

1 TITLE: Interfertile oaks in an island environment: I. High nuclear genetic
2 differentiation and high degree of chloroplast DNA sharing between *Q. alnifolia* and
3 *Q. coccifera* in Cyprus. A multipopulation study.

4

5 AUTHORS: Charalambos Neophytou*^{1,2}, Aikaterini Dounavi¹, Siegfried Fink², Filippou
6 A. Aravanopoulos³

7

8 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

9 Charalambos Neophytou

10 Forest Research Institute of Baden-Württemberg

11 Department of Forest Ecology

12 Wonnhaldestr. 4

13 D-79100 Freiburg

14 Germany

15

16 E-mail address: Charalambos.Neophytou@forst.bwl.de

17 (current e-mail address: chneophytou@gmail.com)

18 Telephone: +49 / 761 / 40 18 159

19 Fax: +49 / 761 / 40 18 133

20

21 The final publication is available at:

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

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

² Chair of Forest Botany, Faculty of Forest and Environmental Sciences, Albert-Ludwigs University of Freiburg, Bertoldstr. 17, 79085, Freiburg, Germany

³ Laboratory of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding, Faculty of Forestry and Natural Environment, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, P.O. Box 238, Thessaloniki, Greece

1 ABSTRACT

2

3 The evergreen *Quercus alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* form the only interfertile pair of oak
4 species growing in Cyprus. Hybridization between the two species has already been
5 observed and studied morphologically. However, little evidence exists about the
6 extent of genetic introgression. In the present study, we aimed to study the effects
7 of introgressive hybridization mutually on both chloroplast and nuclear genomes.
8 We sampled both pure and mixed populations of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* from
9 several locations across their distribution area in Cyprus. We analyzed the genetic
10 variation within and between species by conducting Analysis of Molecular Variance
11 (AMOVA) based on nuclear microsatellites. Population genetic structure and levels of
12 admixture were studied by means of a Bayesian analysis (STRUCTURE simulation
13 analysis). Chloroplast DNA microsatellites were used for a spatial analysis of genetic
14 barriers. The main part of the nuclear genetic variation was explained by partition
15 into species groups. High interspecific differentiation and low admixture of nuclear
16 genomes, both in pure and mixed populations, support limited genetic introgression
17 between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in Cyprus. On the contrary, chloroplast DNA
18 haplotypes were shared between the species and were locally structured suggesting
19 cytoplasmic introgression. Occasional hybridization events followed by backcrossings
20 with both parental species might lead to this pattern of genetic differentiation.

21

22 KEY WORDS: *Quercus alnifolia*, *Quercus coccifera*, DNA microsatellites, cpDNA
23 haplotypes, genetic differentiation, hybridization, genetic introgression, genetic
24 structure, spatial genetic barriers.

1 INTRODUCTION

2

3 Since DNA markers became widely available, genetic research of natural oak
4 populations has been intensified. A rapidly growing number of studies describing
5 molecular genetic diversity and differentiation have been carried out (Muir et al.
6 2000; Craft and Ashley 2006; Soto et al. 2007). A wide variety of both nuclear and
7 organelle DNA markers have been applied, leading to contrasting results. On one
8 hand, nuclear markers have been successfully used to differentiate at the species
9 level (Muir et al. 2000; Curtu et al. 2007a). On the other hand, chloroplast DNA
10 lineages have been found to be shared between related species (Petit et al. 2002;
11 Lumaret et al. 2002; López de Heredia et al. 2005). The underlying evolutionary
12 forces leading to this pattern have been intensively debated. Both common ancestry
13 and interspecific gene flow have been proposed as contributing to the high degree of
14 genetic information sharing (Muir and Schlotterer 2005; Lexer et al. 2006). Increasing
15 evidence supports that hybridization plays a central role in the genomic architecture
16 of the different taxa not only in oak, but also in several other plant genera (Kremer
17 et al. 2002; Petit et al. 2004; Nosil et al. 2009).

18

19 The genus *Quercus* has served as a model for studying hybridization since the advent
20 of evolutionary thinking (Darwin 1859). Many oak species that belong to the same
21 phylogenetic group are interfertile and hybridize under natural conditions. Despite
22 high levels of interspecific gene flow, intermediate individuals often occur in very
23 limited numbers. For instance, Rubio de Casas et al. (2007) found that *Q. coccifera*
24 maintains its morphological identity despite high levels of hybridization with *Q. ilex*
25 in Spain. On the other hand, large scale studies based on chloroplast DNA markers
26 reveal high levels of cytoplasmic sharing between related species. An extensive study
27 including 2600 populations of European oak species of the subgenus *Quercus* s.s.
28 showed that chloroplast DNA haplotypes were only geographically structured and no
29 correlation with species was found (Petit et al. 2002). Similarly, chlorotypes in
30 Mediterranean sclerophyllous oak species present a geographic distribution along an
31 east-west axis and are shared among species (Lumaret et al. 2002; López de Heredia
32 et al. 2007).

33

34 Common structures of organelle DNA genomes support past hybridization and
35 introgression events (Lumaret and Jabbour-Zahab 2009). Especially in the well
36 studied European oak species of the subgenus *Quercus* s.s., maternal lineages carry
37 the imprints of the postglacial recolonization and are entirely shared between
38 species. No correlation between nuclear and chloroplast DNA variation was found,
39 which supports the notion that species regain their identity after a limited number of
40 backcrossings following the initial hybridization event (Kremer et al. 2002; Petit et al.
41 2004). Similar cases of 'cytoplasmic capture' have been described between the

1 occasionally hybridizing Mediterranean species *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber*. In this case, it
2 was shown that some populations of *Q. suber* possess chloroplast DNA lineages that
3 originated from sympatric or neighbouring *Q. ilex* populations (Belahbib et al. 2001).

4
5 Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that interspecific differentiation between
6 related oak species varies from locus to locus (Curtu et al. 2007a; Soto et al. 2007;
7 Gugerli et al. 2008). This differentiation pattern was attributed either to past
8 selective sweeps (Muir and Schlötterer 2005) or to active selection at adaptive loci
9 following hybridization (Scotti-Saintagne et al. 2004). The latter process leads to a
10 fast 'resurrection' of the parental species after an initial hybridization event (Petit et
11 al. 2004). Rubio de Casas et al. (2007) in a case study of *Q. coccifera* and *Q. ilex*
12 support that parental phenotypical traits re-emerge in early stages of introgression
13 in a similar way, whereas at selectively neutral loci a large amount of genetic
14 variation remains shared.

15
16 In Cyprus, *Q. coccifera* and the endemic *Quercus alnifolia* are significant elements of
17 the local Mediterranean sclerophyllous flora. They are the only two interfertile oak
18 species and do not hybridize with *Q. infectoria*, the third indigenous oak species of
19 the island (Neophytou et al. 2008). *Quercus alnifolia* is abundant in the central
20 mountainous area of Troodos and grows on volcanic geological substrate. *Quercus*
21 *coccifera* has a wider, but more scattered distribution and is locally dominant on
22 calcareous formations (Barbero and Quezel 1979). However, the two species grow
23 over large areas in sympatry and overlapping of their flowering periods allows
24 interspecific pollination. Hybridization between the two species has been studied by
25 morphological traits only (Knopf 2006, Hand 2006, Neophytou et al. 2007).
26 Morphologically intermediate individuals were rather scarce. A multivariate analysis
27 using morphological leaf traits supports some interspecific introgression in sympatric
28 populations and reveals a higher degree of diversity in *Q. coccifera* (Neophytou et al.
29 2007). Additionally, according to a study describing variation at seven isoenzyme loci,
30 *Q. alnifolia* shares all its alleles with *Q. coccifera* and exhibits markedly lower
31 diversity at most loci (Toumi and Lumaret 2001).

32
33 In our study, genetic variation within and between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* was
34 investigated using both chloroplast and nuclear DNA microsatellite markers. For this
35 purpose, pure and sympatric populations were included covering a large part of the
36 species' distribution area in Cyprus. We studied the effects of hybridization and
37 subsequent genetic introgression on their nuclear and chloroplast genomes. We
38 addressed following questions:

- 39 - Is there substantial genetic differentiation between the two species despite
- 40 hybridization? Is there intraspecific subdivision?
- 41 - Does interspecific differentiation vary within mixed and between pure populations?

1 Is there introgressive hybridization?
2 - Does cpDNA variation follow a different interspecific and intraspecific variation
3 pattern?

4

5

6 MATERIALS AND METHODS

7

8 *Sample collection*

9

10 Samplings comprised six pure *Q. alnifolia* populations, six pure *Q. coccifera*
11 populations and one mixed stand with both species. One large sample (96
12 individuals) was taken from one pure population per species, in order to calculate
13 population diversity measures (localities Stavros for *Q. alnifolia* and Kannaviou for *Q.*
14 *coccifera*, a1 and c1 in Figure 1 respectively). Additionally, 207 *Q. alnifolia* (a2 in
15 Figure 1), 66 *Q. coccifera* (c2 in Figure 1) and four individuals with intermediate
16 morphological characteristics were collected from a *Q. alnifolia*-dominated mixed
17 stand (locality Kambos) in order to detect possible genetic introgression. Smaller
18 samples (5-12 individuals) were taken from five additional pure populations per
19 species scattered throughout the distribution area of each species in Cyprus, in order
20 to capture as much chloroplast DNA variation as possible (a3-a7 in *Q. alnifolia* and
21 c3-c7 in *Q. coccifera* in Figure 1). Regarding the large populations, subsamples were
22 used for the cpDNA analysis. In particular, 24 samples were analyzed from each one
23 of the pure populations (a1 and c1), whereas 28 *Q. alnifolia* and eight *Q. coccifera*
24 individuals from the mixed stand were also included into the analysis. According to
25 Pons and Petit (1995), a small sample size and a large number of sampled
26 populations are required when using markers with high inter- and low
27 intrapopulation variation, as in the case of chloroplast DNA haplotypes. In total, 564
28 individuals were sampled. All sampled plants were georeferenced using a GPS. Leaf
29 probes were stored in plastic bags with silica gel at 4°C for a short period until DNA
30 extraction.

31

32 *Laboratory procedures*

33

34 Leaf material was first freeze-dried and then DNA was extracted using the DNeasy 96
35 extraction kit (Qiagen). Subsequently, PCR was carried out for the amplification of
36 five nuclear and seven chloroplast DNA (cpDNA) microsatellites (SSRs). Nuclear SSR
37 loci QpZAG9 and 119 were first described in *Q. petraea* (Steinkellner et al. 1997) and
38 QrZAG11, 96 and 112 in *Q. robur* (Kampfer et al. 1998). The aforementioned nuclear
39 loci were chosen after testing several SSR primer pairs from the species mentioned
40 above, most of which showed diverse amplification problems. Thus, primer selection
41 was based on the quality of amplification products and reliability of scoring. The

1 volume of the reaction mixture was 25µl containing 10ng of template DNA. Reaction
2 Buffer “E” was used (Genaxxon, Germany). The latter contained 670 mM Tris/HCl
3 (pH 8.8 at 25°C), 160 mM (NH₄)₂SO₄ and 0.1 % Tween 20 and was diluted one to ten
4 in the reaction mix. Concentrations of other PCR chemicals were as follows: 1.5 mM
5 MgCl₂, 200 mM of each dNTP, 1 unit Taq DNA Polymerase (Genaxxon, Germany) and
6 0.2 mM Primer (Biomers, Germany). PCR programs included an initial denaturation
7 step at 95°C lasting 8 min, 10 cycles of 94°C for 15 s, an annealing step at 50°C for
8 loci QpZAG119, QrZAG11 and QrZAG112 or 57°C for loci QpZAG9 and QrZAG96, a
9 denaturation step at 72°C for 15 s and 23 additional cycles with reduced
10 denaturation temperature (89°C) and the remaining parameters as in the first 10
11 cycles. No final elongation was performed. For the chloroplast microsatellites PCR
12 programs comprised an initial denaturation step at 95°C lasting 5 min and 30 cycles
13 with denaturation (94°C), annealing and denaturation steps (72°C) lasting one
14 minute each. Annealing temperatures were set to 50°C for loci µcd4, µcd7, µdt1,
15 µdt3 and µkk3 and 57°C for locus ccmp2. With regards to the cpDNA SSR loci,
16 primers for ccmp2 were initially developed in *Nicotiana tabacum* (Weising and
17 Gardner 1999), and for µcd4, µcd7, µdt1, µdt3 and µkk3 in *Q. petraea* and *Q. robur*
18 (Deguilloux et al. 2003). Allele scoring was carried out by means of capillary
19 electrophoresis using an ABI PRISM 3100 genetic analyzer (Applied Biosystems). For
20 this purpose, primers were fluorescent labelled and the GeneScan ROX-400 (Applied
21 Biosystems) size standard was used in order to size the PCR-products. Allele sizing
22 was performed by applying the GeneMapper v4.0 software (Applied Biosystems).

23

24 *Data Analysis*

25

26 First, we calculated population diversity measures based on nuclear microsatellites.
27 Only the two large populations of each species were included in these analyses – one
28 pure and one from the mixed stand. The sample size of the remaining small
29 populations ($N \leq 12$) precluded an accurate estimation of nuclear diversity measures
30 (Nei 1978). We computed allele frequencies, observed and expected heterozygosity
31 as well as private allele frequency using the GenAlEx 6.1 software (Peakall and
32 Smouse, 2006). We additionally used the FSTAT software (Goudet 1995) to calculate
33 allelic richness after rarefaction for each population and locus, which is a diversity
34 measure independent of the population size (Petit et al., 1998). Rarefaction size was
35 65 corresponding to the minimum number of genotyped individuals per population
36 and locus. By using the same software we computed inbreeding coefficients (F_{IS}) for
37 each locus and population and tested significance by performing 10000
38 randomizations of alleles among individuals within samples. Furthermore, we used
39 the software Microchecker (Van Oosterhout et al., 2004) to test the occurrence of
40 null (non-amplifiable) alleles, which is indicated by an overall significant homozygote
41 excess. One thousand randomizations of alleles were applied in order to test if this

1 deviation was significant. Frequencies of such 'null alleles' were calculated and
2 adjusted genotypes were produced according to Van Oosterhout et al. (2006).

3
4 In order to dissect the genetic variation into its components, an F_{ST} based analysis of
5 molecular variance (AMOVA; Excoffier et al. 1992) was conducted by using the
6 multilocus approach of the Arlequin 3.1 software (Excoffier et al. 2005). Partitioning
7 of genetic diversity within and between species and populations was investigated by
8 including the large populations in the analysis and defining species as groups. For the
9 calculation of a Euclidean distance matrix and sums of squares, two dummy
10 haplotypes are produced by randomly setting the gametic phase for each individual.
11 Sum of square deviations within or among populations are insensitive to the choice
12 of haplotypic phase in the diploid individuals (Michalakis and Excoffier 1996). The
13 significance of covariance components and fixation indices was tested in both cases
14 with a non-parametric permutation procedure (Excoffier et al. 1992):

15 - Haplotypes among populations and among groups (i.e. species) were permuted for
16 testing interspecific variation.

17 - Haplotypes among populations within groups were permuted for testing variation
18 among conspecific populations.

19 - Populations were permuted between groups in order to test variation due to
20 species.

21 Additionally, by using the same software, pairwise F_{STs} were computed separately for
22 each locus and, by permuting individual genotypes among populations, their
23 significance was tested. In all cases we performed 10 000 permutations.

24
25 In order to detect genetic structures and assign individuals to groups, a model-based
26 Bayesian procedure was implemented using the Structure 2.2 software (Pritchard et
27 al. 2000) was used. Data from all loci and all samples were used for calculating
28 posterior probabilities of membership to assumed K subpopulations or groups,
29 without prior information of their population of origin. One-hundred-thousand burn-
30 in periods and 100000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulations were performed
31 assuming admixture and correlated allele frequencies. In order to decide for the
32 most likely K , data were ran by setting $K= 1, 2, \dots, 10$. Ten runs were performed for
33 each K . Maximum posterior probability ($\ln P(D)$) and minimum deviation between
34 runs were used to infer ΔK , a statistic based on the rate of change of $\ln P(D)$ between
35 successive K values and its variation among runs. ΔK corresponds to the second
36 order rate of change of $\ln P(D)$ for a given value of K and more accurately detects the
37 uppermost hierarchical level of structure, providing an accurate estimation of
38 population clustering (Evanno et al. 2005). Proportions of membership to the K
39 assumed groups for each individual and population were then calculated. Two
40 thresholds of membership proportion, $P(X|K)= 0.8$ and $P(X|K)= 0.95$, were
41 empirically used to detect admixed genotypes.

1
2 Finally, an analysis of cpDNA variation was conducted. Chlorotypes (cpDNA
3 haplotypes) were defined as different combinations of alleles among the scored
4 cpDNA microsatellites. Relationships between chlorotypes were investigated by
5 means of a minimum spanning network, produced using the Arlequin 3.1 software
6 (Excoffier et al. 2005) and plotted using the TCS 1.21 software (Clement et al. 2000).
7 Furthermore, spatial genetic barriers were studied based on cpDNA variation using
8 Slatkin's R_{ST} values (Slatkin 1995). Measures of differentiation taking into account the
9 degree of similarity between haplotypes like Slatkin's R_{ST} have been shown to be
10 more efficient in estimating subdivision when maternally inherited organelle
11 genomes of angiosperms are considered. This is due to the higher relative
12 contribution of mutation vs. drift to population subdivision caused by limited
13 dispersal (Petit et al. 2005). Pairwise R_{ST} distances between populations were
14 calculated by using the software Microsat (Minch et al. 1995). Additionally, 100
15 pairwise R_{ST} tables were produced by bootstrapping. The Monmonier maximum
16 difference algorithm (Monmonier 1973) was implemented by software Barrier 2.2
17 (Manni et al. 2004) in order to place a predetermined number of genetic barriers
18 across a geometric network connecting all populations. Genetic barriers were set for
19 each of the bootstrapped pairwise R_{ST} tables in order to test significance. For each
20 pair of neighbouring populations the number of times that their border was included
21 in a given barrier (0-100) was tested. For choosing the optimal number of barriers
22 this process was repeated by setting different number of barriers, from 1 to 10. Since
23 our aim was to subdivide the populations in a limited number of spatial groups
24 potentially corresponding to the two species, we tried to keep the number of
25 barriers as low as possible and their significance as high as possible. The mixed stand
26 was not considered at this stage since the geographic locations of the two species
27 coincide and an illustration of a large scale geographic barrier including both is not
28 possible.

31 RESULTS

33 *Nuclear microsatellite population diversity and differentiation*

35 Results from pure and sympatric populations, as well as from pooled *Q. alnifolia* and
36 *Q. coccifera* populations are presented in Table 1. In general, all analyzed loci were
37 polymorphic as revealed by the population diversity measures. Some differences
38 occurred among loci, with QpZAG9 and QpZAG119 being the most variable in both
39 species. Loci QrZAG96 and 112 showed low to medium diversity (Table 1) arising
40 from high frequencies of certain alleles. Locus QrZAG11 was highly variable in *Q.*
41 *coccifera* ($H_e = 0.795-0.816$), whereas in *Q. alnifolia* one allele ('251') was almost fixed

1 with a frequency of 89.9 % (Figure 2) leading to a very low genetic diversity ($H_e=$
2 0.156-0.220). Species private alleles were mostly observed in low frequencies. Allele
3 '141' of locus QrZAG96 was the most frequent private allele in *Q. coccifera* (12.4 %).
4 Some diagnostic alleles for species differentiation could be identified. These alleles
5 were prevalent in one species whereas they occurred in very low frequencies in the
6 other. The most characteristic example was observed at locus QrZAG112 where
7 allele '86' occurred with a frequency of 85.6 % in *Q. coccifera* versus 2 % in *Q.*
8 *alnifolia*, whilst allele '88' displayed the opposite pattern with frequencies reaching
9 72 % in *Q. alnifolia* and only 3.6 % in *Q. coccifera* (Figure 3).

10
11 Inbreeding coefficients (F_{IS}) were constantly significant at locus QpZAG119 ($P<$
12 0.001). An overall significant excess of homozygotes supported the occurrence of
13 null (non-amplified) alleles. Estimates of null allele frequency varied between 27.7
14 and 29.7% in *Q. alnifolia* and between 10.9 and 13.4% in *Q. coccifera* (Table 1). Thus,
15 this locus was removed from further analyses. A significant F_{IS} was observed at locus
16 QrZAG11 ($P<0.01$) in the *Q. coccifera* population from the mixed stand. Null allele
17 frequency was again significant in this case. Adjusted genotypes produced by using
18 the Microchecker software were used in further analyses. In the remaining loci,
19 neither F_{IS} nor the presence of null alleles was significant. However, F_{IS} value in the
20 case of QrZAG112 in *Q. coccifera* from the mixed population was high ($F_{IS}= 0.225$, $P=$
21 0.06).

22
23 Multilocus AMOVA revealed that the main part of the overall genetic variation was
24 due to partitioning into species groups (Table 2). In particular, the interspecific
25 component was significant ($F_{CT}= 0.333$, $P< 0.001$) representing 33.26 % of the total
26 variation. Inbreeding coefficient within populations was found to be low ($F_{IS}= 0.028$)
27 but significant ($P< 0.01$). Fixation indices due to the partition of the species groups
28 into populations were low ($F_{SC}= 0.008$) but significant ($P< 0.01$) and accounted for
29 0.55 % of the total variation (Table 2). Investigation of population specific fixation
30 measures further revealed high interspecific differentiation. All interspecific pairwise
31 F_{ST} s were high and significant (Table 3). Loci QpZAG11 and 112 showed the highest
32 values due to the prevalence of different alleles in each species. One shared allele in
33 high frequency at locus QrZAG96 resulted in a low but still significant interspecific
34 F_{ST} . Values of intraspecific F_{ST} s were low and did not exceed 0.05. However, locus
35 QrZAG11 showed a significant differentiation in *Q. alnifolia* ($P< 0.01$). Within *Q.*
36 *coccifera* locus QrZAG112 demonstrated the highest F_{ST} value ($F_{ST}= 0.0497$; Table 3)
37 which was significant at the 0.001 level. Moreover, at loci QpZAG9 and QrZAG11
38 interspecific F_{ST} s for *Q. coccifera* were low, but significant at the 0.05 level.

39
40 Two well separated species groups were defined after a Bayesian analysis of genetic
41 structure was employed. Maximum posterior probability ($\ln P(D)$) strongly increased

1 between runs with K= 1 and K= 2. For larger Ks, lnP(D) values only slightly increased
2 and tended to plateau, whereas variation among runs of a given K increased. The
3 largest ΔK , calculated according to Evanno et al. (2005), was maximal for K= 2, giving
4 the highest posterior probability of K. The two inferred clusters corresponded to two
5 species groups. High membership proportions were measured for all populations,
6 varying between 0.947 and 0.986 for *Q. alnifolia* and between 0.940 and 0.986 for *Q.*
7 *coccifera* (Table 4). In large samples, whether pure or sympatric, proportion of
8 membership to species groups was high measuring for *Q. alnifolia* 0.975 in Stavros
9 (a1) and 0.966 in Kambos (a2) and for *Q. coccifera* 0.967 in Kannaviou (c1) and 0.978
10 in Kambos (c2). Admixed genotypes ($P(X|K)<0.95$) were observed in almost all
11 populations of both species in low proportions (Table 4). Most of them possessed an
12 individual proportion of membership between 0.80 and 0.95. A relatively high
13 number of individuals with $0.80<P(X|K)<0.95$ were observed in the pure population
14 of *Q. coccifera* in Kannaviou. Individuals with proportions of membership lower than
15 0.80 were rarer. Ten *Q. alnifolia* individuals within an overall total of 351, and eight
16 *Q. coccifera* individuals out of 209, displayed scores of less than 0.80. They also
17 occurred in most populations, whether pure or sympatric. Finally, two designated *Q.*
18 *alnifolia* trees from the mixed stand were assigned to the cluster of *Q. coccifera* with
19 low proportions of membership (< 0.8 ; Table 4). We noticed that genotypic
20 admixture was partly due to the occurrence of one species' diagnostic alleles in the
21 other species. This was more obvious among admixed *Q. alnifolia* individuals
22 probably because this species was more uniform at most loci included into the
23 Bayesian analysis of genetic structure.

24

25 *cpDNA population diversity*

26

27 A total of 12 chlorotypes were observed. These were assigned numbers from 1 to 12
28 (Table 5). Seven out of twelve chlorotypes were shared between the two species,
29 whereas no species-specific lineages could be observed (Figure 4). Some chlorotypes
30 were frequent in both *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. In particular, chlorotypes 2 and 4
31 were observed in both species with frequencies varying from 14.7 to 21.6 %.
32 Chlorotypes 3, 10 and 11 occurred only in *Q. alnifolia* and 5, 8 and 12 only in *Q.*
33 *coccifera*. However, their frequency was mostly low (< 10 %) with one exception –
34 chlorotype 10 in *Q. alnifolia* (16.0 %). The geographic distribution of all variants is
35 illustrated in Figure 5. Some chlorotypes dominate in a specific region, like
36 chlorotype 2 that occurs in the eastern and chlorotype 4 that occurs in the western
37 populations of both *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* (Figure 5). Others exhibit a rather
38 local distribution, for example chlorotype 9, which is scattered amongst three *Q.*
39 *coccifera* and one *Q. alnifolia* population. In the mixed population, cpDNA sharing is
40 limited. Only chlorotype 7 occurs in both species (frequent occurrence in *Q. alnifolia*

1 and rare in *Q. coccifera*), whereas chlorotypes 5 and 12 are confined to *Q. coccifera*
2 and 6 to *Q. alnifolia*, respectively (Figure 5).

3
4 Further spatial analysis of geographic patterns provided insights regarding the spatial
5 genetic structure of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. In general, significant spatial
6 genetic barriers do not coincide with species boundaries. For instance, no significant
7 differentiation among one of the northernmost *Q. coccifera* populations (c6) and two
8 eastern populations of *Q. alnifolia* (a5, a7) was observed (Figure 6). As shown in
9 Figure 5, these populations consist of the same chlorotypes although they belong to
10 different species. Moreover, these populations grow on two different mountain
11 ranges (a5 and a7 on Troodos; c6 on Pentadaktylos) separated by the central plain
12 where oak species are currently absent. Chlorotype 2 is shown to dominate these
13 populations, whereas chlorotype 1 is present at a much lower frequency. Genetic
14 barriers were named using the letters A-G and were sorted by decreasing genetic
15 differentiation in terms of R_{ST} (Figure 6). All barriers were significant, as supported by
16 96-100 bootstraps. The highest differentiation was observed between population c1,
17 which was separated by the genetic barrier A from its neighbouring populations (c4,
18 a1 and a3). Barrier B was extensive and divided the remaining populations into
19 western (c3, c4, a1, a3 and a4) and eastern parts (c5-7, a5-7). The remaining barriers
20 (C-G) were local. For example, barrier C separated the population a5 from the
21 population c5.

22 23 24 DISCUSSION

25
26 Contrasting differentiation patterns were revealed by the analysis of nuclear and
27 chloroplast microsatellite markers in natural populations of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q.*
28 *coccifera* throughout Cyprus. A high degree of interspecific differentiation was
29 detected by means of nuclear SSRs. Species discrimination was highly significant
30 both in pure populations and in sympatry. On the other hand, cpDNA haplotypes
31 were shared between species and demonstrated partly shared geographic
32 structures. These results are comparable to other reports of nuclear and cpDNA
33 diversity among related oak species, such as in section *Robur* including *Q. petraea*, *Q.*
34 *robur*, *Q. pubescens* and other species in Europe (Petit et al. 2002; Curtu et al.
35 2007b), *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber* in the Western Mediterranean (López de Heredia et al.
36 2005; Soto et al. 2007; Mir et al. 2009), or *Q. douglasii* and *Q. lobata* in North
37 America (Craft and Ashley 2006).

38
39 All nuclear microsatellite loci analyzed in our study were polymorphic. Genetic
40 diversity varied among loci, as well as between species. Two loci, QrZAG11 and 112
41 were highly differentiating between species. Due to the prevalence of one allele in *Q.*

1 *alnifolia* versus a diverse pattern in *Q. coccifera*, locus QrZAG11 showed high levels
2 of differentiation between the two species. Locus QrZAG112 was highly discriminant
3 due to the predominance of different diagnostic alleles with high frequencies in each
4 species. Similar patterns of differentiation have been reported between several
5 interfertile pairs of oaks, involving different marker loci in each case. For instance,
6 five 'F_{ST} outlier' SSR loci have been found to distinguish *Q. petraea* from *Q. robur*
7 (Scotti-Saintagne et al. 2004). Results from Soto et al. (2007) support that locus
8 QpZAG9 is likewise highly discriminant between *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber*.

9
10 High differentiation of nuclear genomes between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* in our
11 study was also supported by multilocus analyses. Species were the main component
12 of genetic variation in AMOVA, whereas subdivision within species accounted for a
13 minimal part of the total variation. Structure analysis further supported the high
14 differentiation between the two species at the population level. Whether pure or in
15 sympatry, populations of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* displayed high proportions of
16 membership to their own species cluster. Individuals with admixed genotypes
17 occurred in low proportions in both mixed and pure stands. This result indicates that
18 interspecific hybridization is limited. Higher introgression rates in contact zones
19 cannot be supported. In such cases the sympatric population should have been more
20 admixed and would have included a higher proportion of admixed individuals in
21 comparison to the pure populations. Increased genetic introgression in sympatry has
22 been observed in mixed populations of closely related oak species. For instance, in
23 the case of *Q. petraea* and *Q. pubescens*, hybridization leads to an increased
24 occurrence of introgressed genotypes in sympatry (Curtu et al. 2007b, Gugerli et al.
25 2008, Salvini et al. 2009).

26
27 On the other hand, multilocus genetic differentiation of nuclear SSRs within species
28 was found to be low, but significant. Moreover, both F_{ST} values and levels of
29 significance were found to be higher in *Q. coccifera*. In contrast to *Q. alnifolia* which
30 is confined to the volcanic rock formations of the Troodos Mountains, *Q. coccifera*
31 grows on several different geological substrates. The pure population of *Q. coccifera*,
32 where the large sample was taken from, grows on sedimentary rock formations. The
33 mixed stand and the pure population of *Q. alnifolia* both occur on intrusive rocks
34 (diabase) of the ophiolite sequence of Troodos. The distinctive soil conditions
35 between the two *Q. coccifera* stands may account for the more pronounced
36 intraspecific differentiation found in this species. Similar results were reported from
37 Lorenzo et al. 2009, where high genetic differentiation was found among populations
38 of *Q. suber* occurring under differential edaphic conditions on the island of Minorca.
39 Furthermore, *Q. alnifolia* was found to be generally less diverse at the studied loci,
40 which can be attributed to its highly restricted habitat. Similar findings based on
41 isoenzyme markers were presented by Toumi and Lumaret (2001). Also in the

1 paradigm of *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber*, the latter species, confined to acidic soils, is less
2 diverse than the former, which has greater edaphic amplitude (Burgarella et al.
3 2009).

4
5 Anthropogenic influences may have played a significant role in the formation of
6 genetic structures within and between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. The habitat of *Q.*
7 *alnifolia* is restricted to the rugged landscape of the Troodos Mountains. There is no
8 evidence of a major disturbance due to human activities since the initial agropastoral
9 settlement of Cyprus during the Neolithic in these areas (about 10800 BP; Butzer and
10 Harris 2007). On the contrary, the fertile soils where *Q. coccifera* is primarily
11 distributed were intensively exploited by humans, either for agriculture or for
12 grazing. For instance, large areas in the region southwest of Troodos, where the
13 sample of the large *Q. coccifera* population was taken from, have been intensively
14 used since antiquity for grape cultivation leading to a high fragmentation of the
15 indigenous plant societies (Christou 2001). This fragmentation may have led to a
16 higher degree of interpopulation genetic differentiation within this species, due to
17 demographic events.

18
19 Regarding cpDNA, maternal lineages are shared between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q.*
20 *coccifera*. Haplotypic diversity of these species in Cyprus is high compared to related
21 species growing in the Mediterranean Basin (see Fineschi et al. 2005; López de
22 Heredia et al. 2005 and Magri et al. 2007 for an overview about *Q. coccifera*, *Q. ilex*
23 and *Q. suber* in the western Mediterranean). Geographic and genetic barriers do not
24 coincide and the distribution of chlorotypes is rather locally structured. These
25 structures may partially reflect landscape barriers. Such barriers between the
26 western, the central and the eastern portions of the Troodos Mountains may have
27 contributed to the *Q. alnifolia* structures. In the case of *Q. coccifera*, cpDNA data
28 support connectivity of the two western populations (in Akamas (c3) and Lysos (c4))
29 which might have been remnants of a denser shrubland prior to fragmentation due
30 to human activities in this region. The complex distribution of the chlorotypes may
31 reflect different waves of colonization from the past. In the case of western
32 Mediterranean sclerophyllous oaks, distribution of cpDNA lineages still reflect the
33 westward colonization which took place during the tertiary (Lumaret et al. 2002,
34 López de Heredia et al. 2007). In these species, local structures are often shared
35 among species, although hybridization levels are low (Belahbib et al. 2001, Burgarella
36 et al. 2009, Mir et al. 2009). Furthermore, the scattered occurrence of some
37 chlorotypes throughout the island may reflect some sporadic long distance dispersal
38 events. Given that *Q. coccifera*, in contrast to *Q. alnifolia*, has been used as a pasture
39 and for the production of crimson dye, human seed transfer cannot be ruled out.
40 This could be the case in the large population whose prevalent chlorotype
41 (chlorotype 9) is not common for the south-western region of Cyprus.

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

The high degree of cpDNA sharing between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* and the occurrence of some common regional chlorotypes (e.g. chlorotype 2 in central and north-eastern Cyprus and chlorotypes 4 and 6 in the west) support the hypothesis that the two species have exchanged their genetic variants through gene flow. However, a restricted cpDNA sharing in the mixed stand from our study does not support a high degree of current introgressive hybridization, which would balance the chlorotype frequencies between the species. This hypothesis agrees with the low introgression of nuclear genomes in this stand, which is not higher than in pure stands. A similar situation in an oak community with four interfertile species was reported by Curtu et al. (2007b), who observed that *Quercus robur* showed the lowest degree of nuclear admixture compared to *Q. frainetto*, *Q. petraea* and *Q. pubescens*. Furthermore, its predominant chlorotype was not found in any individual of the other species. In our study, the predominant chlorotype of *Q. coccifera* in the mixed stand (chlorotype 12) was not found in any one of the analyzed *Q. alnifolia*.

Nevertheless, once hybridization between two related species is possible, there is the potential of succeeding introgression. In the present study, we provided evidence that initial hybridization between *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* occurs in nature. The four designated hybrids possessed admixed genotypes and their chlorotypes were observed in both *Q. coccifera* (chlorotype 5) and *Q. alnifolia* (chlorotype 7; results not shown) from the same stand. Moreover, hybrids produced large amounts of acorns (field observations). Occasional hybridization and backcrossings might have happened several times in the past leading to local exchanges of chlorotypes. The imprints of such historic introgression events may have remained intact since the Pleistocene glaciation and did not lead to severe extinctions in the Mediterranean Basin (Jimenez et al. 2004, López de Heredia et al. 2007). The low dispersal ability of cpDNA might account for the prevalence of specific chlorotypes in a given geographic region and occasional introgressive hybridization may have led to exchange between the two species. Despite being distantly related, *Q. ilex* and *Q. suber* were able to exchange their cpDNA, although hybridization between them is not common (Belahbib et al. 2001, Mir et al. 2009). Introgression of their nuclear and chloroplast genomes has been shown to be independent (Mir et al. 2009). Besides selection, reproductive barriers due to speciation also limit genetic introgression (Belahbib et al. 2001; Boavida et al. 2001). Speciation of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera* were already distinct during Miocene (Palamarev 1989). Separate evolution for a long time may have led to the occurrence of reproductive barriers limiting hybridization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

We would like to thank Andreas Christou, Constantinos Kounnamas, Salih Gücel, Zacharias Triftarides, Savvas Protopapas, Petros Anastasiou and the Department of Forests, Republic of Cyprus personnel, for their assistance during plant collections. We are grateful to Dr. Unai López de Heredia for stimulating discussions. This research was conducted in partial fulfilment for the doctorate degree of the first author at Albert-Ludwigs University of Freiburg. During that time the first author was supported by doctorate scholarships from DAAD and the State of Baden-Württemberg. Partial financial assistance to Filippos Aravanopoulos in the form of two cooperative grants of the Ministry of Natural Resources of Cyprus and the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCE LIST

Barbero M, Quezel P (1979) Contribution à l'étude des groupements forestiers de Chypre. Documents Phytosociologiques IV: 9-34.

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

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

Burgarella C, Lorenzo Z, Jabbour-Zahab R, Lumaret R, Guichoux E, Petit RJ, Soto A, Gil L. (2009) Detection of hybrids in nature: application to oaks (*Quercus suber* and *Q. ilex*). Heredity 102: 442-452.

Butzer KW, Harris SE. 2007. Geoarchaeological approaches to the environmental history of Cyprus: explication and critical evaluation. Journal of Archaeological Science 34: 1932-1952.

Christou A. (2001) Cyprus (country report). Mediterranean Oaks Network: Report of the first meeting: 12-14 October 2000-Antalya, Turkey.3.

López de Heredia U, Carrión JS, Jiménez P, Collada C, Gil L. (2007) Molecular and palaeoecological evidence for multiple glacial refugia for evergreen oaks on the Iberian Peninsula. Journal of Biogeography 34: 1505–1517.

Lorenzo Z, Burgarella C, de Heredia UL, Lumaret R, Petit RJ, Soto A, Gil L. (2009)

1 Relevance of genetics for conservation policies: the case of Minorcan cork oaks. Ann
2 Bot 104: 1069-1076.
3
4 Clement M, Posada D, Crandall KA. (2000) TCS: a computer program to estimate
5 gene genealogies. Molecular Ecology 9: 1657-1659.
6
7 Craft KJ, Ashley MV (2006) Population differentiation among three species of white
8 oak in northeastern Illinois. Can J Forest Res 36: 206-215.
9
10 Curtu AL, Gailing O, Leinemann L, Finkeldey R (2007a) Genetic variation and
11 differentiation within a natural community of five oak species (*Quercus* spp.). Plant
12 Biol 9: 116-126.
13
14 Curtu AL, Gailing O, Finkeldey R (2007b). Evidence for hybridization and introgression
15 within a species-rich oak (*Quercus* spp.) community. BMC Evol. Biol. 7: 218-233.
16
17 Darwin C (1859) On the origin of species by natural selection. London: Murray.
18
19 Deguilloux M, Dumolin-Lapègue S, Gielly L, Grivet D, Petit RJ (2003) A set of primers
20 for the amplification of chloroplast microsatellites in *Quercus*. Mol Ecol Notes 3: 24-
21 27.
22
23 Evanno G, Regnaut S, Goudet J (2005) Detecting the number of clusters of individuals
24 using the software structure: a simulation study. Mol Ecol 14: 2611-2620.
25
26 Excoffier L, Laval G, Schneider S (2005) Arlequin (version 3.0): an integrated software
27 package for population genetics data analysis. Evol Bioinform Online 1: 47-50.
28
29 Excoffier L, Smouse PE, Quattro JM (1992) Analysis of molecular variance inferred
30 from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: Application to human mitochondrial
31 DNA restriction data. Genetics 131: 479-491.
32
33 Fineschi S, Cozzolino S, Migliaccio M, Musacchio A, Innocenti M, Vendramin GG
34 (2005) Sicily represents the Italian reservoir of chloroplast DNA diversity of *Quercus*
35 *ilex* L.(Fagaceae). Ann For Sci 62: 79-84.
36
37 Goudet J. (1995) FSTAT (version 1.2): A computer program to calculate F-statistics: J
38 Hered 86: 485-486.
39

1 Gugerli F, Brodbeck S, Holderegger R. (2008) Utility of multilocus genotypes for taxon
2 assignment in stands of closely related European white oaks from Switzerland. *Ann*
3 *Bot* 102: 855-863.
4

5 Hand R (2006) Supplementary notes to the flora of Cyprus V. *Willdenowia* 36: 761-
6 809.
7

8 Jiménez P, López de Heredia U, Collada C, Lorenzo Z, Gil L (2004) High variability of
9 chloroplast DNA in three Mediterranean evergreen oaks indicates complex
10 evolutionary history. *Heredity* 93: 510-515.
11

12 Kampfer S, Lexer C, Glössl J, Steinkellner H (1998) Characterization of (GA)_n
13 Microsatellite Loci from *Quercus robur*. *Hereditas* 129: 183-186.
14

15 Knopf H. (2006) *Quercus alnifolia* Poech. Pp. 1-7. In: Schütt, P., Schuck, H. J., Lang,
16 UM, Roloff A (ed.). *Enzyklopädie der Holzgewächse* 3. Landsberg am Lech.
17

18 Kremer A, Kleinschmit J, Cottrell J et al. (2002) Is there a correlation between
19 chloroplastic and nuclear divergence, or what are the roles of history and selection
20 on genetic diversity in European oaks? *For Ecol Manage* 156: 75-87.
21

22 Lexer C, Kremer A, Petit RJ. (2006) Shared alleles in sympatric oaks: recurrent gene
23 flow is a more parsimonious explanation than ancestral polymorphism. *Mol Ecol* 15:
24 2007-2012.
25

26 López de Heredia U, Jiménez P, Díaz-Fernández P, Gil L (2005) The Balearic Islands: a
27 reservoir of cpDNA genetic variation for evergreen oaks. *J Biogeogr* 32: 939-949.
28

29 López de Heredia U, Jiménez P, Collada C, Simeone MC, Bellarosa R, Schirone B,
30 Cervera MT Gil L (2007) Multi-marker phylogeny of three evergreen oaks reveals
31 vicariant patterns in the Western Mediterranean. *Taxon* 56: 1209-1220.
32

33 López de Heredia U, Carrión JS, Jiménez P, Collada C, Gil L. (2007b). Molecular and
34 palaeoecological evidence for multiple glacial refugia for evergreen oaks on the
35 Iberian Peninsula. *Journal of Biogeography* 34: 1505–1517.
36

37 Lorenzo Z, Burgarella C, de Heredia UL, Lumaret R, Petit RJ, Soto A, Gil L. 2009.
38 Relevance of genetics for conservation policies: the case of Minorcan cork oaks. *Ann*
39 *Bot* 104: 1069-1076.
40
41

1 Lumaret R, Mir C, Michaud H, Raynal V (2002) Phylogeographical variation of
2 chloroplast DNA in holm oak (*Quercus ilex* L.). Mol Ecol 11: 2327-36.
3

4 Lumaret R, Jabbour-Zahab R. (2009) Ancient and current gene flow between two
5 distantly related Mediterranean oak species, *Quercus suber* and *Q. ilex*. Annals of
6 Botany 104: 725-736.
7

8 Magri D, Fineschi S, Bellarosa R, Buonamici A, Sebastiani F, Schirone B, Simeone MC,
9 Vnedramin GG (2007) The distribution of *Quercus suber* chloroplast haplotypes
10 matches the palaeogeographical history of the western Mediterranean. Mol Ecol 16:
11 5259-5266.
12

13 Manni F, Guérard E, Heyer E (2004) Geographic patterns of (genetic, morphologic,
14 linguistic) variation. Hum Biol 76: 173-190.
15

16 Michalakis Y, Excoffier L. 1996. A generic estimation of population subdivision using
17 distances between alleles with special reference for microsatellite loci. Genetics 142:
18 1061.
19

20 Minch E, Ruiz-Linares A, Goldstein D, Feldman M, Cavalli-Sforza LL (1995) MICROSAT,
21 The microsatellite distance program. <http://human.stanford.edu/> Stanford
22 California: Stanford University.
23

24 Mir C, Jarne P, Sarda V, Bonin A, Lumaret R (2009) Contrasting nuclear and
25 cytoplasmic exchanges between phylogenetically distant oak species (*Quercus suber*
26 L. and *Q. ilex* L.) in Southern France: inferring crosses and dynamics. Plant Biol 11:
27 213-226.
28

29 Monmonier M (1973) Maximum-difference barriers: An alternative numerical
30 regionalization method. Geogr Anal, 3: 245-261.
31

32 Muir G, Fleming CC, Schlotterer C (2000) Species status of hybridizing oaks. Nature
33 405: 1016.
34

35 Muir G, Schlotterer C (2005) Evidence for shared ancestral polymorphism rather than
36 recurrent gene flow at microsatellite loci differentiating two hybridizing oaks
37 (*Quercus* spp.). Mol Ecol 14: 549-561.
38

39 Nei M (1978) Estimation of average heterozygosity and genetic distance from a small
40 number of individuals. Genetics 89: 583-590.
41

1 Neophytou C, Palli G, Dounavi A, Aravanopoulos F. (2007) Morphological
2 differentiation and hybridization between *Quercus alnifolia* Poech and *Quercus*
3 *coccifera* L. (Fagaceae) in Cyprus. *Silvae Genet* 56: 271-277.
4
5 Neophytou C, Dounavi A, Aravanopoulos F. (2008) Conservation of nuclear SSR loci
6 reveals high affinity of *Quercus infectoria* ssp. *veneris* A. Kern (Fagaceae) to section
7 Robur. *Plant Mol Biol Rep* 26: 133-141.
8
9 Nosil P, Funk DJ, Ortiz-Barrientos D (2009) Divergent selection and heterogeneous
10 genomic divergence. *Mol Ecol* 18: 375-402.
11
12 Palamarev E. (1989) Paleobotanical evidences of the Tertiary history and origin of
13 the Mediterranean sclerophyll dendroflora. *Plant Syst Evol* 162: 93-107.
14
15 Peakall R, Smouse PE. (2006) GenAlEx 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic
16 software for teaching and research. *Mol Ecol Notes* 6: 288-295.
17
18 Petit RJ, El Mousadik A, Pons O. (1998) Identifying populations for conservation on
19 the basis of genetic markers. *Conserv. Biol.* 12, 844-855.
20
21 Petit RJ, Csaikl UM, Bordács S et al. (2002) Chloroplast DNA variation in European
22 white oaks: Phylogeography and patterns of diversity based on data from over 2600
23 populations. *For Ecol Manage* 156: 5-26.
24
25 Petit RJ, Bodenes C, Ducouso A, Roussel G, Kremer A. (2004) Hybridization as a
26 mechanism of invasion in oaks. *New Phytol* 161: 151-164.
27
28 Petit RJ, Duminil J, Fineschi S, Hampe A, Salvini D, Vendramin GG. (2005)
29 Comparative organization of chloroplast, mitochondrial and nuclear diversity in plant
30 populations. *Mol Ecol* 14: 689-701.
31
32 Pons O, Petit RJ. (1995) Estimation, variance and optimal sampling of gene diversity.
33 *Theor Appl Genet* 90: 462-470.
34
35 Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P. (2000) Inference of population structure using
36 multilocus genotype data. *Genetics* 155: 945-959.
37
38 Rubio de Casas R, Cano E, Balaguer L, Perez-Corona E, Manrique E, García-Verdugo C,
39 Vargas P. (2007) Taxonomic identity of *Quercus coccifera* L. in the Iberian Peninsula is
40 maintained in spite of widespread hybridisation, as revealed by morphological, ISSR
41 and ITS sequence data. *Flora* 202: 488-499.

1
2 Salvini D, Bruschi P, Fineschi S, Grossoni P, Kjær ED, Vendramin GG (2009) Natural
3 hybridisation between *Quercus petraea* (Matt.) Liebl. and *Quercus pubescens* Willd.
4 within an Italian stand as revealed by microsatellite fingerprinting. *Plant Biology* 11
5 (758-765).
6
7 Scotti-Saintagne C, Bodénès C, Barreneche T, Bertocchi E, Plomion C, Kremer A
8 (2004) Genome scanning for interspecific differentiation between two closely related
9 oak species [*Quercus robur* L. and *Q. petraea* (Matt.) Liebl.]. *Genetics* 168: 1615-
10 1626.
11
12 Slatkin M. (1995) A measure of population subdivision based on microsatellite allele
13 frequencies. *Genetics* 139: 457-462.
14
15 Soto A, Lorenzo Z, Gil L. (2007) Differences in fine-scale genetic structure and
16 dispersal in *Quercus ilex* L. and *Q. suber* L.: consequences for regeneration of
17 mediterranean open woods. *Heredity* 99: 601-607.
18
19 Steinkellner H, Fluch S, Turetschek E, Lexer C, Streiff R, Kremer A, Burg K, Glössl J
20 (1997) Identification and characterization of (GA/CT)_n- microsatellite loci from
21 *Quercus petraea*. *Plant Mol Biol* 33: 1093-1096.
22
23 Toumi L, Lumaret R. (2001) Allozyme characterisation of four Mediterranean
24 evergreen oak species. *Biochem Syst Ecol* 29: 799-817.
25
26 Van Oosterhout C, Hutchinson WF, Wills DPM., Shipley P. (2004) MICRO-CHECKER:
27 software for identifying and correcting genotyping errors in microsatellite data. *Mol*
28 *Ecol Notes* 4: 535-538.
29
30 Van Oosterhout C, Weetman D, Hutchinson WF. (2006) Estimation and adjustment of
31 microsatellite null alleles in nonequilibrium populations. *Mol Ecol Notes* 6: 255-256.
32
33 Weising K, Gardner RC. (1999) A set of conserved PCR primers for the analysis of
34 simple sequence repeat polymorphisms in chloroplast genomes of dicotyledonous
35 angiosperms. *Genome* 42: 9-19.

TABLES

Table 1 – Diversity measures within populations of *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*

Sample size (N), allelic richness (R_{65} ; rarefaction size= 65), observed (H_0) and expected (H_e) heterozygosity, inbreeding coefficients (F_{IS} ; * $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$) and estimated frequency of null alleles. Only the two largest populations of each species are presented. Null allele frequencies are given only if they are significant.

| Popu- lation | Locus | <i>Quercus alnifolia</i> | | | | | | <i>Quercus coccifera</i> | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|----------|-------|-------|----------|------|--------------------------|----------|--------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | N | R_{65} | H_0 | H_e | F_{IS} | null | N | R_{65} | H_0 | H_e | F_{IS} | null | | |
| Pure | QpZAG9 | 95 | 9.853 | 0.653 | 0.686 | 0.054 | | 96 | 17.047 | 0.833 | 0.841 | 0.014 | | | |
| | QrZAG11 | 91 | 3.972 | 0.209 | 0.220 | 0.055 | | 92 | 12.486 | 0.761 | 0.795 | 0.049 | | | |
| | QrZAG96 | 95 | 3.000 | 0.484 | 0.487 | 0.011 | | 96 | 5.564 | 0.354 | 0.341 | -0.032 | | | |
| | QrZAG112 | 95 | 4.585 | 0.432 | 0.442 | 0.030 | | 96 | 4.964 | 0.375 | 0.349 | -0.070 | | | |
| | QpZAG119 | 76 | 22.477 | 0.368 | 0.924 | 0.605 | *** | 0.297 | 92 | 22.829 | 0.804 | 0.897 | 0.109 | *** | 0.055 |
| | Multilocus | | | 0.429 | 0.552 | 0.228 | | | | 0.626 | 0.645 | 0.035 | | | |
| Mixed | QpZAG9 | 207 | 8.898 | 0.681 | 0.720 | 0.057 | | 66 | 11.985 | 0.848 | 0.851 | 0.011 | | | |
| | QrZAG11 | 206 | 4.929 | 0.150 | 0.156 | 0.040 | | 65 | 13.000 | 0.646 | 0.816 | 0.216 | ** | 0.104 | |
| | QrZAG96 | 207 | 3.844 | 0.527 | 0.519 | -0.013 | | 66 | 4.985 | 0.379 | 0.409 | 0.082 | | | |
| | QrZAG112 | 207 | 5.785 | 0.386 | 0.423 | 0.088 | | 66 | 4.000 | 0.091 | 0.116 | 0.225 | | | |
| | QpZAG119 | 188 | 27.272 | 0.420 | 0.949 | 0.559 | *** | 0.277 | 65 | 17.000 | 0.615 | 0.831 | 0.267 | *** | 0.134 |
| | Multilocus | | | 0.433 | 0.553 | 0.220 | | | | 0.516 | 0.605 | 0.154 | | | |

Table 2 – AMOVA summary.

Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) based on nuclear DNA data from the four large populations (a1, a2, c1 and c2). Variation was dissected to the following components: species, population within species, within population and within individuals (overall). Significance was tested by a permutation procedure (* $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$).

| Source of variation | Degrees of freedom | Sum of squares | Variance components (significance) | Fixation indices | Percentage of variation |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Among species groups | 1 | 211.145 | 0,49320*** | 0.333 (F_{CT}) | 33.26 |
| Among populations, within species | 2 | 5.463 | 0,00823** | 0.008 (F_{SC}) | 0.55 |
| Within populations | 461 | 465.227 | 0,02770* | 0.028 (F_{IS}) | 1.87 |
| Within individuals (overall) | 465 | 443.500 | 0,95376*** | 0,357 (F_{IT}) | 64.32 |

Table 3 – Pairwise population comparisons

Pairwise F_{ST} s between the four largest populations are presented (a1, a2, c1 and c2). Values from each locus are shown separately and a multilocus value is given as well. Significance was tested by permuting individuals between the compared populations (* $P \leq 0.05$, ** $P \leq 0.01$, *** $P \leq 0.001$).

| Populations compared | INTRASPECIFIC | | INTERSPECIFIC | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | a1-a2 | c1-c2 | a1-c1 | a1-c2 | a2-c1 | a2-c2 |
| Locus | | | | | | |
| QpZAG9 | 0.0063 _(n.s.) | 0.0076* | 0.1465*** | 0.1350*** | 0.1404*** | 0.1186*** |
| QrZAG11 | 0.0184** | 0.0118* | 0.3285*** | 0.3488*** | 0.4324*** | 0.4657*** |
| QrZAG96 | 0.0015 _(n.s.) | 0.0014 _(n.s.) | 0.0670*** | 0.0606*** | 0.0747*** | 0.0637*** |
| QrZAG112 | 0.0028 _(n.s.) | 0.0497*** | 0.5729*** | 0.6888*** | 0.5724*** | 0.6612*** |
| Overall | 0.0049* | 0.0127*** | 0.3104*** | 0.3504*** | 0.3299*** | 0.3642*** |

Table 4 – Proportions of membership to species group and number of admixed individuals

Results based on the Bayesian analysis with the Structure software are presented. Population localities, species and number of sampled individuals per population are given in the first three columns. Under P(X|K) proportions of membership of each population to each one of the two inferred clusters are given. A threshold of P(X|K)=0.95 was set to distinguish ‘pure’ from admixed individuals. Admixed genotypes are separated into those with individual membership proportions (P(X|K)) between 0.8 and 0.95 symbolized with N(0.8<P<0.95) and those with respective values between 0.5 and 0.8 symbolized with N(0.5<P<0.8).

| | | <i>Quercus alnifolia</i> cluster | | | | | <i>Quercus coccifera</i> cluster | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------|------------------|
| | | Group membership | Number of individuals per class of membership proportion | | | | | | | | Group membership |
| Population | Sp. | N | P(X K) | N (P>0.95) | N (0.8<P<0.95) | N (0.5<P<0.8) | N (0.5<P<0.8) | N (0.8<P<0.95) | N (P>0.95) | P(X K) | |
| Stavros | <i>Q. alnifolia</i> | 96 | 0,975 | 90 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,025 | |
| Kionia | | 10 | 0,954 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,046 | |
| Papoutsia | | 10 | 0,952 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,048 | |
| Madari | | 10 | 0,947 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,053 | |
| Karvounas | | 10 | 0,986 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,014 | |
| Kykkos | | 8 | 0,974 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0,026 | |
| Kambos | | 207 | 0,966 | 182 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0,034 | |
| Kambos (hybrids) | | 4 | 0,270 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0,730 | |
| Kambos | <i>Q. coccifera</i> | 66 | 0,022 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 63 | 0,978 | |
| Pentadaktylos | | 12 | 0,015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0,986 | |
| Lapithos | | 10 | 0,041 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0,959 | |
| Akamas | | 10 | 0,052 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0,948 | |
| Lysos | | 10 | 0,060 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0,940 | |
| Kalopanayiotis | | 5 | 0,034 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0,966 | |
| Kannaviou | | 96 | 0,033 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 81 | 0,967 | |

Table 5 – Multilocus chloroplast haplotypes and their frequencies within each species

Allele sizes for each locus are presented in columns. Frequencies of each chlorotype within species are given at the bottom of the table.

| | | Chlorotypes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Locus | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Allele sizes | ccmp2 | 235 | 235 | 234 | 234 | 234 | 234 | 234 | 235 | 235 | 234 | 234 | 234 |
| | μ dt1 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 |
| | μ dt3 | 119 | 119 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 119 | 119 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| | μ cd4 | 95 | 95 | 93 | 94 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 93 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 93 |
| | μ cd7 | 83 | 84 | 83 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 83 | 84 | 83 | 84 | 84 |
| | μ kk3 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 94 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Chlorotype frequency | <i>Q.alnifolia</i> | 10% | 27% | 3% | 20% | 0% | 13% | 1% | 0% | 6% | 16% | 4% | 0% |
| | <i>Q.coccifera</i> | 10% | 20% | 0% | 19% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 9% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 7% |

FIGURES




Fig. 1 – Geophysical map of Cyprus showing locations of all sampled populations. Stands are marked as follows: *Quercus alnifolia*: a1-7, *Q. coccifera*: c1-7. Locality names corresponding to each population are given.




Fig. 2 – Allele frequencies at loci QrZAG11 in *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. *Q. alnifolia* is represented by black filled bars and *Q. coccifera* by grey filled bars.




Fig. 3 – Allele frequencies at locus QrZAG112 in *Q. alnifolia* and *Q. coccifera*. *Q. alnifolia* is represented by black filled bars and *Q. coccifera* by grey filled bars.




Fig. 4 – Minimum spanning network of haplotypes. Haplotype nomenclature follows Table 5. Chlorotypes occurring in *Q. alnifolia* are marked with a square and chlorotypes observed in *Q. coccifera* are designated by a circle. Small circles represent missing or unsampled chlorotypes.




Fig. 5 – Frequency of chlorotypes across sampled stands in Cyprus. Each chlorotype is represented by one colour and its frequency is illustrated in a pie diagram for each population. Stands are marked as follows: *Quercus alnifolia*: a1-7, *Q. coccifera*: c1-7




Fig. 6 – Spatial genetic barriers between populations using R_{ST} based on cpDNA variation. Polygons corresponding to each population were placed in order to present genetic barriers among them. Seven barriers are shown with thick black lines at the edges of each polygon. The beginning of a barrier is marked by the letters A-G and thy end by A'-G'.