic and confined to a limited area on the igneous rocks of Troodos  
25 Mountains on Cyprus. Fossil evidence of its ancestral species, *Q. pseudoalnus*, is  
26 limited (Palamarev 1989). Thus, it might have been to a greater extent subjected to  
27 genetic drift effects during its evolutionary history.

28

29 Genetic drift may also account for the high allele frequency differences between the  
30 two species at loci QrZAG11 and 112. The aspect of high nuclear genetic  
31 differentiation and low admixture between the two species has already been  
32 discussed in Neophytou et al. (2010a). In the present study, we extended the  
33 analyses by studying genetic diversity and differentiation among progeny arrays from  
34 known maternal trees of both species, as well as of a designated hybrid. Genetic  
35 differentiation between effective pollen clouds is very high and significant between  
36 all interspecific pairs of mother trees. At the within species level, differentiation  
37 among pollen clouds was lower, but in several cases significant, which may indicate  
38 assortative mating. Heterogeneity among pollen pools received by different  
39 maternal trees of the same species has been observed in other oak species as well  
40 and has been attributed to within population differences in flower maturation timing  
41 (e.g. Streiff et al. 1999 for *Q. petraea* and *Q. robur*).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

More detailed information about the frequency of interspecific crossings was revealed by the Bayesian clustering analysis of male gametes. In particular, no evidence for interspecific pollinations was found for any individual among *Q. alnifolia* progeny arrays. Among progeny arrays of *Q. coccifera* mother trees, there was evidence for only five interspecific matings out of a total of 176 analyzed offspring (2.8%). Four of them occurred in a specific maternal tree (C349; 28.6 % of the total male gametic contributions to the progeny of this tree). The frequency of interspecific pollinations between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* appears to be lower in comparison to the well studied European white oaks. For instance, Salvini et al. (2009) found that 26% of *Q. pubescens* offspring (acorns) were fathered by *Q. petraea* in a mixed stand of the two species in Italy. In the case of *Q. robur* and *Q. petraea* this percentage varied between 17 and 48% among different progenies of the first species, whereas the second species acted almost exclusively as pollen donor (Bacilieri et al. 1996).

A directionality of interspecific pollen flow was observed in our data, with *Q. alnifolia* acting as pollen donor. The hybrid mother tree was mainly pollinated by *Q. alnifolia*, whilst we could not detect any *Q. coccifera* paternal contribution among progenies of *Q. alnifolia* mother trees. An important factor playing a role in pollination patterns is the relative abundance and spatial distribution of the two species (Lepais et al. 2009, Varela et al. 2008). In our study stand, *Q. alnifolia* is predominant (Figure 1), which could be the reason of the genetic affinity of its effective pollen cloud to the '*Q. alnifolia*' cluster. Additionally, neighbouring trees C282 and C283 possessed effective pollen clouds with minimal differentiation. Finally, for all interspecific pollinations of *Q. coccifera* tree C349, which demonstrated the highest degree of interbreeding among all mother trees, the pollen donor might have been a nearby *Q. alnifolia* (A351, at 2 m distance), as its genotype matches the male gametic contribution of all interbred offspring. However, we note here that for each one of the interbred offspring of this tree, up to three adult *Q. alnifolia* trees of the study stand possessed a matching genotype and could have been potential male parents. Thus we were not able to assign the father unambiguously. The analysis of additional SSRs is necessary to obtain higher exclusion probabilities in paternity analyses.

The rarity of interspecific crossings indicates that effective reproductive barriers might act between the two species preventing successful interspecific mating. Flowering periods of the two species are widely overlapping with *Q. alnifolia* flowering between the end of April and the beginning of June (Knopf 2006), whereas dates for *Q. coccifera* span from April to May (Chatziphilippidis 2006). This gives the opportunity of interspecific pollinations. Observations from year 2009 in our study stand confirmed overlapping in flowering. However, in *Q. coccifera* flower

1 maturation was slightly more advanced. The hybrid mother tree showed a delay in  
2 flowering. Given that the two species are protandrous, this asynchrony could have  
3 resulted in a higher degree of fertilization of *Q. coccifera* and hybrid female flowers  
4 with *Q. alnifolia* pollen (it is more likely that female flowers of *Q. coccifera* are  
5 receptive during maturation of male flowers of *Q. alnifolia* than the opposite). In the  
6 case of the interfertile *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber*, flowering timing has been proposed to  
7 affect hybridization directionality with the latter species flowering later and acting  
8 almost exclusively as pollen donor (Varela et al. 2008). Apart from flowering  
9 phenology, post-pollination mechanisms may also prevent interbreeding. Pollen-  
10 pistil interactions may set a prezygotic barrier by inhibiting of pollen tube growth  
11 and embryo formation. In addition, even if fertilization is successful, acorn  
12 maturation may be incomplete and immature seeds from interspecific crosses may  
13 be aborted (Boavida et al. 2001). Given that *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* show  
14 differences in their reproductive cycles (annual acorn maturation in *Q. alnifolia* and  
15 predominantly biennial in *Q. coccifera*; Knopf 2006, Bianco and Schirone 1985), such  
16 physiological incompatibilities possibly act preventing hybridization between the two  
17 species.

18  
19 Results from cpDNA microsatellites further confirm very low levels of introgressive  
20 hybridization between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in the study stand. A limited  
21 sharing was observed mainly concerning haplotype 7, dominant in *Q. alnifolia* of this  
22 stand, which was found in eight *Q. coccifera* trees (12%). Nonetheless, there is no  
23 evidence that this was due to recent hybridization since genotypes of these  
24 individuals were not introgressed (membership proportions to *Q. coccifera* cluster  
25 0.972-0.990 based on Structure analysis in Neophytou et al. (2010a); results not  
26 shown). Moreover, since no sequence information from the analyzed cpDNA SSR loci  
27 was available, size homoplasmy cannot be ruled out.

28  
29 This lack of cpDNA introgression at a local scale revealed by the present study may  
30 indicate a relatively recent contact of the two species at this certain study site. On  
31 the other hand, large scale cpDNA introgression revealed by multipopulation data  
32 (Neophytou et al. 2010a) might be due to historical hybridization events. The spatial  
33 distribution of cpDNA lineages in other sclerophyllous oaks of the Mediterranean  
34 reflects ancient migration patterns, since these species persisted in the area  
35 throughout the Pleistocene (e.g. Jiménez et al. 2004; López de Heredia et al. 2007).  
36 Large scale chloroplast DNA sharing between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* is probably  
37 the imprint of rare hybridization events that sporadically happened during their long  
38 existence on Cyprus.

39  
40  
41

1 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

2

3 We would like to thank Andreas Christou (Department of Forests, Republic of Cyprus  
4 personnel, for their assistance during plant collections). We are grateful to Mr.  
5 Petros Anastasiou for his valuable help during plant collections. This research was  
6 conducted in partial fulfilment for the doctorate degree of the first author at Albert-  
7 Ludwigs University of Freiburg. During that time the first author was supported by  
8 doctorate scholarships from DAAD and the State of Baden-Württemberg. Partial  
9 financial assistance to Filippou Aravanopoulos in the form of two cooperative grants  
10 of the Ministry of Natural Resources of Cyprus and the Aristotle University of  
11 Thessaloniki is gratefully acknowledged.

12

13

14 LITERATURE CITED

15

16 Aravanopoulos FA. (2005) Phenotypic variation and population relationships of  
17 chestnut (*Castanea sativa*) in Greece, revealed by multivariate analysis of leaf  
18 morphometrics. Acta Hort 693: 230-240.

19

20 Bacilieri R, Ducouso A, Petit RJ, Kremer A. (1996) Mating system and asymmetric  
21 hybridization in a mixed stand of European oaks. Evolution 50: 900-908.

22

23 Belahbib N, Pemonge M, Ouassou A, Sbay H, Kremer A, Petit RJ. (2001) Frequent  
24 cytoplasmic exchanges between oak species that are not closely related: *Quercus*  
25 *suber* and *Q. ilex* in Morocco. Mol Ecol 10: 2003-2012.

26

27 Belkhir K, Borsa P, Chikhi L, Raufaste N, Bonhomme F. (2004) GENETIX 4.05, logiciel  
28 sous Windows TM pour la génétique des populations. Laboratoire Génome,  
29 Populations, Interactions, CNRS UMR 5171. Université de Montpellier II, Montpellier  
30 (France).

31

32 Benzécri JP, Bellier L. (1973) L'analyse des données: Benzécri, J.-P. et al. L'analyse des  
33 correspondances. Dunod. Paris.

34

35 Bianco P, Schirone B. 1985. On *Quercus coccifera* L. s.l.: Variation in reproductive  
36 phenology. Taxon 34: 436-439.

37

38 Boavida LC, Silva JP, Feijó JA. (2001) Sexual reproduction in the cork oak (*Quercus*  
39 *suber* L). II. Crossing intra- and interspecific barriers. Sex Plant Reprod 14: 143-152.

40

41 Chatziphilippidis G. (2006) *Quercus coccifera* Linné, 1753. In: Schütt, P., Schuck, H. J.,



- 1 Lang, UM, Roloff A (ed.). Enzyklopädie der Holzgewächse 3. Landsberg am Lech.  
2
- 3 Deguilloux M, Dumolin-Lapègue S, Gielly L, Grivet D, Petit RJ. (2003) A set of primers  
4 for the amplification of chloroplast microsatellites in *Quercus*. Mol Ecol Notes 3: 24-  
5 27.  
6
- 7 Dickinson TA, Parker WH, Strauss RE. (1987) Another approach to leaf shape  
8 comparisons. Taxon: 1-20.  
9
- 10 Dodd RS, Afzal-Rafii Z. (2004) Selection and dispersal in a multispecies oak hybrid  
11 zone. Evolution 58: 261–269.  
12
- 13 Finkeldey R, Mátyás G. (2003) Genetic variation of oaks (*Quercus* spp.) in  
14 Switzerland. 3. Lack of impact of postglacial recolonization history on nuclear gene  
15 loci. Theor Appl Genet 106: 346-352.  
16
- 17 Fisher RA. (1936) Multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. Annals of Eugenics  
18 7: 179-188.  
19
- 20 Gugerli F, Walser J, Dounavi K, Holderegger R, Finkeldey R. (2007) Coincidence of  
21 Small-scale Spatial Discontinuities in Leaf Morphology and Nuclear Microsatellite  
22 Variation of *Quercus petraea* and *Q. robur* in a Mixed Forest. Ann Bot 99: 713-722.  
23
- 24 Gillet EM. (1997) Maximum Likelihood Estimators of the Gametic Contributions to  
25 Single-Plant Progenies. Biometrics 53: 504-523.  
26
- 27 Hand R. (2006) Supplementary notes to the flora of Cyprus V. Willdenowia 36: 761-  
28 809.  
29
- 30 Jimenez P, de Heredia UL, Collada C, Lorenzo Z, Gil L. (2004) High variability of  
31 chloroplast DNA in three Mediterranean evergreen oaks indicates complex  
32 evolutionary history. Heredity 93: 510-515.  
33
- 34 Kampfer S, Lexer C, Glössl J, Steinkellner H. (1998) Characterization of (GA)<sub>n</sub>  
35 Microsatellite Loci from *Quercus robur*. Hereditas 129: 183-186.  
36
- 37 Knopf H. (2006) *Quercus alnifolia* Poech. In: Schütt, P., Schuck, H. J., Lang, UM, Roloff  
38 A (ed.). Enzyklopädie der Holzgewächse 3. Landsberg am Lech.  
39
- 40 Kremer A, Dupouey JL, Deans JD, Cottrell J, Csaikl U, Finkeldey R, Espinel S, Jensen J,  
41 Kleinschmit J, Van Dam B. (2002) Leaf morphological differentiation between

1 *Quercus robur* and *Quercus petraea* is stable across western European mixed oak  
2 stands. Ann For Sci 59: 777-787.  
3  
4 Lepais O, Petit RJ, Guichoux E, Lavabre JE, Alberto F, Kremer A, Gerber S. (2009)  
5 Species relative abundance and direction of introgression in oaks. Mol Ecol 18: 2228-  
6 2242.  
7  
8 López de Heredia U, Jiménez P, Simeone MC, Bellarosa R, Schirone B, Cervera MT, Gil  
9 L. (2007) Multi-marker phylogeny of three evergreen oaks reveals vicariant patterns  
10 in the Western Mediterranean. Taxon 56: 1209-1220.  
11  
12 Meikle RD. 1977. Flora of Cyprus 1-2. Bentham-Moxon Trust. Kew (UK).  
13  
14 Muir G, Fleming CC, Schlötterer C. (2000) Species status of hybridizing oaks. Nature  
15 405: 1016.  
16  
17 Nei M. (1987) Molecular evolutionary genetics. Columbia University Press.  
18  
19 Neophytou C, Palli G, Dounavi A, Aravanopoulos F. (2007) Morphological  
20 differentiation and hybridization between *Quercus alnifolia* Poech and *Quercus*  
21 *coccifera* L. (Fagaceae) in Cyprus. Silvae Genet 56: 271-277.  
22  
23 Neophytou C, Dounavi A, Aravanopoulos F. (2008) Conservation of Nuclear SSR Loci  
24 Reveals High Affinity of *Quercus infectoria* ssp. *veneris* A. Kern (Fagaceae) to Section  
25 Robur. Plant Mol Biol Rep 26: 133-141.  
26  
27 Neophytou C, Dounavi A, Fink S, Aravanopoulos F. (2010a) Interfertile oaks in an  
28 island environment: I. High nuclear genetic differentiation and high degree of  
29 chloroplast DNA sharing between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in Cyprus. A  
30 multipopulation study. European Journal of Forest Research. DOI: XXXXXXXXX  
31  
32 Neophytou C, Aravanopoulos F, Fink S, Dounavi A. (2010b) Detecting interspecific  
33 and geographic differentiation patterns in two interfertile oak species (*Quercus*  
34 *petraea* (Matt.) Liebl. and *Q. robur* L.) using small sets of microsatellite markers.  
35 Forest Ecol Manag 259 (10): 2026-2035.  
36  
37 Palamarev E. 1989. Paleobotanical evidences of the Tertiary history and origin of the  
38 Mediterranean sclerophyll dendroflora. Plant Syst Evol 162: 93-107.  
39  
40 Peakall ROD, Smouse PE. 2005. GENALEX 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population  
41 genetic software for teaching and research. Mol Ecol Notes 6: 288–295.

1  
2 Petit RJ, El Mousadik A, Pons O. (1997a) Identifying populations for conservation on  
3 the basis of genetic markers. *Conserv Biol* 12: 844–855.  
4  
5 Petit RJ, Pineau E, Demesure B, Bacilieri R, Ducouso A, Kremer A. (1997b)  
6 Chloroplast DNA footprints of postglacial recolonization by oaks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U*  
7 *S A* 94: 9996-10001.  
8  
9 Petit RJ, Csaikl UM, Bordács S, Burg K, Coart E, Cottrell J, Dam BV, Deans JD, Dumolin-  
10 Lapègue S, Fineschi S, Finkeldey R, Amanda, Glaz I, Goicoechea PG, Jensen JS, König  
11 AO, Lowe AJ, Madsen SF, Mátyás G, Munro RC, Olalde M, Pemonge M, Popescu F,  
12 Slade D, Tabbener H, Turchini D, Vries SGMD, Ziegenhagen B, Kremer A. (2002)  
13 Chloroplast DNA variation in European white oaks: Phylogeography and patterns of  
14 diversity based on data from over 2600 populations. *For Ecol Manag* 156: 5-26.  
15  
16 Pimentel RA. (1979) *Morphometrics: the multivariate analysis of biological data.*  
17 Kendall/Hunt Dubuque, Iowa.  
18  
19 Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P. (2000) Inference of population structure using  
20 multilocus genotype data. *Genetics* 155: 945-959.  
21  
22 Rubio de Casas R, Cano E, Balaguer L, Perez-Corona E, Manrique E, García-Verdugo C,  
23 Vargas P. (2007) Taxonomic identity of *Quercus coccifera* L. in the Iberian Peninsula is  
24 maintained in spite of widespread hybridisation, as revealed by morphological, ISSR  
25 and ITS sequence data. *Flora* 202: 488–499.  
26  
27 Rushton BS. (1993) Natural hybridization within the genus *Quercus* L. *Ann Sci Forest*  
28 50: 18 pages.  
29  
30 Salvini D, Bruschi P, Fineschi S, Grossoni P, Kjaer ED, Vendramin GG. (2009) Natural  
31 hybridisation between *Quercus petraea* (Matt.) Liebl. and *Quercus pubescens* Willd.  
32 within an Italian stand as revealed by microsatellite fingerprinting. *Plant Biol* 11:  
33 758–765.  
34  
35 Smouse PE, Dyer RJ, Westfall RD, Sork VL. (2001) Two-generation analysis of pollen  
36 flow across a landscape. I. Male gamete heterogeneity among females. *Evolution* 55:  
37 260–271.  
38  
39 Steinkellner H, Fluch S, Turetschek E, Lexer C, Streiff R, Kremer A, Burg K, Glössl J.  
40 (1997) Identification and characterization of (GA/CT)<sub>n</sub>- microsatellite loci from  
41 *Quercus petraea*. *Plant Mol Biol* 33: 1093-1096.

1  
2 Streiff R, Ducousso A, Lexer C, Steinkellner H, Glössl J, Kremer A. (1999) Pollen  
3 dispersal inferred from paternity analysis in a mixed oak stand of *Quercus robur* L.  
4 and *Q. petraea* (Matt.) Liebl. Mol Ecol 8: 831-841.  
5  
6 Toumi L, Lumaret R. (2001) Allozyme characterisation of four Mediterranean  
7 evergreen oak species. Biochem Sys Ecol 29: 799-817.  
8  
9 Varela M, Brás R, Barros IR, Oliveira P, Meierrose C. (2008) Opportunity for  
10 hybridization between two oak species in mixed stands as monitored by the timing  
11 and intensity of pollen production. For Ecol Manag 256: 1546–1551.  
12  
13 Weising K, Gardner RC. (1999) A set of conserved PCR primers for the analysis of  
14 simple sequence repeat polymorphisms in chloroplast genomes of dicotyledonous  
15 angiosperms. Genome 42: 9-19.  
16

TABLES

Table 1 – Nuclear genetic diversity measures of adult trees and male gametes of the analyzed progenies (effective pollen clouds) in each species. N= number of analyzed chromosomes (2n for the adults and n for the pollen clouds),  $n_{al}$ = number of alleles,  $H_k$ = Nei's unbiased gene diversity,  $SE_{Hk}$ = standard error of Nei's unbiased gene diversity and  $R_8$ = allelic richness (rarefaction size= 8 haploid individuals).

Locus		Adults			Pollen clouds		
		<i>Q. alnifolia</i>	<i>Q. coccifera</i>	Hybr.	<i>Q. alnifolia</i>	<i>Q. coccifera</i>	Hybr.
QpZAG9	N	414	132	8	57	172	43
	$n_{al}$	11	12	4	7	14	9
	$H_k$	0.722	0.858	0.821	0.736	0.850	0.798
	$SE_{Hk}$	0.015	0.014	0.101	0.035	0.012	0.037
	$R_8$	3.781	5.136	4.000	3.754	5.038	4.422
QrZAG11	N	412	130	8	55	170	42
	$n_{al}$	6	13	4	2	13	2
	$H_k$	0.157	0.822	0.643	0.105	0.805	0.048
	$SE_{Hk}$	0.024	0.020	0.184	0.055	0.019	0.045
	$R_8$	1.613	4.788	4.000	1.382	4.620	1.190
QrZAG96	N	414	132	8	69	171	33
	$n_{al}$	5	5	2	3	6	3
	$H_k$	0.520	0.412	0.250	0.571	0.339	0.595
	$SE_{Hk}$	0.023	0.048	0.180	0.043	0.045	0.043
	$R_8$	2.617	2.415	2.000	2.640	2.277	2.571
QrZAG112	N	414	132	8	68	175	43
	$n_{al}$	7	4	4	3	3	3
	$H_k$	0.424	0.117	0.750	0.403	0.109	0.451
	$SE_{Hk}$	0.026	0.038	0.139	0.054	0.031	0.080
	$R_8$	2.412	1.462	4.000	1.031	1.396	2.454
Multilocus	$n_{al}$	7.250	8.500	3.500	3.750	9.000	4.250
	$H_k$	0.456	0.552	0.616	0.454	0.526	0.473
	$SE_{Hk}$	0.235	0.354	0.255	0.302	0.361	0.317
	$R_8$	2.606	3.450	3.500	2.202	3.333	2.659

Table 2 – Haplotypic diversity and differentiation between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. measures of adult trees and male gametes of the analyzed progenies (effective pollen clouds) in each species. N= number of analyzed individuals,  $n_{hap}$ = number of haplotypes,  $H_k$ = Nei's unbiased gene diversity,  $SE_{Hk}$ = standard error of Nei's unbiased gene diversity.

	<i>Q. alnifolia</i>	<i>Q. coccifera</i>	Hybr.
N	207	66	4
$n_{hap}$	3	5	2
$H_k$	0.136	0.651	0.521
$SE_{Hk}$	0.031	0.035	0.265

Table 3 – Multilocus pairwise  $\Phi_{ft}$  values among male gametes of each analyzed progeny array. Mother trees: A= *Quercus alnifolia*, C= *Quercus coccifera*, H= intermediates. Locations of the trees are shown in Figure 1.

	A216	A290	A441	C282	C283	C349	C361	C367
A290	0.053*							
A441	0.053	0.094*						
C282	0.348***	0.453***	0.385***					
C283	0.343***	0.446***	0.372***	0.000				
C349	0.268***	0.378***	0.306***	0.137***	0.128***			
C361	0.342***	0.409***	0.356***	0.047**	0.033*	0.052**		
C367	0.360***	0.440***	0.386***	0.036**	0.019	0.111***	0.019*	
H371	0.023	0.058***	0.043	0.307***	0.297***	0.204***	0.278***	0.312***

Table 4 – Proportions of membership of male gametes to species group  
 Results based on the Structure genetic assignment analysis are presented. Mother trees, species and number of sampled offspring (acorns) per tree are given in the first three columns. Proportions of membership of each effective pollen cloud to each one of the two inferred clusters are given in the fourth column (P(X|K)). Two threshold values of P(X|K) were set; 0.8 and 0.95. Number of individuals is given for each class of membership proportion; e.g. N (0.95<P<0.8) for individuals showing 0.95<P(X|K)<0.8 etc.

Moth. tree	Sp.	N	Group membership P(X K)	<i>Quercus alnifolia</i> cluster				<i>Quercus coccifera</i> cluster			Group membership P(X K)
				Number of individuals per class of membership proportion							
				N (P>0.95)	N (0.95<P<0.8)	N (0.5<P<0.8)	N (0.5<P<0.8)	N (0.8<P<0.95)	N (P>0.95)		
A216		15	0.970	14	1	0	0	0	0	0.031	
A290	<i>Q.</i>	48	0.956	37	10	1	0	0	0	0.044	
A441	<i>alnifolia</i>	8	0.942	6	2	0	0	0	0	0.058	
Total		71	0.957	57	13	1	0	0	0	0.043	
H371	Hybrid	43	0.884	30	8	1	2	2	0	0.116	
C282		34	0.055	0	0	0	0	6	28	0.945	
C283		28	0.106	0	0	0	3	6	19	0.894	
C349	<i>Q.</i>	14	0.337	2	2	0	2	5	3	0.663	
C361	<i>coccifera</i>	50	0.075	0	0	0	0	25	25	0.925	
C367		50	0.070	0	1	0	1	11	37	0.930	
Total		176	0.095	2	3	0	6	53	112	0.905	

FIGURES

FIGURE LEGENDS:




Figure 1 – Satellite image of the mixed stand (retrieved by Google Earth). All adult trees belonging to the two parental species are presented. The mother trees corresponding to the analyzed progeny arrays are also located (Species is given as prefix of tree number A= *Q. alnifolia*, C= *Q. coccifera*, H= designated hybrid).






Figure 2 – Illustration of the assessed leaf morphological parameters. Black numbers denote teeth number (TE) and white numbers denote side vein number (UN). LL= lamina length, LW= lamina width, PL= petiole length (PL).

### Principal Component Analysis of Leaf Morphological Traits




Figure 3 – Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of leaf morphological traits. A scatter plot of the first two principal components and a frequency distribution bar plot based on the first principal component are included. *Quercus alnifolia* is denoted with non-filled triangles on the scatter plot and non-filled columns on the bar plot. *Quercus coccifera* is denoted with black-filled inverse triangles on the scatter plot and black-filled columns on the bar plot. Putative hybrids are denoted with asterisks on the scatter plot and grey-filled columns on the bar plot.




Figure 4 – Results of the discriminant analysis of leaf morphometric characters and the Structure analysis of nuclear microsatellites (Neophytou et al. 2010a) are presented with bar plots for individuals with membership proportions to their own cluster lower than 0.8 (revealed either by the morphological or by the genetic analysis). Membership proportion to each of the derived clusters is shown. Black colour is used for the derived cluster of *Q. alnifolia*, grey for hybrids (only in the Discriminant Analysis) and white for *Q. alnifolia*. Chlorotype of each individual is given in a separate column.

### Allele frequency distribution among adults and pollen clouds




Figure 5 – Distribution of diagnostic alleles among adult trees (black-filled) and progenies (white-filled) in *Q. alnifolia*, *Q. coccifera* and putative hybrids.

### Factorial Correspondence Analysis of Genotypes




Figure 6 – Factorial Correspondence Analysis (PCA) of nuclear microsatellite data. A scatter plot of the first two factors and a frequency distribution bar plot based on the first factor are included. *Quercus alnifolia* is denoted with non-filled triangles on the scatter plot and non-filled columns on the bar plot. *Quercus coccifera* is denoted with black-filled inverse triangles on the scatter plot and black-filled columns on the bar plot. Putative hybrids are denoted with asterisks on the scatter plot and grey-filled columns on the bar plot.




Figure 7 – Frequency distribution of chloroplast DNA haplotypes. Chlorotype designation is based upon Neophytou et al. (2010a).