

**EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY,
SEASCAPE GENETICS AND SPECIATION
IN ELASMOBRANCHS FROM THE
GULF OF CALIFORNIA.**

Jonathan R. Sandoval-Castillo

“Yuma”

Molecular Ecology Lab (MELMU)
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University
Sydney, NSW, AUSTRALIA

A thesis submitted to Macquarie University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
List of figures.....	5
List of tables	6
Abstract	7
Declaration of authorship and originality	9
Acknowledgements	10

CHAPTER I GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....12

1.1 EVOLUTION AND SPECIATION	12
1.2 ELASMOBRANCHS.....	15
1.2.1 EVOLUTION, ZOOGEOGRAPHY, ECOLOGY AND TAXONOMY	15
1.2.2 FISHERIES AND MANAGEMENT.....	18
1.3 THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA AND THE BAJA CALIFORNIA PENINSULA	20
1.3.1 GEOLOGICAL HISTORY	20
1.3.2 OCEANOGRAPHY	26
1.3.3 BIODIVERSITY AND ECONOMY	28
1.4 MOLECULAR MARKERS TO STUDY ELASMOBRANCHS FROM THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA.....	30
1.5 THESIS OUTLINE.....	33

CHAPTER II ECOLOGICAL SPECIATION IN AN ELASMOBRANCH FROM THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA: THE GUITARFISH GENUS *RHINOBATOS*35

2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	35
2.2 METHODS.....	41
2.2.1 SAMPLING.	41
2.2.2 DNA ANALYSIS.....	41
2.2.3 OCEANOGRAPHIC DATASET.	42
2.2.4 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	42
2.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	47
2.3.1 GENETIC DIVERSITY	47
2.3.2 CRYPTIC SPECIATION	48
2.3.3 PHYLOGEOGRAPHIC HYPOTHESES	54
2.3.4 ECOLOGICAL ADAPTATION AND SPECIATION	57
2.3.5 SYMPATRIC SPECIATION?.....	65
2.3.6 ISOLATION BARRIERS	65
2.4 CONCLUSIONS	66

CHAPTER III PHYLOGEOGRAPHY, SEASCAPE GENETICS AND SPECIATION OF ANGEL SHARK *SQUATINA CALIFORNICA*68

3.1 INTRODUCTION	68
------------------------	----

3.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	74
3.2.1 SAMPLING.....	74
3.2.2 DNA ANALYSES	74
3.2.3 ECOLOGICAL VARIABLES	78
3.2.4 PHYLOGENETIC AND GENEALOGICAL HISTORY.....	78
3.2.5 SUMMARY STATISTICS	79
3.2.6 POPULATION STRUCTURE	79
3.2.7 ISOLATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AND ECOLOGICAL DISTANCES	80
3.2.8 BIOGEOGRAPHIC HYPOTHESES	81
3.3 RESULTS	85
3.3.1 GENETIC DIVERSITY	85
3.3.2 PHYLOGENETIC AND GENEALOGICAL PATTERNS	88
3.3.3 POPULATION STRUCTURE	88
3.3.4 ISOLATION BY DISTANCE	89
3.3.5 HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY.....	97
3.3.6 BIOGEOGRAPHIC HYPOTHESIS AND BARRIERS	97
3.4 DISCUSSION	100
3.4.1 BAJA CALIFORNIA PENINSULA (BCP) AS A PHYLOGEOGRAPHIC BARRIER FOR A COASTAL SHARK	100
3.4.2 ECOLOGICALLY DISTINCT POPULATIONS IN THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA	102
3.4.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AND TAXONOMY	105

CHAPTER IV “TRANS-PENINSULAR” CONNECTIVITY IN A HEAVILY EXPLOITED COASTAL SHARK: THE BROWN SMOOTH-HOUND *MUSTELUS HENLEI* FROM THE GULF OF CALIFORNIA AND THE MEXICAN PACIFIC COAST **108**

4.1 INTRODUCTION	108
4.2 METHODS.	114
4.2.1 TISSUE SAMPLING.....	114
4.2.2 GENETIC MARKERS.....	114
4.2.3 DATA ANALYSIS	115
4.3 RESULTS	119
4.3.1 HIGH GENETIC VARIABILITY.....	119
4.3.2 GENEALOGICAL ANALYSIS	123
4.3.2 HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY	123
4.3.3 HIGH CONNECTIVITY AND LOW POPULATION STRUCTURE	127
4.3.4 ISOLATION BY GEOGRAPHIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL DISTANCES	133
4.3.5 SEX-BIASED DISPERSAL	133
4.4 DISCUSSION	136
4.4.1 SPECIES IDENTIFICATION AND POPULATION HISTORY	136
4.4.2 CONTEMPORARY GENETIC STRUCTURE.....	138
4.4.3 ISOLATION BY DISTANCE AND SEX BIASED DISPERSAL IN <i>M. HENLEI</i>	139
4.4.4 CONSERVATION IMPLICATIONS FOR A HIGHLY EXPLOITED SHARK SPECIES	141

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS..... **143**

5.1 COMPARATIVE PHYLOGEOGRAPHY, SEASCAPE AND POPULATION GENETICS.....	143
--	------------

5.1.1 HIGH MOBILITY VS LOW MOBILITY	143
5.1.2 HISTORICAL GEOLOGICAL BARRIERS	145
5.1.3 THE ECOLOGICAL BARRIERS	146
5.2 TAXONOMY AND CONSERVATION.....	147
5.2.1 CRYPTIC SPECIES AND TAXONOMY	147
5.2.2 CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT	149
5.3 FUTURE RESEARCH.....	150
 <u>CHAPTER VI REFERENCE MATERIAL.....</u>	 <u>152</u>

List of figures

Fig. 1.1. Paleogeographic reconstruction of western North America for the Mid-Miocene.	22
Fig. 1.2. Paleogeographic reconstruction of western North America for the Late-Miocene.	23
Fig. 1.3 Paleogeographic reconstruction of western North America for the Miocene-Pliocene	24
Fig. 1.4 Paleogeographic reconstruction of western North America for the Late-Pliocene	25
Fig. 1.5 The Gulf of California and the Baja California Peninsula	27
Fig. 2.1 Maps of geological history and bioregions in the Gulf of California and the Baja California Peninsula	38
Fig. 2.2 The Gulf of California and the Baja California Peninsula in Mexico	39
Fig. 2.3 Phylogeographic hypotheses for diversification of <i>Rhinobatos</i>	46
Fig. 2.4 mtDNA phylogeny for <i>Rhinobatos</i> complex from the GC-BCP region	51
Fig. 2.5 mtDNA genealogical network for <i>Rhinobatos</i> complex from the GC-BCP region	52
Fig. 2.6 Ecological niche models for lineages in <i>Rhinobatos</i>	60
Fig. 2.7 Genetic groups in the <i>Rhinobatos</i> species complex	61
Fig. 3.1 Maps of the vicariant events and the bioregions in the Gulf of California and the Pacific Coast	71
Fig. 3.2 Gulf of California and the Baja California Peninsula.	72
Fig. 3.3 Phylogeographic hypotheses for <i>Squatina californica</i> in the GC	84
Fig. 3.4 mtDNA genealogical network for <i>Squatina californica</i> from the GC-Baja California Peninsula	86
Fig. 3.5 mtDNA phylogeny for <i>Squatina californica</i> from the GC-Baja California Peninsula	87
Fig. 3.6 Genetic clusters in <i>Squatina californica</i> identified with STRUCTURE 2.3	92
Fig. 3.7 Interpolation maps of the admixture level between regions	93
Fig. 3.8 Barriers to gene flow for <i>Squatina californica</i>	99
Fig. 4.1 Map of the Gulf of California and the Baja California Peninsula.	112
Fig. 4.2 Genealogical network of <i>Mustelus henlei</i> mtDNA control region haplotypes	122
Fig. 4.3 Mismatch distribution of pairwise sequence differences in <i>Mustelus henlei</i>	125
Fig. 4.4 Correlogram plots of the spatial autocorrelation coefficient r	130
Fig. 4.5 Results for the spatial analysis of shared alleles	131
Fig. 4.6 Frequency distribution of assignment index correction values (Alc).	134
Fig. 4.7 Mean and standard deviation of assignment index correction	135

List of tables

Table 2.1 Sampling localities, lineages and total level of diversity	49
Table 2.2 AFLP primer sets, scored, removed, and retained loci per primer set.	50
Table 2.3 <i>Rhinobatos</i> hierarchical analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA).....	53
Table 2.4 Historical gene flow and population sizes of <i>Rhinobatos</i> lineages	55
Table 2.5 Simulation tests based on deep coalescence of evolutionary hypotheses of diversification in <i>Rhinobatos</i>	56
Table 2.6 Ecological niche identity test among lineages of <i>Rhinobatos</i>	58
Table 2.7 Correlations between genetic differentiation and geographical and ecological distances.....	64
Table 3.1 Sampling localities for <i>Squatina californica</i> , bioregions and genetic diversity	75
Table 3.2 AFLP primer sets, scored, removed, and retained loci per primer set.	76
Table 3.3 Hierarchical analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) for <i>Squatina californica</i> ..	90
Table 3.4 Results of population pairwise fixation index for <i>Squatina californica</i>	91
Table 3.5 Correlations between genetic differentiation and geographical and ecological distances for <i>Squatina californica</i>	94
Table 3.6 Correlations between genetic differentiation and geographical and ecological distances for <i>S. californica</i> only from the Gulf of California.....	95
Table 3.7 Historical gene flow in <i>Squatina californica</i> between bioregions	96
Table 3.8 Simulation test for phylogeographic hypotheses on <i>Squatina californica</i>	98
Table 4.1 Sampling localities, bioregions and total level of diversity.....	113
Table 4.2 Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium test significant values for samples of <i>Mustelus henlei</i>	120
Table 4.3 Linkage disequilibrium test significant values for <i>Mustelus henlei</i> microsatellite loci	121
Table 4.4 Historical gene flow between regions for <i>M. ustelus henei</i>	124
Table 4.5 Population expansion analyses results. Tajima's D, Fu's Fs, τ ,	126
Table 4.6 <i>Mustelus henlei</i> hierarchical analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA).....	128
Table 4.7 Localities pairwise fixation indices	129
Table 4.8 Isolation by ecological and geographic distances.....	132

Abstract

Speciation is one of the most important but less understood processes in nature. An identification of evolutionary and ecological processes promoting reproductive isolation and genetic differentiation is necessary to understand speciation. Although elasmobranchs generally show life histories thought to reduce the potential for regional genetic structure, we are largely unaware about the relative contribution of dispersal potential in shaping population structure and speciation in this group. The Gulf of California (GC) shows high ecological diversity, complex oceanography and active geological history, characteristics that make it a suitable scenario to study speciation. This study aims to elucidate ecological and biogeographic factors that influence genetic structure and speciation in co-distributed elasmobranchs from the Gulf of California and the Pacific coast of Baja California Peninsula (BCP), in Mexico. This was achieved using both nuclear and mitochondrial markers and a range of analytical tools in population and seascape genetics, phylogeography and phylogenetics. Tissue samples of three co-distributed groups of sharks and rays from the genera *Rhinobatos*, *Squatina* and *Mustelus* were obtained from several localities encompassing the major bioregions of the GC and the BCP. These taxa represent a range of dispersal ability, allowing testing the influence of mobility on genetic structure of elasmobranchs. Patterns of phylogeographic structure and genetic connectivity are described for each species and related to the geological history and the contemporary oceanographic setting of the GC. At a large spatial scale, patterns of genetic divergence were better explained by both vicariant geological events and oceanographic complexity. This indicates that ecological isolation via oceanographic discontinuities could be an important driver of marine biodiversity in the GC. Overall, genetic structure appeared inversely correlated with species vagility. This study also reports on previously unsuspected cryptic species and on well-delineated populations that should be managed separately. These results provide urgently

needed information for conservation management of the heavily exploited elasmobranch fisheries in the region. This work represents the first comparative genetic analysis in elasmobranchs from the iconic GC ecosystem and has important implications for the study of the Gulf's biodiversity and its origin and for improving our understanding about speciation in the sea.

Declaration of authorship and originality

The work in this thesis has not previously submitted for a degree or as part of requirements for a degree at any other institution. This thesis contains original research material and has been prepared and written by myself. Any help and assistance received during my research work and preparation of the thesis are acknowledged

JSC performed research (100%), analysed data (90%), wrote the thesis (60%) and designed the research (90%). His supervisor LB contributed to research design (10%), to writing (40%) and analysis (10%)

Also, all information and literature source are indicated in the thesis appropriately



Jonathan Sandoval-Castillo

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my supervisor Professor Luciano Beheregaray for his enormous intellectual, logistic and emotional support, this thesis would be impossible without his clever ideas, extensive knowledge, and, most importantly, his passion for the study of evolutionary history. He has providing me with inspiration and opportunities for exploring, learning and discovery, but more important he provided me an invaluable friendship. Moitu abrigado!

I also want to thanks to all the people and institutions who contributed to sample collection, Jorge Ramirez-Gonzalez (Gigio), Karina de la Rosa, Ulises Mendez, Perla Lozano, Oscar Sosa-Nishizaki, Omar Santana, Hector Trinidad, Kena Curiel, Familia Curiel, Familia Escobar, Erick Oñate, CEDO Puerto Peñasco, Aquatic Adventures Bahia de los Angeles, and all the fishermen of the Gulf of California and Baja California Peninsula, without whom this work would not have been possible.

Funding for this project was provided by Macquarie University (Postgraduate Research Fund and Macquarie University Abroad Travel Grant). Also during my candidature I was supported by a Macquarie University Research Excellence Scholarship.

Thanks also to all the members of the Molecular Ecology Lab, I have learned a lot but also I had fun with them. Gina Cooke, Shannon Corrigan, Leanne Faulks, Peter Teske, Catherine Attard, Ana Amaral, Mark Sistrom, Jo Wiszniewski, Minami Sasaki, Kerstin Bilgmann, Fabrisius Domingo, Daniel Carvalho.

I extend my gratitude to Professor Lesley Hughes for help and support in the last part of my PhD.

Special thanks to Luciana Möller and Luciana Beheregaray, for being there in hard times, for opening their door and introducing me two wonderful little people, thanks Pipe for speak my language and thank you Luisa for evocate my childhood. I will value our friendship forever.

Gina thanks for all the support, jokes, chats and for being you “naca”. Thanks Shannon for trying to introduce me with the shark people in Australia, for being also a "naca" and flirting with me all the time. You two improved this thesis a lot, but most importantly, my time in Australia.

Thank to my friends MC, Zeynep and Karthik, without them lunch time would be boring. Heartfelt thanks Marie Clear Hermant for reading the whole thesis and learning about sharks and genes.

I am especially grateful to my friends Flor Colombo and Karina de la Rosa. Por escuchar mis locuras y compartir las suyas.

Finally, I would not have been able to finish if it were not for the support of my family, they always has given me the love needed to continue. Gracias Madre, Padre, Patola, Chicatana, por soportarme, hacerme reir y darme amor cuando lo necesito.... y tu Capirola gracias por tu aportación a este trabajo.