



Population genetic signatures of a recent marine

range extension

Jorge E. Ramos, Gretta T. Pecl, Natalie A. Moltschaniwskyj, Jayson M. Semmens

& Jan M. Strugnell

jeramos@utas.edu.au

translating nature into knowledge

Changes in distribution driven by oceanic warming

- Several marine species are changing their patterns of geographic distribution, abundance, and phenology in response to oceanic warming
- The magnitude in **responses** is **highly variable** (e.g. 25-85% in the expected direction)



The issue



Background

What species are likely to undertake changes in distribution

driven by oceanic warming



Background

Case study: range extension of Octopus tetricus



Octopus tetricus (Gould 1852)



Pitt et al. 2010; Last et al. 2011; Ramos et al. 2014, 2015, in review

1. What is the **population genetic structure** of *O. tetricus* along its entire distribution?

2. Does O. tetricus have phenotypic plasticity?

3. What is the **gene flow** between historical and extension areas?

4. Where are the **source populations** located that contribute to the range extension areas?

5. What is the **genetic diversity** of the range extension vs other population components?

6. Are there any **bottleneck or demographic effects**?

How these genetic signatures influence persistence in new areas?

Methods

Samples collection





Anaesthesia in 2% MgCl solution



Tissue in 95% ethanol

Methods



Lab work and data analyses

Linkage disequilibrium & Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (GENEPOP)

Population genetic structure



Preliminary results

Phenotypic plasticity?



Morphology-genetics for more samples

Genetic connectivity (F_{ST})



Ot2 different from the rest of the population

Range extension partially different from the historical distribution

Genetic connectivity (migration)



Migration from all sites

Mallacoota is the main source of migrants

	Source						
Site	NH	Swa	Mer	Mal	Tas (Ot1)	Tas (Ot2)	
NH	0.680	0.013	0.014	0.210	0.021	0.025	
Swa	0.009	0.676	0.009	0.237	0.019	0.025	
Mer	0.009	0.009	0.676	0.236	0.016	0.028	
Mal	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.796	0.143	0.010	
Tas (Ot1)	0.007	0.008	0.007	0.256	0.690	0.009	
Tas (Ot2)	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.013	0.020	0.910	

Genetic diversity



Zone/Site	n	N _A	N_PA	A _R	Η _o	Η _E	F _{IS}
Historical distr.	88	14.00	2.71	13.73	0.57	0.63	0.09
NH	17	7.43	0.57	7.29	0.51	0.57	0.11
Swa	30	10.14	0.86	8.04	0.58	0.64	0.11
Mer	29	10.00	0.57	8.05	0.62	0.65	0.05
Range ext.	91	15.14	4.43	14.60	0.63	0.69	0.08
Mal	30	9.86	0.86	7.87	0.58	0.62	0.07
Tas (Ot1)	35	10.57	1.14	7.76	0.67	0.65	-0.05
Tas (Ot2)	24	9.00	1.00	7.81	0.64	0.66	0.05
n sample size: N number of alleles: N number of private allel				alleles [.]			

n, sample size; N_A , number of alleles; N_{PA} , number of private alleles; A_R , allelic richness (standardized to 17 samples); H_O , observed heterozygosity; H_E , expected heterozygosity; F_{IS} , Fixation index.

Genetic diversity is similar in the extension area compared with the historical distribution

Rapid demographic expansion (Excoffier et al. 2009)

Bottleneck tests

	Infinite Allele Model				
	i	ii	iii	iv	Overall
Historical distr.	0.318	0.165	0.469	No	No
NH	0.349	0.220	0.766	No	No
Swa	0.593	0.339	0.406	No	No
Mer	0.598	0.441	0.406	No	No
Range ext.	0.576	0.245	0.766	No	No
Mal	0.586	0.094	0.656	No	No
Tas (Ot1)	0.589	0.385	0.766	No	No
Tas (Ot2)	0.606	0.303	0.594	No	No
i) "sign test" for	heterozy	gosity e	excess;	ii) "stai	ndardized

differences test" for differences in allele frequencies; iii) "Wilcoxon test" for reduced mean heterozygosity; iv) "mode-shift qualitative test" for distortion of allele frequency distributions. Significance at P < 0.05

Kimura & Crow 1964; Ohta & Kimura 1973; Cornuet & Luikart 1996; Luikart *et al.* 1997; Luikart *et al.* 1998; Luikart & Cornuet 1998

No evidence of a bottleneck effect

Preliminary results

Effective population size (Ne)

Zone	Ne	CI (Inferior)	CI (Superior)
Historical distribution	1665	244	Ø
Range extension	96	67	154

Ne, Effective population size; CI, Confidence interval; P = 0.02

Ne at the extension area is small compared with the historical distribution

Ne \geq 100: limits loss in total fitness to \leq 10%, avoids inbreeding depression;

Ne ≥ 1000: Retains evolutionary potential (Frankham *et al.* 2014)

What is the population genetic structure of *O. tetricus* along its entire distribution?
 Two groups: 1) entire distribution; 2) Tasmania (Ot2).

2. Does O. tetricus have phenotypic plasticity?

Phenotypic plasticity seems to occur at the range extension area.

3. What is the **gene flow** between historical and range extension areas? There is moderate **gene flow** between sites.

4. Where are the **source populations** located that are contributing to the range extension of *O. tetricus*?

All along the distribution. The main source of migrants is located off Mallacoota.

5. What is the genetic diversity of the range extension vs other population components?Genetic diversity is similar at the extension area compared to the historical area.

6. Are there any bottleneck or demographic effects at extension areas?
No evidence of a bottleneck effect. Effective population size in the range extension area is small compared with the historical distribution.

Implications

How these genetic signatures influence persistence in new areas?





Thank you!







Australian Government







PICES



SPOT. LOG. MAP.

Coffs Harbour Fisherman's Coop



Local Fisherman • Fresh Wild Seafood



ES International Council for the Exploration of the Sea EM Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer

Jill Landsberg Trust Fund Scholarship



translating **nature** intokn**ow ledge**