Volume 28, Number 3 July 2018



Published by the British Herpetological Society

# **British Herpetological Society**



The Herpetological Journal is published quarterly by the British Herpetological Society and is issued free to members. Articles are listed in Current Awareness in Biological Sciences, Current Contents, Science Citation Index and Zoological Record. Applications to purchase copies and/or for details of membership should be made to the Hon. Secretary, British Herpetological Society, The Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London, NW1 4RY, UK. Instructions to authors are printed inside the back cover. All contributions should be addressed to the Scientific Editor.

Front cover: A young Varanus komodoensis from Rinca island (Photograph by Rick J. Hodges)

#### Copyright

It is a fundamental condition that submitted manuscripts have not been published and will not be simultaneously submitted or published elsewhere. By submitting a manuscript, the authors agree that the copyright for their article is transferred to the publisher if and when the article is accepted for publication. The copyright covers the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute the article, including reprints and photographic reproductions. Permission for any such activities must be sought in advance from the Editors.

FULL PAPER



# Deep Mitochondrial and Morphological Differentiation of *Hemidactylus persicus* Anderson, 1872 (Squamata: Gekkonidae) in Iran

Mahboubeh Sadat Hosseinzadeh<sup>1</sup>, Mansour Aliabadian<sup>2,3</sup>, Eskandar Rastegar-pouyani<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Birjand, Birjand, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

<sup>3</sup>Research Department of Zoological Innovations (RDZI), Institute of Applied Zoology, Faculty of Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran

With currently 149 species, *Hemidactylus* Oken, 1817 is one of the most species-rich genera of the family Gekkonidae. In this study, 50 *Hemidactylus persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus* from southern Iran and three specimens of the newly described species *H. kurdicus* from north-eastern Iraq were screened using sequences of the mitochondrial 12S rRNA gene (approximately 400 bp) with two *H. hajarensis* as outgroups. In addition, 58 specimens were analysed morphologically using 25 mensural and six meristic characters. The genetic data recovered six well supported clades of *H. persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus* in southern Iran, which also showed morphological differentiation with the exception of specimens from Khuzestan and Fars provinces. Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) and haplotype networks are compatible with our phylogenetic tree and morphological analyses. These findings highlight deep mitochondrial and morphological variation of *H. persicus* from Iran. Interestingly, our phylogenetic inference revealed that *H. romeshkanicus* should be regarded as a valid species, whereas *H. kurdicus* is not a distinct evolutionary lineage and synonymous with *H. romeshkanicus*.

Key words: Gekkonidae; Iranian plateau; Phylogeny; Radiation; Species complex

## INTRODUCTION

The diverse herpetofauna of the Iranian plateau has been of interest to herpetologists, particularly with respect to ecology and zoogeography (e.g., Anderson, 1968; Hosseinzadeh et al., 2014a). Topographically, the Iranian plateau consists of a complex of mountain chains enclosing two main mountain ranges: the Elburz, which extends from north-west to north-east, and the Zagros, which extends from north-west to south-eastern Iran (Fisher, 1968). Descriptions of species using molecular tools resulted in the detection of cryptic taxa, and the raising of geographically isolated subspecies to the rank of species (Ahmadzadeh et al., 2013; Ficetola et al., 2013). However, further molecular and integrative studies are necessary in order to gain a more complete understanding of the Iranian herpetofauna.

With 149 recognised species (Uetz et al., 2018), the genus *Hemidactylus* Oken, 1817 is one of the most species-rich genera of the family Gekkonidae. It is globally distributed in tropical and subtropical regions. Four species of *Hemidactylus* have been reported from Iran: *Hemidactylus persicus* Anderson, 1872, *H. robustus* Heyden, 1827, *H. flaviviridis* Rüppell, 1840, and *H. romeshkanicus* Torki 2011 (Anderson, 1999; Bauer et al., 2006; Torki et al., 2011; Šmíd et al., 2014; Hosseinzadeh et al., 2014b). *Hemidactylus persicus* is distributed in the northern Arabian Peninsula, southern Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Pakistan and India (Sindaco & Jeremčenko, 2008; Carranza & Arnold, 2012; Khan, 2013; Castilla et al., 2013; Šmíd et al., 2014). Molecular studies of Iranian *H. persicus* have shown a high level of genetic differentiation (Carranza & Arnold, 2012; Šmíd et al., 2013). Recently, a new species, *H. kurdicus*, has been reported from the oak woodlands of Zagros forest steppe of Qara Dagh Mountains, Sulaimani, north-eastern Iraq (Safaei-Mahroo et al., 2017).

The occupation of Iran by *H. persicus* in different climates and habitats along with deep intraspecific variation suggests that it might comprise a species complex. According to Torki et al. (2011), *H. romeshkanicus* is endemic to Iran, inhabiting western slopes of the Zagros Mountains and southern Lorestan. According to Šmíd et al. (2014), the species probably belongs to the arid clade together with its sister taxa *H. persicus*, *H. robustus* and *H. turcicus*. Here, we study the genetic variability of *H. persicus* across its entire range in the Iranian Plateau using 12S rRNA mtDNA sequences, together with multivariate analyses of mensural and meristic characters. Further, we evaluate the validity of *H. romeshkanicus* using these methods.

Correspondence: Mahboubeh S. Hosseinzadeh (m.hosseinzadeh@birjand.ac.ir)

## **METHODS**

Fifty-three Hemidactylus were included in the phylogenetic analyses which were procured from collections (Collection of The Biology Department of Shiraz University (CBSU), Zoological Museum of University of Tehran (ZUTC), Department of The Environment of Hormozgan Zoological Collection (DHZC), Farhang Torki Herpetology Museum (FTHM), Collection of The California Academy of Sciences: (CAS), Centre for Ecological Sciences, Bangalore, India (CES), Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley (MVZ), National Museum, Prague (NMP)). Morphological characters of specimens collected from the type locality of H. romeshkanicus were compared with the holotype from Zoologisches Museum of Berlin (ZMB). Other samples were obtained from recent expeditions and have been deposited in the Sabzevar University Herpetological Collection (SUHC), the Zoological Museum of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad (ZMFUM) and the Zoological Museum of University of Birjand (ZMUB) with appropriate sampling permission from the Department of Environment of Iran (see Table 1, Fig. 2). Specimens were euthanised with chloroform and tissues extracted and fixed in 75% ethanol. In total, 42 H. persicus were sequenced for this study. A further eight and three sequences of *H. persicus* and *H.* kurdicus, respectively, and two of H. hajarensis (used as outgroup) were downloaded from GenBank. We used 12Sa and 12Sb primers (Kocher et al., 1989) to amplify a section (approximately 400 bp) of the mitochondrial 12S ribosomal RNA gene. Sequences were imported to BioEdit, version 7.0.9.0 (Hall, 1999), aligned using ClustalW multiple alignment, and adjusted by hand. A distance matrix using uncorrected p-distances was calculated with MEGA, version 5 (Tamura et al., 2011). Two phylogenetic analyses were performed: Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Bayesian Inference (BI). We choose GTR+I+G as the best-fitting model of nucleotide substitution based on the Akaike Information Criterion as implemented in ModelTest, version 3.7 (Posada & Crandall, 1998). The maximum likelihood (ML) tree was produced using RAxML v 7.0.3 (Stamatakis, 2006). To test the robustness of the nodes we ran 1000 bootstrap pseudo-replications under ML (Templeton et al., 1992). Bayesian analyses were performed in MrBayes 3.1.2 (Huelsenbeck & Ronquist, 2001). Four Markov Chain Monte Carlo analyses (MCMC) were run simultaneously for 10 million generations and the first 1,000,000 trees (as a conservative 'burn-in') were discarded. Posterior probabilities for nodes were calculated from the remaining trees using a majorityrule consensus analysis. Clades are regarded as strongly supported if they have bootstrap values higher than 70% in ML, or posterior probabilities (pp) of 95% or above in the Bayesian analysis (Hillis et al., 1993). To visualise the number of specimens sharing certain haplotypes, haplotype networks of the 12S were constructed using the TCS software package (Clement et al., 2000). This program estimates the number of mutational steps by which pairwise haplotypes differ and computes the probability of parsimony for pairwise differences until the probability exceeds 0.95 (Templeton et al., 1992). To further evaluate relationships among populations of H. persicus we performed a Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) using GenAlEx v.6.5 (Peakall & Smouse, 2006). We used the same software to perform a Mantel test to examine the correlation between geographic and genetic distances based on point localities in the populations of H. persicus (Jensen et al., 2005). An analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was performed to evaluate the population structure and mutational differences between the loci in different populations using GenAlEx v.6.5 (Peakall & Smouse, 2006). Additionally, to calculate the genetic differentiation fixation index, the partitioning of among-group genetic variation (PhiPT) values were calculated in order to examine the distribution of differences within and between populations using GenAlEx v.6.5 (Peakall & Smouse, 2006).

Fifty-eight specimens of *H. persicus* were examined morphologically, including 29 males and 29 females. All specimens were studied for 25 mensural and six meristic characters following Kluge (1969), Vences et al. (2004), Busais & Joger (2011), and Carranza & Arnold (2012, see supplementary section; Table 2).

Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS 16.0 and PAST v. 2.17c (Hammer et al., 2001). The multivariate canonical variate analysis (CVA) was conducted on the transformed matrix to determine if individuals would be assigned to the correct population group based on morphological measurements.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

A total of 399 characters of the 12S rRNA gene were used in the phylogenetic analyses, of which there were 44 parsimony-informative characters (224 invariant or monomorphic sites and 44 variable or polymorphic sites). The proportion of invariable sites, I = 0, for amongsite rate variation followed a gamma distribution, with the shape parameter a = 0.2402. The frequencies of nucleotides were: freq A = 0.3285, freq C = 0.3047, freq G = 0.1913, freq T = 0.1755. Both methods (ML and BI) gave very similar results and showed only minor differences, at the base of the trees, where relationships had little support (Fig. 1). The phylogeny recovered six well-supported clades comprising the following populations: Clade A from south-west Iran (Behbahan city, East of Khuzestan Province); south-east Iran (Lipar, Jod Village and Bazman, Sistan and Baluchistan), extreme south-west Iran (Mahshar, Khuzestan Province); Clade B, from south Iran (south of Lorestan, Romeshkan, Pole-e-Dokhtar); north-east Iraq (western border of the Zagros forest steppe in south-western Sulaimani, Kurdistan region); Clade B, from south-west Iran (northern and central Khuzestan; western Ilam); Clade C, from south Iran (Bushehr and southern Fars Province); Clade C, from central Iran (Kerman and northern Fars Province); and Clade C<sub>3</sub> from south Iran (central and eastern Fars Province; south-eastern Khuzestan, Fig. 1). Uncorrected genetic distances ranged between 0.000 and 0.008 and between 0.026 and 0.097 within and between clades of H. persicus, respectively (Table 3). There is no genetic distance between H. kurdicus and clade B, **Table 1.** Details of studied specimens of *H. persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus*. The abbreviations refer to: Collection of The Biology Department of Shiraz University (CBSU), Zoological Museum of University of Tehran (ZUTC), Department of The Environment of Hormozgan Zoological Collection (DHZC), Farhang Torki Herpetology Museum (FTHM), Collection of The California Academy of Sciences (CAS), Centre for Ecological Sciences, Bangalore, India (CES), Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley (MVZ), National Museum, Prague (NMP), Sabzevar University Herpetological Collection (SUHC), Zoological Museum of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad (ZMFUM) and Zoological Museum of University of Birjand (ZMUB). M. = Morphological study, G. = Genetic study.

Species	Voucher Code	Locality; number in Figure S <sub>1</sub>	GenBank Ac-	Source	Type of
H romochkanicus	SULIC 1152	40 Km oast of Haftrol Irani1	NG744E24	This study	Study
H. TOMESHKUMCUS	SUHC 1153	40 Km east of Haftgel, Iran;1	NG744524	This study	M G
H. romoshkanicus	SUHC 1154	40 Km east of Haftgel, Itali,1	NG744525	This study	M G
H romeshkanicus	SUHC 1155	40 Km east of Haftgel Iran:1	MG744520	This study	M G
H persicus	SUHC 1222	5Km west of Dawyer Iran;2	MG744527	This study	M G
H persicus	SUHC 1222	5Km west of Dayyer, Iran;2	MG744529	This study	M G
H porsicus	SUHC 1414	Nourabad Iran:2	MG744550	This study	ivi., G.
H porsicus	SUHC 1414	Nourabad, Iran;2	MC744551	This study	G.
H porsicus	SUHC 1415	Nourabad, Iran;2	NG744552	This study	G.
H. persicus	SUNC 1425	Nourabad, Iran;3	1016/44555	This study	IVI., G.
H. persicus	SUNC 2622	Nourdbdu, Irdii;5	-	This study	IVI.
H. romochkanicus	SUHC 2622	Masjedsolveman, Irani4	MG744559	This study	G.
H. romoshkanicus	SULC 2624	Masjedsolveman, Irani4	MG744540	This study	M G
H. romoshkanicus	SULIC 2625	Masjedsolveman, Irani4	NG744541	This study	IVI., G.
H. TOITIESTIKUTIICUS	SULIC 2642	Abram mountain, Iran;E	1010744542	This study	G.
H porsicus	SULC 2644	Ahram mountain, Iran;5	-	This study	IVI.
H. persicus	SUNC 3644	Ahram mountain, Irani5	-	This study	IVI.
H. persicus	SUNC 3645	Anifani moundan, irang		This study	IVI.
H. persicus	SURC 3693		IVIG744544		IVI., G.
H. persicus	SUHC 3694	Khabr national park, Iran;6	MG744551	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	SUHC 3696	Khabr national park, Iran;6	MG744545	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	SUHC 3691	Ahram mountain, Iran;5	MG744543	This study	G.
H. persicus	ZMFUM 10005	Gakal Cave, Gachsaran, Iran;7	MG744548	This study	M., G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMFUM10001	Izeh,Iran;8	MG744515	This study	M., G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMFUM10002	Izeh,Iran;8	MG744522	This study	M., G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMFUM10003	Izeh,Iran;8	MG744523	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	CBSU R082	25km NW of Lamerd, Iran;9	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	CBSU R083	25km NW of Lamerd, Iran;9	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10007	Varavi, Iran;10	MG744547	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10008	Varavi, Iran;10	MG744549	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10009	Varavi, Iran;10	MG744550	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10010	Behbahan, Iran; 11	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10011	Behbahan, Iran; 11	MG744546	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	CBSU 8071	GoohGorm Jahrum, Iran;12	-	This study	Ń.
H. persicus	CBSU 8068	GoohGorm Jahrum.Iran:12	-	This study	М.
H. persicus	CBSU 8091	GoohGorm Jahrum Iran:12	-	This study	М.
H. persicus	CBSU 8083	GoohGorm Jahrum Iran:12	-	This study	M.
H nersicus	CBSU 4217	lahrum Iran:13	-	This study	M
H nersicus	CBSU 8055	Kazeron Iran:1/		This study	M
H nersicus	CBSU 8056	Shiraz Iran:15	-	This study	M
H persicus	CBSU 5205	Shiraz, Iran,15	_	This study	N/
H persicus	CBSU P111	Gachearan Iran:16		This study	N/
H romochkanicus		Masiad solaman Iran:17	-	This study	M G
H. romochkanicus	SULC 2784	Dolo o dokhtar krani 19	NG744555	This study	M G
H. TOMESHKUMCUS	SUNC 3784	POIE-E-UOKIILdI,IIdII;18	IVIG744555	This study	IVI., G.
H. TOMESHKUMCUS	SUNC 3780	POIE-E-UOKIILdI,IIdII;18	1016744554	This study	IVI., G.
H. romesnkanicus	SUHC 3789	Pole-e-dokntar,Iran;18	-	This study	IVI.
H. persicus	SUHC 3785	Nienran, Iran; 19	-	This study	IVI.
H. persicus	SUHC 2097	Bazman,Iran;20	MG744520	This study	G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMFUM 10024	Romeshkan, Lorestan, Iran;21	IVIG/44556	This study	IVI., G.
H. romesnkanicus	ZIVIB 75020	Romeshkan, Lorestan, Iran;21	-	Iorki et al., 2011	IVI.
H. persicus	SUHC 1558	Jahrom, Iran; 22	MG744536	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	SUHC 1974	Marvdasht,Iran;23	MG744538	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	DHZCH132	Qeshm island, Iran;24	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZUTC R.1256	Bibi Hakemieh, KohgiloyehvaBoyerahmad, Iran;25	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZUTC R.1222	Bibi Hakemieh, KohgiloyehvaBoyerahmad, Iran;25	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZUTC R.1234	Bibi Hakemieh, KohgiloyehvaBoyerahmad, Iran;25	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZUTC R.1476	Jod Village, Sistan and Baluchistan, Iran;26	MG744552	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	SUHC 451	10 Km East of Evaz, Iran;27	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	SUHC 1787	10 Km East of Evaz, Iran;27	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	SUHC 1416	Parishan region, Iran; 28	MG744533	This study	G.
H. persicus	SUHC 1421	Parishan region, Iran; 28	MG744534	This study	G.
H. persicus	SUHC 1837	Darab,Iran;29	MG744537	This study	G.
H. persicus	SUHC 1211	Bushehr,Iran;30	MG744528	This study	G.
H. persicus	CBSU R004	Kazeron, Iran; 31	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	CBSU B636	Kazeron, Iran; 31	-	This study	M.
H. persicus	ZMUB 41	Behbahan,Iran;11	MG744516	This study	M., G.
H. persicus	ZMUB 42	Behbahan,Iran;11	MG744517	This study	M., G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMUB 43	Mehran, Ilam, 19	MG744518	This study	M.,G.
H. romeshkanicus	ZMUB 44	Mehran, Ilam, 19	MG744519	This study	M.,G.
H. persicus	ZMFUM10004	Farur Island, Iran; 36	MG744521	This study	G.
H. persicus	MVZHERP234385	Lipar Village, Sistan and Baluchistan, Iran:32	JQ957077	Šmíd et al.,2013	G.
H. persicus	FTHM005000	Mahshahr,Iran;33	JQ957074	Šmíd et al 2013	G.
H. persicus	FTHM005001	Mahshahr, Iran; 33	JQ957075	Šmíd et al.2013	G.
H. romeshkanicus	FTHM005100	Bushehr Iran:34	JQ957076	Šmíd et al.2013	G.
H. persicus	NMP6V74807/1	Booreki Iran 35	KC818691	Šmíd et al. 2013	G.
H. persicus	NMP6V74807/2	Booreki Iran 35	KC818690	Šmíd et al. 2013	G.
H kurdicus	CAS 262258	Kurdistan Region Trag-37	MG549189	Safaei-Mahroo et al. 2017	G.
H kurdicus	CAS 262250	Kurdistan Region Trad-37	MG549190	Safaei-Mahroo et al. 2017	G.
H kurdicus	CAS 262260	Kurdistan Region, Iraq,37	MG5/0101	Safaei-Mahroo et al. 2017	G.
H nersicus	CE2 02200	NahhDongar Raiasthan India 29	KC725107	Bancal and Karanth 2012	G.
H nersicus	CES 1 00027	NabhDongar Raiasthan India:29	HM505701	Bancal and Karanth 2010	G.
H bajaransis	CAS 227612	Taput Omani20	TU1253/UI	Carranza and Arnold 2006	G.
n. nujurensis	CAS 227012	Tanuf Orrege 20	DQ120337		G.
n. hujurensis	CA5 227014	ianui,Oman;39	DQ120338	Carranza anu Arnoi0,2006	в.



**Figure 1.** Bayesian 12S rRNA tree. Posterior probability and ML bootstrap values are indicated in star symbol (>99% (\*\*), >95% (\*)) and number on each branch of phylogenetic tree, respectively. Number in parenthesis showed locality of the specimens according to figure  $S_1$ 

(*H. romeshkanicus*) (0.000). Apart from this case, the lowest genetic distance was found between clades  $B_1$  (*H. romeshkanicus*) and  $B_2$  (0.026). The highest genetic distance was found between clades  $B_1$  (*H. romeshkanicus*) and A as well as *H. kurdicus* and A (0.097). The most genetically divergent group was clade A, being sister to all other *H. persicus* clades. Haplotype network analyses revealed 18 haplotypes including five haplotype networks and three unique haplotypes recovered by TCS. Specimens of *H. kurdicus* with *H. romeshkanicus* formed the same haplotype (Fig. 3).

Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) distinguished six groups of individuals along discriminate axes 1 and 2, which accounted for 61.91 % and 25.26 % of the genetic variation, respectively (Fig. 4). Along the first axis, clade A, separated from clades H. romeshkanicus, B, and C, while the second axis resolved the other clades, but clade C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub> are very close to each other. Genetic distances were positively correlated with geographic distances among six population (Rxy=0.003). The AMOVA analyses revealed that more genetic variation within populations (60%) was observed than among the six populations of H. persicus (40%). The largest PhiPT value was between clades A and  $C_1$  (0.666), with the smallest value between clades B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub> (-0.044). Clade B<sub>1</sub> represents H. romeshkanicus. The PhiPT distances between clades  $B_1$  (*H. romeshkanicus*) and  $B_2$  (-0.044), and between clades C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> (0.138) were not statistically significant.

There was no significant sexual dimorphism in *H. persicus*, excluding the number of preanal pores, which are only present in males. Morphology divided the individuals of *H. persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus* into six groups according to the clades in the 12S rRNA topology. Morphological character summaries are shown in Table 4. CVA analyses of meristic and morphometric characters showed that clades A and *H. romeshkanicus* 

are fully differentiated from other groups, clades  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are distinct from other groups, and clades  $C_3$  and  $B_2$  overlap with each other (Table 3, Fig. 5). The holotype of *H. romeshkanicus* falls within clade  $B_1$ , hence forth the *H. romeshkanicus* clade. Of thirty-one studied variables, SED/SVL, IO2/SVL and EEd/SVL had the highest CV1 and CV2 loadings (Table 5).

According to Vasconcelos & Carranza (2014), uncorrected genetic distances of up to 5.7% in 12SrRNA are considered to reflect high levels of genetic differentiation between different populations of Hemidactylus species. Interestingly, H. kurdicus shares the same haplotype with specimens of clade B<sub>1</sub> (H. romeshkanicus) (without genetic distance, 0.000). There is also little genetic differentiation between clade B, from Khuzestan and Ilam provinces and clade B<sub>1</sub> (H. romeshkanicus) from Lorstan province and Sulaimani, north-eastern Iraq, suggesting that these clades represent the same species at however high mitochondrial level of variation. Generally, H. kurdicus is not a distinct evolutionary lineage and synonymous with H. romeshkanicus, which has been described first by Torki et al. (2011). Taken together, five clades with significant genetic distances and eighteen different haplotypes are found within H. persicus of Iran, with H. romeshkanicus forming a distinct clade with a unique haplotype. However, unique haplotype networks according to defined clades probably imply the presence of isolated populations without gene flow. In addition, six haplotypes occur in clade C that include all individuals from Fars Province, with the exception of specimens from mountainous areas in the north, which are included in clade C<sub>2</sub>, and lowland regions in southern Fars which are assigned to clade C<sub>1</sub>. With respect to different geographical conditions, three clades of H. persicus exist in Fars Province that show high genetic variation and most likely long-term



**Figure 3.** Haplotype networks constructed with statistical parsimony based on 399 bp of the mitochondrial 12S ribosomal RNA gene of *H. persicus, H. kurdicus* and *H. romeshkanicus* (50 individuals). Each circle represents one haplotype; size of circles is proportional to haplotype frequency.



**Figure 4.** Principal coordinates analysis of five populations of *H. persicus, H. kurdicus* and *H. romeshkanicus*.





isolation. Morphologically, many external features of *Hemidactylus* species appear quite plastic, often varying within and between species (Carranza & Arnold, 2006). As a result, morphological characters may not be able to differentiate populations. Genetic distances suggest that clade C is characterised by deep interspecific variation between three main local populations from southern Iran (Bushehr and southern Fars Province; Clade C<sub>1</sub>), central Iran (Kerman and northern Fars Province; Clade C<sub>2</sub>), and southern Iran (central and eastern Fars Province; south-eastern Khuzestan; Clade C<sub>3</sub>). Research is currently ongoing to clarify the phylogenetic relationships of *H. persicus* complex with more mitochondrial and nuclear genes.

The results derived from PCoA are compatible with our phylogenetic tree and morphological analyses. The individuals of clades C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub> are closer in PCoA, PhiPT and morphological analyses, whereas in the phylogenetic tree clades C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>1</sub> and clades C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> are closer than clades C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub>. The inconsistent results of clades C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> might be related to short geographic distances between the two clades which influence the PCoA, PhiPT and morphological analyses. The Mantel test showed a significant correlation with geographic and genetic distance, indicating that populations of H. persicus show a pattern of isolation by distance, which is usually explained by gene flow (Rousset, 1997). According to Šmíd et al. (2013), the long presence of H. persicus in Iran has resulted in high levels of intraspecific differentiation within the Iranian populations. Iran has two main mountain ranges that have played a significant role in the distribution, isolation and separation of reptile species; the Elburz Mountains that run from north-west to northeast and the Zagros Mountains that range from northwestern to south-eastern Iran (Fisher, 1968; Macey et al., 1998). The formation of the Zagros Mountains began by the collision of the Arabian lithospheric plate moving in a north-easterly direction with the Eurasian landmass, which took place from the Oligocene to the Miocene 35 -20 million years ago (Ma) (Mouthereau, 2011). According to Šmíd et al. (2013), the oldest reported dispersal of Hemidactylus from Arabia onto the Iranian Plateau occurred 13.1 Ma when the ancestor of H. persicus colonised Iran. The closest relatives of the Iranian H. persicus are found in UAE and northern Oman including H. luqueorum and H. hajarensis which are sister taxa of H. persicus. Dispersal therefore occurred most probably via the Gomphotherium land bridge connecting the Arabian and Anatolian plates approximately 18 Ma (Gardner 2009; Šmíd et al., 2013).

Geological events have led to the formation of different habitats and climatic conditions, separating the mountain regions from the Mesopotamian lowland populations and undoubtedly influencing the radiation, isolation, and differentiation of the Iranian herpetofauna (Wischuf & Fritz, 1996; Hrbek & Meyer, 2003; Feldman & Parham 2004; Rastegar-Pouyani et al., 2010). It seems likely that the ancestor of *H. persicus* penetrated the Iranian plateau from the south-west (basic dichotomy on the tree; clade A) and then dispersed to the more eastern parts (Gardner, 2009; Šmíd et al., 2013). Two

Table 2.	The	mensural	and	meristic	characters	used i	n t	this
study.								

Characters	Definition
SVL	Maximum snout to vent length (from tip of snout to
	cloacal aperture)
HW	Head width (at the widest point of head)
НН	Head height (from occiput to underside of jaws)
ΠL	process of jaw)
CL	caudal length (from posterior edge of cloaca to tip of tail)
101	anterior interorbital distance (distance between left and right supracilary scale rows at anteriormost point of eyes)
102	posterior interorbital distance (distance between left and right supracilary scale rows at posterior- most point of eyes)
SL	supralabial scales (right)
IL	Infralabial scales (right)
4th SC	Scansors under 4th toe(Counts the sub digital lamellae in a single row of scales from the base of toe to the tip of the 4th toe)
1st SC	Scansors under 1st toe (Counts the sub digital lamellae in a single row of scales from the base of toe to the tip of the 1st toe)
OD	Orbital diameter (from greatest diameter of orbit)
EED	Eye to ear distance (from anterior edge of ear open- ing to posterior corner of eye)
SED	Snout to eye distance (from anterior point of eye to tip of snout)
DS	No. of dorsal scales (Counts the mid-way scales between the fore and hind limbs)
VS	No. of ventral scales (Counts the transverse row across the belly that includes the greatest number)
HLS	HL/SVL
HWS	HW/SVL
HHS	HH/SVL
OS	OD/SVL
015	IO1/SVL
025	102/SVL
ES	EED/SVL
SS	SED/SVL
HWH	HW/HL
ннн	HH/HL
HWHH	HW/HH
ОН	OD/HL
EH	EED/HL
SH	SED/HL
01H	IO1/HL

samples from India grouped with individuals of clade A, suggesting an eastward distribution from south-western Iran to India. The seven samples from Šmíd et al. (2013) are dispersed in our phylogenetic tree, including three samples from Brooki (Fars Province, Iran) that are located in clade  $C_3$ ; one sample from Bushehr that is located in the *H. romeshkanicus* clade; three samples including one from Lipar village (Sistan and Baluchistan Province, Iran) and two others from Mahshar (extreme south-western Iran) are placed in clade A. The latter three samples

**Table 3.** Average uncorrected genetic distances (p-distance) between and within individual clades of *H. persicus*, *H. kurdicus* and *H. romeshkanicus* from the Iranian plateau based on 399 bp fragment of 12SrRNA.

Population	H. kurdicus	Clade B <sub>2</sub>	Clade C <sub>3</sub>	Clade A	Clade C <sub>1</sub>	Clade C <sub>2</sub>	Clade B <sub>1</sub>	Within clades
H. kurdicus								0.000
Clade B	0.026							0.001
Clade C	0.088	0.085						0.008
Clade A	0.097	0.094	0.065					0.003
Clade C <sub>1</sub>	0.076	0.080	0.044	0.054				0.002
Clade C	0.090	0.086	0.054	0.076	0.041			0.004
Clade B <sub>1</sub>	0.000	0.026	0.088	0.097	0.076	0.090	0.000	0.000

**Table 4.** Descriptive parameters of 25 metric and six meristic characters including maximum, minimum, mean, and standard error in the studied clades of *H. persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus*.

Population	Clade A	(n=3)	Clade B,	(n=13)	Clade B, (n=6)	
Characters	Mean ± std. Error	Range	Mean ± std. Error	Range	Mean ± std. Error	Range
SV/	59 02+7 21	51 81-66 23	60 97+2 93	42 31-72 73	64 48+2 81	55 65-73 06
HW	12 23+1 54	10 69-13 78	11 96+0 64	7 72-14 06	13 01+0 44	12 05-14 49
HH	6.55+1.04	5.51-7.59	5.88+0.34	3.88-7.43	6.94+0.63	4.83-9.38
HI	15,93+0,73	15.20-16.66	17.8+0.80	12.95-20.73	19.63+0.89	16.42-22.47
CL	-	-	69.22±4.84	53.07-81.05	86.00	86.00-86.00
101	4.97+0.26	4.71-5.23	4,49+0,30	2.68-5.65	4.81+0.23	3.89-5.53
102	6.68±0.82	5.86-7.51	6.69±0.49	3.21-8.30	7.75±0.34	6.83-8.73
SL	10	10-10.00	11.09±0.16	10.00-12.00	12.66±0.66	11.00-15.00
IL	8.5±0.5	8.00-9.00	8.54±0.2	8.00-10.00	9.66±0.49	8.00-11.00
OD	3.55±0.62	2.93-4.18	4.04±0.31	2.54-6.49	4.51±0.23	3.68-5.36
EED	4.92±0.73	4.19-5.65	4.72±0.23	3.00-5.48	4.82±0.29	3.97-6.00
SED	6.57±0.83	5.74-7.40	6.72±0.33	5.14-8.52	6.98±0.51	4.98-8.66
DS	43±1	42.00-44.00	43.1±2.01	32.00-50.00	45.60±4.54	32.00-60.00
VS	43.5±7.5	36.00-51.00	43.3±2.28	27.00-53.00	40.00±1.84	34.00-46.00
1st SC	6.5±1.5	5.00-8.00	8.63±0.36	6.00-10.00	9.66±0.33	9.00-11.00
4th SC	12±2	10.00-14.00	12.45±0.15	12.00-13.00	13.00±0.25	12.00-14.00
CL/SVL	-	-	1.16±0.03	0.97-1.25	1.2113±0	1.21-1.21
HL/SVL	0.27±0.02	0.25-0.29	0.29±0.004	0.27-0.32	0.30±0.003	0.30-0.32
HW/SVL	0.20±0.0008	0.21-0.21	0.19±0.006	0.14-0.21	0.20±0.006	0.18-0.22
HH/SVL	0.11±0.004	0.11-0.11	0.09±0.003	0.07-0.11	0.10±0.008	0.07-0.13
UD/SVL	0.05±0.003	0.06-0.06	0.06±0.005	0.06-0.12	0.06±0.001	0.07-0.07
101/3VL	0.08±0.005	0.08-0.09	0.07±0.002	0.00-0.09	0.07±0.003	0.07-0.09
	0.11±0.0001	0.11-0.11	0.1±0.004	0.08-0.15	0.12±0.002	0.11-0.15
EED/SVL	0.08±0.002	0.08-0.09	0.07±0.001	0.07-0.09	0.07±0.005	0.00-0.09
JED/JVL HM//HI	0.76+0.061	0.11-0.11	0.1110.003	0.09-0.10	0.66+0.01	0.07-0.13
нн/ні	0.40+0.046	0.36-0.46	0.33+0.01	0.38-0.70	0.35+0.02	0.01-0.74
HW/HH	1 87+0 06	1 82-1 94	2 04+0 06	1 80-2 60	1 93+0 13	1 54-2 49
OD/HI	0.22+0.02	0.19-0.25	0.22+0.01	0.20-0.41	0.22+0.005	0.21-0.25
EED/HL	0.30±0.03	0.28-0.34	0.26±0.006	0.23-0.30	0.24±0.01	0.21-0.28
SED/HL	0.41±0.03	0.38-0.44	0.37±0.01	0.34-0.54	0.35±0.02	0.22-0.41
IO1/HL	0.31±0.002	0.31-0.31	0.25±0.01	0.21-0.31	0.24±0.01	0.21-0.30
IO2/HL	0.41±0.03	0.39-0.45	0.37±0.02	0.25-0.50	0.39±0.01	0.37-0.45
				·		
Population	Clade C	1 (n=8)	Clade C	2 (n=5)	Clade C <sub>3</sub> (	n=23)
Population Characters	Clade C Mean ± std. Error	1 (n=8) Range	Clade C Mean ± std. Error	<mark>, (n=5)</mark> Range	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error	n=23) Range
Population Characters SVL	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37	<b>, (n=8)</b> Range 50.01-61.06	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95	<b>Range</b> 35.72-62.35	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63
Population Characters SVL HW	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22	<b>(n=8)</b> Range 50.01-61.06 9.70-11.68	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94	<b>Range</b> 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27
Population Characters SVL HW HH	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21	<pre>(n=8)</pre>	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51	<b>Range</b> 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41	<b>Range</b> 50.01-61.06 9.70-11.68 4.09-5.70 14.56-17.76	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07	<b>Range</b> 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( <u>Mean ± std. Error</u> 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68	▲ Range 50.01-61.06 9.70-11.68 4.09-5.70 14.56-17.76 44.87-65.75	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1 IO2	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14 6.03±0.23	<pre></pre>	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82	<b>Range</b> 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1 IO2 SL	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14 6.03±0.23 11.50±0.32	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82 11.40±0.50	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH LL CL IO1 IO2 SL IL	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14 6.03±0.23 11.50±0.32 9.00±0.32	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82 11.40±0.50 9.0±0.00	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05 9.00-15.00 8.00-11.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14 6.03±0.23 11.50±0.32 9.00±0.32 3.39±0.14	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82 11.40±0.50 9.0±0.00 3.37±0.18	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17 3.76±0.11	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05 9.00-15.00 8.00-11.00 2.60-4.72
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 54.63±1.37 10.63±0.22 4.96±0.21 16.15±0.41 57.74±4.68 4.22±0.14 6.03±0.23 11.50±0.32 9.00±0.32 3.39±0.14 4.20±0.14	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82 11.40±0.50 9.0±0.00 3.37±0.18 3.65±0.37	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17 3.76±0.11 4.45±0.12	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05 9.00-15.00 8.00-11.00 2.60-4.72 3.58-6.03
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 1.37 \\ 10.63 \pm 0.22 \\ 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ 5.81 \pm 0.12 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42	Clade C Mean ± std. Error 49.38±4.95 9.45±0.94 4.10±0.51 14.95±1.07 48.5±5.29 3.92±0.33 5.53±0.82 11.40±0.50 9.0±0.00 3.37±0.18 3.65±0.37 5.64±0.43	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17 3.76±0.11 4.45±0.12 6.38±0.13	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05 9.00-15.00 8.00-11.00 2.60-4.72 3.58-6.03 5.41-7.63
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 1.37 \\ 10.63 \pm 0.22 \\ 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ 41.87 \pm 2.07 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \end{tabular}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17 3.76±0.11 4.45±0.12 6.38±0.13 46.41±2.26	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \end{tabular}$	Range Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-46.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 1.37 \\ \hline 10.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \end{tabular}$	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11	n=23) Range 51.40-68.63 9.75-14.27 4.17-7.35 14.00-19.90 46.73-90.14 3.76-5.15 4.79-8.05 9.00-15.00 8.00-11.00 2.60-4.72 3.58-6.03 5.41-7.63 35.00-78.00 31.00-53.00 7.00-9.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \end{tabular}$	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00 11.00-14.00	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           0.20-14.00           0.86-1.18	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \end{tabular}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline $4.63\pm1.37 \\ 10.63\pm0.22 \\ 4.96\pm0.21 \\ 16.15\pm0.41 \\ $57.74\pm4.68 \\ 4.22\pm0.14 \\ 6.03\pm0.23 \\ 11.50\pm0.32 \\ 9.00\pm0.32 \\ 3.39\pm0.14 \\ 4.20\pm0.14 \\ 5.81\pm0.12 \\ 41.87\pm2.07 \\ 42.87\pm0.91 \\ 8.75\pm0.45 \\ 13.25\pm0.25 \\ 1.06\pm0.07 \\ 0.29\pm0.003 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \\ 0.30 \pm .0009 \end{tabular}$	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00 11.00-14.00 1.21-1.33 0.28-0.33	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean ± std. Error 59.67±1.15 11.72±0.25 5.79±0.20 17.33±0.34 71.25±4.05 4.36±0.09 6.33±0.19 11.57±0.28 8.95±0.17 3.76±0.11 4.45±0.12 6.38±0.13 46.41±2.26 43.40±1.17 8.19±0.11 11.90±0.15 1.159±0.05 0.29±0.003	Range           \$1.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL HW/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline $4.63\pm 0.22 \\ 4.96\pm 0.21 \\ 16.15\pm 0.41 \\ 57.74\pm 4.68 \\ 4.22\pm 0.14 \\ 6.03\pm 0.23 \\ 11.50\pm 0.32 \\ 9.00\pm 0.32 \\ 3.39\pm 0.14 \\ 4.20\pm 0.14 \\ 5.81\pm 0.12 \\ 41.87\pm 2.07 \\ 42.87\pm 0.91 \\ 8.75\pm 0.45 \\ 13.25\pm 0.25 \\ 1.06\pm 0.07 \\ 0.29\pm 0.003 \\ 0.19\pm 0.002 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \\ 0.30 \pm .0009 \\ 0.20 \pm 0.011 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00 11.00-14.00 1.21-1.33 0.28-0.33 0.18-0.24	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL HW/SVL HH/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 1.37 \\ \hline 10.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.19 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \\ 0.30 \pm 0.009 \\ 0.20 \pm 0.011 \\ 0.08 \pm 0.006 \end{tabular}$	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00 11.00-14.00 11.00-14.00 1.21-1.33 0.28-0.33 0.18-0.24 0.07-0.11	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL HW/SVL HH/SVL OD/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.06 \pm 0.001 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \\ 0.30 \pm .0009 \\ 0.20 \pm 0.011 \\ 0.08 \pm 0.006 \\ 0.06 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range 35.72-62.35 6.78-11.80 2.65-5.53 11.77-17.63 43.21-53.80 3.15-5.03 3.20-7.90 10.00-13.00 9.00-9.00 2.77-3.75 2.55-4.58 4.25-6.82 30.00-45.00 36.00-46.00 9.00-10.00 11.00-14.00 1.21-1.33 0.28-0.33 0.18-0.24 0.07-0.11 0.06-0.08	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL HW/SVL OD/SVL IO1/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10	$\begin{array}{r} \label{eq:clade C} \\ \hline \text{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \hline 49.38 \pm 4.95 \\ 9.45 \pm 0.94 \\ 4.10 \pm 0.51 \\ 14.95 \pm 1.07 \\ 48.5 \pm 5.29 \\ 3.92 \pm 0.33 \\ 5.53 \pm 0.82 \\ 11.40 \pm 0.50 \\ 9.0 \pm 0.00 \\ 3.37 \pm 0.18 \\ 3.65 \pm 0.37 \\ 5.64 \pm 0.43 \\ 38.2 \pm 2.47 \\ 40.40 \pm 1.69 \\ 9.20 \pm 0.20 \\ 12.6 \pm 0.50 \\ 1.27 \pm 0.06 \\ 0.30 \pm .0009 \\ 0.20 \pm 0.011 \\ 0.08 \pm 0.006 \\ 0.06 \pm 0.003 \\ 0.08 \pm 0.003 \\ \end{array}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.01 11.90 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09
Population Characters SVL HW HH HL CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HL/SVL HW/SVL HH/SVL HH/SVL IO1/SVL IO2/SVL IO2/SVL	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63 $\pm$ 1.3710.63 $\pm$ 0.224.96 $\pm$ 0.2116.15 $\pm$ 0.4157.74 $\pm$ 4.684.22 $\pm$ 0.146.03 $\pm$ 0.2311.50 $\pm$ 0.329.00 $\pm$ 0.323.39 $\pm$ 0.144.20 $\pm$ 0.145.81 $\pm$ 0.1241.87 $\pm$ 2.0742.87 $\pm$ 0.918.75 $\pm$ 0.4513.25 $\pm$ 0.251.06 $\pm$ 0.070.29 $\pm$ 0.0030.19 $\pm$ 0.0020.09 $\pm$ 0.0030.06 $\pm$ 0.0010.07 $\pm$ 0.0030.11 $\pm$ 0.003	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           10.20-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm 4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm 0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm 0.51} \\ \mbox{14.95$\pm 1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm 5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm 0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm 0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm 0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm 0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm 0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm 0.43} \\ \mbox{38.2$\pm 2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm 1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm 0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm 0.06} \\ \mbox{0.30$\pm .0009} \\ \mbox{0.20$\pm 0.011} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm 0.009} \\ \end{tabular}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002	Range           \$1.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline $4.63\pm 1.37 \\ 10.63\pm 0.22 \\ 4.96\pm 0.21 \\ 16.15\pm 0.41 \\ 57.74\pm 4.68 \\ 4.22\pm 0.14 \\ 6.03\pm 0.23 \\ 11.50\pm 0.32 \\ 9.00\pm 0.32 \\ 3.39\pm 0.14 \\ 4.20\pm 0.14 \\ 4.20\pm 0.14 \\ 5.81\pm 0.12 \\ 41.87\pm 2.07 \\ 42.87\pm 0.91 \\ 8.75\pm 0.45 \\ 13.25\pm 0.25 \\ 1.06\pm 0.07 \\ 0.29\pm 0.003 \\ 0.19\pm 0.002 \\ 0.09\pm 0.003 \\ 0.09\pm 0.003 \\ 0.06\pm 0.001 \\ 0.07\pm 0.003 \\ 0.11\pm 0.003 \\ 0.07\pm 0.002 \end{tabular}$	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm0.51} \\ \mbox{14.95$\pm1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm0.43} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm0.43} \\ \mbox{3.82$\pm2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm0.06} \\ \mbox{0.30$\pm.0009} \\ \mbox{0.20$\pm0.011} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm0.009} \\ \mbox{0.07$\pm0.0007} \\ \end{array}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.99           0.80-13           0.07-0.08	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           HW/SVL           HH/SVL           OD/SVL           IO2/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.001 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-698           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm0.51} \\ \mbox{14.95$\pm1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm0.43} \\ \mbox{38.2$\pm2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm0.06} \\ \mbox{0.30$\pm0.006} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.01$\pm0.009} \\ \mbox{0.07$\pm0.0007} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm0.003} \\ \end{array}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.10-0.12
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           HW/SVL           HH/SVL           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           EED/SVL           EED/SVL           HW/SVL           HH/SVL           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           HE/SVL           HW/HL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.19 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.11 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.10 \pm 0.001 \\ \hline 0.65 \pm 0.01 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.69	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm 4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm 0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm 0.51} \\ \mbox{14.95$\pm 1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm 5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm 0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm 0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm 0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm 0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm 0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm 0.43} \\ \mbox{38.2$\pm 2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm 1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm 0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm 0.06} \\ \mbox{0.30$\pm 0.009} \\ \mbox{0.20$\pm 0.011} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm 0.006} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm 0.007} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.62$\pm 0.02} \\ \end{array}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-45.00           30.02-80.03           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.009	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.012           0.57-0.77
Population Characters SVL HW HH CL IO1 IO2 SL IL OD EED SED DS VS 1st SC 4th SC CL/SVL HU/SVL HW/SVL HH/SVL OD/SVL IO1/SVL IO1/SVL IO1/SVL IO1/SVL IO2/SVL EED/SVL EED/SVL SED/SVL HW/HL HH/HL	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63 $\pm$ 1.3710.63 $\pm$ 0.224.96 $\pm$ 0.2116.15 $\pm$ 0.4157.74 $\pm$ 4.684.22 $\pm$ 0.146.03 $\pm$ 0.2311.50 $\pm$ 0.329.00 $\pm$ 0.323.39 $\pm$ 0.144.20 $\pm$ 0.145.81 $\pm$ 0.1241.87 $\pm$ 2.0742.87 $\pm$ 0.918.75 $\pm$ 0.4513.25 $\pm$ 0.251.06 $\pm$ 0.070.29 $\pm$ 0.0030.19 $\pm$ 0.0020.09 $\pm$ 0.0030.11 $\pm$ 0.0030.11 $\pm$ 0.0020.10 $\pm$ 0.0010.65 $\pm$ 0.010.30 $\pm$ 0.009	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.69           0.26-0.33	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error49.38±4.959.45±0.944.10±0.5114.95±1.0748.5±5.293.92±0.335.53±0.8211.40±0.509.0±0.003.37±0.183.65±0.375.64±0.4338.2±2.4740.40±1.699.20±0.2012.6±0.501.27±0.060.30±.00090.20±0.0110.08±0.0030.08±0.0030.11±0.0090.7±0.0070.11±0.0030.62±0.020.27±0.02	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.009 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.57-0.77           0.25-0.41
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           HMY/SVL           HD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           IO2/SVL           ID2/SVL           HO/SVL           HO/SVL           HM/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HH	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63±1.3710.63±0.224.96±0.2116.15±0.4157.74±4.684.22±0.146.03±0.2311.50±0.329.00±0.323.39±0.144.20±0.145.81±0.1241.87±2.0742.87±0.918.75±0.4513.25±0.251.06±0.070.29±0.0030.19±0.0020.09±0.0030.19±0.0030.11±0.0030.07±0.0020.10±0.0110.65±0.010.30±0.0092.16±0.08	Range           50.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.69           0.26-0.33           1.89-2.58	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error49.38 $\pm$ 4.959.45 $\pm$ 0.944.10 $\pm$ 0.5114.95 $\pm$ 1.0748.5 $\pm$ 5.293.92 $\pm$ 0.335.53 $\pm$ 0.8211.40 $\pm$ 0.509.0 $\pm$ 0.003.37 $\pm$ 0.183.65 $\pm$ 0.375.64 $\pm$ 0.4338.2 $\pm$ 2.4740.40 $\pm$ 1.699.20 $\pm$ 0.2012.6 $\pm$ 0.501.27 $\pm$ 0.060.30 $\pm$ .00090.20 $\pm$ 0.0110.08 $\pm$ 0.0030.08 $\pm$ 0.0030.11 $\pm$ 0.0090.07 $\pm$ 0.0070.11 $\pm$ 0.0030.62 $\pm$ 0.020.27 $\pm$ 0.022.34 $\pm$ 0.11	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35           1.96-2.56	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.009 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01 2.05 $\pm$ 0.06	Range           \$1.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.10-0.12           0.57-0.77           0.25-0.41           1.63-2.61
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL           HH/SVL           OD/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL           HW/HH           HH/HL           HH/HL           HW/HL	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63 $\pm$ 1.3710.63 $\pm$ 0.224.96 $\pm$ 0.2116.15 $\pm$ 0.4157.74 $\pm$ 4.684.22 $\pm$ 0.146.03 $\pm$ 0.2311.50 $\pm$ 0.329.00 $\pm$ 0.323.39 $\pm$ 0.144.20 $\pm$ 0.145.81 $\pm$ 0.1241.87 $\pm$ 2.0742.87 $\pm$ 0.918.75 $\pm$ 0.4513.25 $\pm$ 0.251.06 $\pm$ 0.070.29 $\pm$ 0.0030.19 $\pm$ 0.0020.09 $\pm$ 0.0030.19 $\pm$ 0.0030.11 $\pm$ 0.0030.07 $\pm$ 0.0020.10 $\pm$ 0.0010.65 $\pm$ 0.010.30 $\pm$ 0.0092.16 $\pm$ 0.080.20 $\pm$ 0.005	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.63           1.89-2.58           0.19-0.24	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm0.51} \\ \mbox{14.95$\pm1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm0.43} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm0.43} \\ \mbox{3.82$\pm2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm0.06} \\ \mbox{0.30$\pm.0009} \\ \mbox{0.20$\pm0.011} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.08$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm0.009} \\ \mbox{0.07$\pm0.007} \\ \mbox{0.11$\pm0.003} \\ \mbox{0.62$\pm0.02} \\ \mbox{2.34$\pm0.11} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm0.004} \\ \end{array}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35           1.96-2.56           0.21-0.24	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01 2.05 $\pm$ 0.06 0.21 $\pm$ 0.003	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.66-0.09           0.10-0.12           0.57-0.77           0.25-0.41           1.63-2.61           0.18-0.24
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           HM/SVL           OD/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL           HW/HL           SED/HL	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Clade C \\ \hline Mean \pm std. Error \\ \hline 54.63 \pm 0.22 \\ \hline 4.96 \pm 0.21 \\ \hline 16.15 \pm 0.41 \\ \hline 57.74 \pm 4.68 \\ \hline 4.22 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 6.03 \pm 0.23 \\ \hline 11.50 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 9.00 \pm 0.32 \\ \hline 3.39 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 4.20 \pm 0.14 \\ \hline 5.81 \pm 0.12 \\ \hline 41.87 \pm 2.07 \\ \hline 42.87 \pm 0.91 \\ \hline 8.75 \pm 0.45 \\ \hline 13.25 \pm 0.25 \\ \hline 1.06 \pm 0.07 \\ \hline 0.29 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.19 \pm 0.002 \\ \hline 0.09 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.01 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.07 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.11 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.11 \pm 0.003 \\ \hline 0.10 \pm 0.001 \\ \hline 0.65 \pm 0.01 \\ \hline 0.30 \pm 0.005 \\ \hline 0.26 \pm 0.007 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.0.01-61.00           9.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.10           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.13           0.60-0.69           0.26-0.33           1.89-2.58           0.19-0.24           0.23-0.29	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error49.38±4.959.45±0.944.10±0.5114.95±1.0748.5±5.293.92±0.335.53±0.8211.40±0.509.0±0.003.37±0.183.65±0.375.64±0.4338.2±2.4740.40±1.699.20±0.2012.6±0.501.27±0.060.30±.00090.20±0.0110.08±0.0030.08±0.0030.08±0.0030.11±0.0030.62±0.022.34±0.110.22±0.0040.22±0.0040.24±0.007	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.77-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35           1.96-2.56           0.21-0.24           0.22-0.26	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.52 $\pm$ 0.066 0.21 $\pm$ 0.003 0.25 $\pm$ 0.006	n=23)           Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.10-0.12           0.57-0.77           0.25-0.41           1.63-2.61           0.18-0.24           0.20-0.31
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HL/SVL           HV/SVL           HV/SVL           HD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL           HW/SVL           HW/SVL           HW/SVL           HW/HH           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           BED/SVL           SED/SVL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HH           OD/HL           EED/HL           SED/HL	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63±1.3710.63±0.224.96±0.2116.15±0.4157.74±4.684.22±0.146.03±0.2311.50±0.329.00±0.323.39±0.144.20±0.145.81±0.1241.87±2.0742.87±0.918.75±0.4513.25±0.251.06±0.070.29±0.0030.19±0.0020.09±0.0030.06±0.0010.07±0.0020.11±0.0030.07±0.0020.10±0.0010.65±0.010.30±0.0092.16±0.080.20±0.0050.26±0.0070.36±0.006	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.99-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.69           0.26-0.33           1.89-2.58           0.19-0.24           0.23-0.29           0.33-0.39	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error49.38±4.959.45±0.944.10±0.5114.95±1.0748.5±5.293.92±0.335.53±0.8211.40±0.509.0±0.003.37±0.183.65±0.375.64±0.4338.2±2.4740.40±1.699.20±0.2012.6±0.501.27±0.060.30±.00090.20±0.0110.08±0.0030.11±0.0030.62±0.020.27±0.022.34±0.110.22±0.0040.24±0.0070.37±0.006	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35           1.96-2.56           0.21-0.24           0.22-0.26           0.36-0.40	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.002 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.009 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01 2.05 $\pm$ 0.06 0.21 $\pm$ 0.006 0.25 $\pm$ 0.006	n=23)           Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.10-0.12           0.57-0.77           0.25-0.41           1.63-2.61           0.18-0.24           0.20-0.31           0.03-0.41
Population           Characters           SVL           HW           HH           CL           IO1           IO2           SL           IL           OD           EED           SED           DS           VS           1st SC           4th SC           CL/SVL           HW/SVL           HH/SVL           OD/SVL           IO1/SVL           IO2/SVL           EED/SVL           SED/SVL           HH/HL           HW/HH           HH/HL           HW/HL           HH/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           HW/HL           SED/HL           IO1/HL	Clade CMean $\pm$ std. Error54.63±1.3710.63±0.224.96±0.2116.15±0.4157.74±4.684.22±0.146.03±0.2311.50±0.329.00±0.323.39±0.144.20±0.145.81±0.1241.87±2.0742.87±0.918.75±0.4513.25±0.251.06±0.070.29±0.0030.19±0.0020.09±0.0030.11±0.0030.07±0.0020.10±0.0010.65±0.010.30±0.0092.16±0.080.20±0.0050.26±0.0070.36±0.0060.26±0.01	Range           80.01-61.06           9.70-11.68           4.09-5.70           14.56-17.76           44.87-65.75           3.72-5.01           5.13-6.98           10.00-13.00           8.00-11.00           3.01-4.08           3.70-5.07           5.25-6.42           33.00-48.00           40.00-47.00           7.00-11.00           12.00-14.00           0.86-1.18           0.28-0.31           0.18-0.20           0.08-0.10           0.06-0.07           0.07-0.10           0.09-0.12           0.07-0.09           0.10-0.11           0.60-0.69           0.26-0.33           1.89-2.58           0.19-0.24           0.23-0.29           0.33-0.39           0.23-0.32	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{Clade C} \\ \hline \mbox{Mean $\pm$ std. Error} \\ \mbox{49.38$\pm 4.95} \\ \mbox{9.45$\pm 0.94} \\ \mbox{4.10$\pm 0.51} \\ \mbox{1.4.95$\pm 1.07} \\ \mbox{48.5$\pm 5.29} \\ \mbox{3.92$\pm 0.33} \\ \mbox{5.53$\pm 0.82} \\ \mbox{11.40$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{9.0$\pm 0.00} \\ \mbox{3.37$\pm 0.18} \\ \mbox{3.65$\pm 0.37} \\ \mbox{5.64$\pm 0.43} \\ \mbox{38.2$\pm 2.47} \\ \mbox{40.40$\pm 1.69} \\ \mbox{9.20$\pm 0.20} \\ \mbox{12.6$\pm 0.50} \\ \mbox{1.27$\pm 0.06} \\ \mbox{0.009} \\ \mbox{0.20$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.06$\pm 0.003} \\ \mbox{0.01$\pm 0.006} \\ \mbox{0.02$\pm 0.007} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm 0.011} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm 0.004} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm 0.004} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm 0.006} \\ \mbox{0.22$\pm 0.006} \\ \mbox{0.26$\pm 0.009} \\ \mbox{0.26$\pm 0.009} \\ \end{tabular}$	Range           35.72-62.35           6.78-11.80           2.65-5.53           11.77-17.63           43.21-53.80           3.15-5.03           3.20-7.90           10.00-13.00           9.00-9.00           2.77-3.75           2.55-4.58           4.25-6.82           30.00-45.00           36.00-46.00           9.00-10.00           11.00-14.00           1.21-1.33           0.28-0.33           0.18-0.24           0.07-0.11           0.06-0.08           0.07-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.07-0.08           0.11-0.13           0.58-0.69           0.23-0.35           1.96-2.56           0.21-0.24           0.22-0.26           0.36-0.40           0.23-0.29	Clade C <sub>3</sub> ( Mean $\pm$ std. Error 59.67 $\pm$ 1.15 11.72 $\pm$ 0.25 5.79 $\pm$ 0.20 17.33 $\pm$ 0.34 71.25 $\pm$ 4.05 4.36 $\pm$ 0.09 6.33 $\pm$ 0.19 11.57 $\pm$ 0.28 8.95 $\pm$ 0.17 3.76 $\pm$ 0.11 4.45 $\pm$ 0.12 6.38 $\pm$ 0.13 46.41 $\pm$ 2.26 43.40 $\pm$ 1.17 8.19 $\pm$ 0.11 11.90 $\pm$ 0.15 1.159 $\pm$ 0.05 0.29 $\pm$ 0.003 0.19 $\pm$ 0.004 0.09 $\pm$ 0.003 0.06 $\pm$ 0.001 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.07 $\pm$ 0.001 0.10 $\pm$ 0.004 0.67 $\pm$ 0.009 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01 2.05 $\pm$ 0.006 0.35 $\pm$ 0.01 0.25 $\pm$ 0.005	Range           51.40-68.63           9.75-14.27           4.17-7.35           14.00-19.90           46.73-90.14           3.76-5.15           4.79-8.05           9.00-15.00           8.00-11.00           2.60-4.72           3.58-6.03           5.41-7.63           35.00-78.00           31.00-53.00           7.00-9.00           11.00-13.00           0.83-1.35           0.27-0.33           0.12-0.21           0.08-0.12           0.05-0.07           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.08-0.13           0.06-0.09           0.025-0.41           1.63-2.61           0.18-0.24           0.20-0.31           0.30-0.41           0.21-0.29

**Table 5.** Factor loadings of canonical variate analysis (CVA) of 31 morphological characters for the 58 specimens of *H. persicus* and *H. romeshkanicus*.

Characters	CV <sub>1</sub>	CV <sub>2</sub>
SVL	39.705	26.865
HW	29.252	18.666
НН	41.437	28.425
HL	45.242	30.248
101	41.148	44.035
002	41.194	10.075
	54.858	11.709
EED	43.834	40.044
SED	32.829	19.96
HL/SVL	-//2.13	-107.82
HW/SVL	-5.962	-7.9426
HH/SVL	-308.6	-118.62
OD/SVL	-931.89	-1818.7
IO1/SVL	-279.09	1072.1
IO2/SVL	1699.7	18.347
EED/SVL	-1404.8	701.88
SED/SVL	2778.4	579.07
HW/HL	251.45	206.15
HH/HL	93.773	-82.777
HW/HH	34.986	9.873
OD/HL	96.726	811.84
EED/HL	387.34	-409.82
SED/HL	-654.89	-34.759
IO1/HL	104.97	-578.45
IO2/HL	-459.2	183.4
SL	18.386	-4.128
IL	-12.804	-4.4937
DS	1.2861	7.2884
VS	7.6616	-0.19007
1st SC	14.834	-2.5593
4th SC	38.408	21.415
Eigenvalue	5.853	2.871
Accumulated percentage of variability	46.65	22.88

of *H. persicus* have a basal position in the phylogenetic tree relative to the other samples. The topology and phylogenetic positions of the Persian gecko of Šmíd et al., (2013) is consistent with their position in our data.

The results support the validity of H. romeshkanicus using morphological and molecular data. Interestingly, our phylogenetic inference revealed that H. kurdicus shares haplotypes with H. romeshkanicus. The new reported species is not representing a distinct evolutionary lineage and is synonymous with H. romeshkanicus. Hence, H. romeshkanicus is no longer endemic to Iran, expanding the distribution from the type locality (Iran, south of Lorestan, Romeshkan, Pole-e-Dokhtar) and the Khuzestan and Ilam provinces (all locations of specimens from clade B<sub>2</sub>) to Iraq (south-western Sulaimani, Kurdistan region). Furthermore, the habitat of the two species is identical, representing by in oak woodlands of the Zagros forest steppe on western slopes separated only by the political border (Torki et al., 2011; Safaei-Mahroo et al., 2017). Hence, distribution of the species might be extended to central Iraq. Probably, the species is synonymous with previous described species of Iraq, Hemidactylus bornmuelleri Werner, 1895 that has been considered a synonym of H. persicus by Smith 1935. However, there is a need to collect specimens of Persian gecko from different regions of Iraq for final conclusion. These findings highlighted deep mitochondrial and morphological variations between different populations of the Persian gecko in Iran. Eventually, three definite species based on the molecular clades could be recognised: clade C corresponds to type locality of *H. persicus* and we therefore use the name *H. persicus* for this clade; clade B with the name *H. romeshkanicus*; and clade A, which might further represent a new cryptic species. Describing new species and studying variation in all populations is ongoing with additional loci for shedding more light on the clades of *H. persicus* in a further study.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was carried out with official permission number 93/17425 issued by the Department of Environment of Iran. We are very grateful to Dr. Salvador Carranza for paying for the sequencing of 12SrRNA gene used in this study and for helpful comments. We thank Dr. Toba Mohamadian, Dr. Saeed Hossenian, Dr. Hamzeh Oraei, Dr. Azar Khosravani, Dr. Ali Gholamifard and Dr. Rasoul Karamiani for their invaluable help in collecting specimens during long term field work on the Iranian Plateau. Thanks also to Dr. Esmaeili, Dr. Sari, Hassan Salehi, Hossein Parsa, Mesiam Ghasemi and Mojdeh Ram for the loaning of museum specimens in their care. We greatly appreciate the work of Dr. Richard Etheridge, Dr. S.C. Anderson, Dr. Jiri Šmíd, Dr. Aaron M. Bauer & Bijan Tabatabaie in editing the English of the preliminary draft of the manuscript and for helpful comments, and are grateful to Frank Tillack for measuring morphological characters of H. romeshkanicus from Berlin.

#### REFERENCES

- Ahmadzadeh, F., Flecks, M., Carretero, M. A., Mozaffari, O., Bohme, W., Harris, D. J., Freitas, S. & Rodder, D. (2013).
   Cryptic speciation patterns in Iranian rock lizards uncovered by integrative taxonomy. *PLOS ONE* 8, 12.
- Anderson, S.C. (1968). Zoogeographic analysis of the lizard fauna. Pages 305–371 in W. B. Fisher, ed., The Land of Iran.
  In A.J. Arberry, (ed), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, S.C. (1999). *The lizards of Iran*. Contributions to Herpetology Volume 15. Ohio: Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles.
- Bansal, R. & Karanth, K. P. (2010). Molecular phylogeny of *Hemidactylus* geckos (Squamata: Gekkonidae) of the Indian subcontinent reveals a unique Indian radiation and an Indian origin of Asian house geckos. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 57, 459–465.
- Bansal, R. & Karanth, K. P. (2013). Phylogenetic analysis and molecular dating suggest that *Hemidactylus anamallensis* is not a member of the *Hemidactylus* radiation and has an ancient late Cretaceous origin. *PloS one* 8(5), p.e60615:1-8
- Bauer, A.M., Jackman, T., Greenbaum, E. & Papenfuss, T.J. (2006).
  Confirmation of the occurrence of *Hemidactylus robustus* Heyden, 1827 (Reptilia: Gekkonidae) in Iran and Pakistan. *Zoology in the Middle East* 39, 59–62.
- Busais, S.M. & Joger, U. (2011). Three new species and one new subspecies of *Hemidactylus* Oken, 1817 from Yemen (Squamata, Gekkonidae). *Vertebrate Zoology* 61, 267–280.
- Carranza, S. & Arnold, E.N. (2006). Systematics, biogeography,

and evolution of *Hemidactylus* geckos (Reptilia: Gekkonidae) elucidated using mitochondrial DNA sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 38, 531–545.

- Carranza, S. & Arnold, E.N. (2012). A review of the geckos of the genus *Hemidactylus* (Squamata: Gekkonidae) from Oman based on morphology, mitochondrial and nuclear data, with descriptions of eight new species. *Zootaxa* 3378, 1–95
- Clement, X, Posada, D & Crandall, K. (2000). TCS: A computer program to estimate gene genealogies. *Molecular Ecology* 9, 1657–1659.
- Feldman, C.R. & Parham, J.F. (2004). Molecular systematics of Old world stripe-necked turtles (Testudines: Mauremys). Asiatic Herpetological Research 10, 28–37.
- Ficetola, G.F., Bonardi, A., Sindaco, R. & Padoa-Schioppa, E. (2013). Estimating patterns of reptile biodiversity in remote regions. *Journal of Biogeography* 40, 1202–1211.
- Fisher, W. B. (1968). *The land of Iran, Vol. 1. The Cambridge history of Iran*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, A. S. (2009). Two new gecko species records for the United Arab Emirates: *Pristurus carteri* (Gray, 1863) and *Hemidactylus persicus* Anderson, 1872. *Tribulus* 18, 18–23.
- Hall, T. A. (1999). BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/ NT. Nucleic Acids Symposium Series 41, 95–98.
- Hammer, Q., Harper, D.A.T. & Ryan, P.D. (2001). PAST: Paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 4, 1–9.
- Hillis, D. M., Ammerman, L. K., Dixon, M. T. & de Sa, R. O. (1993). Ribosomal DNA and the phylogeny of frogs. *Herpetological Monographs* 7, 118–131.
- Hosseinzadeh, M. S., Aliabadian, M., Rastegar-Pouyani, E. & Rastegar-Pouyani N. (2014a). The roles of environmental factors on reptile richness in Iran. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 35, 215–225.
- Hosseinzadeh, M.S., Aliabadian, M., Rastegar-Pouyani, E., Rastegar-Pouyani, N. (2014b). Morphological study of *Hemidactylus* geckos (Squamata:Gekkonidae) from Iran. *Iranian Journal of Animal Biosystematics* (IJAB) 10,175–184.
- Hrbek, T. & Meyer, A. (2003). Closing of the Tethys sea and the phylogeny of Eurasian killifishes (Cyprinodontiformes: Cyprinodontidae). *Journal of Evolution and Biology* 16, 17–36.
- Jensen, J.L., Bohonak, A.J. & Kelley, S.T. (2005). Isolation by distance, web service. BMC Genetics v. 3.16.
- Khan, M.S. (2013). An Addition to Geckos of the Genus Hemidactylus Oken 1817 in Pakistan, with Notes on Morphology, Ecology and Distribution of Species. Chicago Herpetological Society 48, 130–134.
- Kluge, A.G. (1969). The evolution and geographic origin of the New World Hemidactylus mabouia-brookii complex (Gekkonidae, Sauria). Miscellaneous publications Museum of zoology, University of Michigan138, 1–78.
- Kocher, T.D., Thomas, W.K., Meyer, A., Edwards, S.V., Pääbo, S., Villablanca, F.X. & Wilson, A.C. (1989). Dynamics of mitochondrial DNA evolution in animals: amplification and sequencing with conserved primers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 86, 6196–6200.
- Macey, J.R, Shulte, J.A, Ananjeva, N.B, Larson, A., Rastegar-Pouyani, N., Shamakove, S.M. & Papenfuss, T.J. (1998).
   Phylogenetic relationshi among agamid lizards of the Laudakia caucasia species group: testing the hypotheses of

biogeographic fragmentation and an area caldogram for the Iranian Plateau. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 10, 118–131.

- Peakall, R. & Smouse, P.E. (2006). Genalex 6: Genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 6, 288–295.
- Posada, D. & Crandall, K. A. (1998). Modeltest: Testing the model of DNA substitution. *Bioinformatics* 14, 817–818.
- Rastegar-Pouyani, E., Rastegar Pouyani, N., Kazemi Noureini, S., Joger, U. & Wink, M. (2010). Molecular phylogeny of the *Eremias persica* complex of the Iranian plateau (Reptilia: Lacertidae), based on mtDNA sequences. *Zoological Journal* of the Linnean Society 158, 641–660.
- Rousset, F. (1997). Genetic differentiation and estimation of gene flow from F-statistics under isolation by distance. Genetics 145,1219–1228.
- Safaei-Mahroo, B., Ghaffari, H., Ghafoor, A., & Amini, S. (2017). A new species of *Hemidactylus* (Squamata: Gekkota: Gekkonidae) from Qara Dagh Mountains, Kurdistan Region, with a key to the genus in Iraq. *Zootaxa* 4363(3), 377–392.
- Sindaco, R. & Jeremčenko, V.K. (2008). The reptiles of the western Palearctic. Latina, Italy: 1. Annotated checklist and distributional atlas of the turtles, crocodiles, amphisbaenians and lizards of Europe, North Africa, Middle-East and Central Asia.
- Šmíd, J., Carranza, S., Kratochvíl, L., Gvoždík, V., Nasher, A.K. & Moravec J. (2013). out of Arabia: A Complex Biogeographic History of Multiple Vicariance and Dispersal Events in the Gecko Genus *Hemidactylus* (Reptilia: Gekkonidae). *PLOS ONE* 8, e64018.
- Šmíd, J., Moravec, J., Kodym, P., Kratochvíl, L., Hosseinian Yousefkhani, S.S., Rastegar-Pouyani, E.& Frynta, D. (2014). Annotated checklist and distribution of the lizards of Iran. *Zootaxa*, 3855.
- Stamatakis, A. (2006). RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihoodbased phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 22, 2688–2690.
- Tamura, K., Peterson, D., Peterson, N., Stecher, G., Nei, M. & Kumar, S. (2011). MEGA5: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis using Maximum Likelihood, Evolutionary Distance, and Maximum Parsimony Methods. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 28, 2731–2739.
- Templeton, A.R, Crandall, K.A. & Sing, C.F. (1992). A cladistic analysis of phenotypic associations with haplotypes inferred from restriction endonuclease mapping and DNA sequence data. III. Cladogram estimation. *Genetics* 132, 619–633.
- Torki, F., Manthey, U. & Barts, M. (2011). Ein neuer *Hemidactylus* Gray, 1825 aus der Provinz Lorestan, West-Iran, mit Anmerkungen zu *Hemidactylus robustus* Heyden, 1827 (Reptilia: Squamata: Gekkonidae). *Sauria* 33, 47–56.
- Uetz, P., Freed, P. & Hošek, J. (2018). The Reptile Database. Zoological Museum, Hamburg. Available from: http://www. reptiledatabase. Last accessed on 19 Jun 2018.
- Vences, M., Wanke, S., Vieites, D.R., Branch, B. & Glaw, F. (2004). Natural colonisation or introduction? High genetic divergences and phylogeographic relationships of house geckos (*Hemidactylus*) from Madagascar. *Biological Journal* of Linnaean Society 83, 115–130.
- Wischuf, T. & Fritz, U. (1996). Eine neue Unterart der Bachschildkrote (*Mauremys caspica ventrimaculata* subsp. nov.) aus dem Iranischen Hochland. *Salamandra* 32, 113–122. *Accepted: 10 April 2018*

FULL PAPER



# Corticosterone measurement in Komodo dragon shed skin

Annaïs Carbajal<sup>1</sup>, Oriol Tallo-Parra<sup>1</sup>, Laura Monclús<sup>1</sup>, Manel Aresté<sup>2</sup>, Hugo Fernández-Bellon<sup>1,2</sup>, Vanessa Almagro<sup>1,2</sup> & Manel Lopez-Bejar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Health and Anatomy, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain. <sup>2</sup>Parc Zoològic de Barcelona, Parc de la Ciutadella s/n, 08003 Barcelona, Spain

The analysis of corticosterone (CORT), the main glucocorticoid in reptiles, via blood or faeces provides an index of hormone concentrations over a relatively short time period. Unlike these conventional matrices, snake shed skin is supposed to incorporate circulating CORT over the period of skin growth, thus reflecting long-term retrospective levels of the hormone. The present study aimed to assess the feasibility to extract CORT from shed skin of Komodo dragon and biochemically validate the quantification of the hormone by enzyme immunoassay (EIA). Additionally, possible sources of variation in shed skin CORT that could reflect biological variation were examined (sex, age, body region and season of ecdysis). Results of the biochemical validation showed that CORT can be reliably measured in shed skin of Komodo dragon by EIA through the presented methodology. Males presented statistically higher levels of CORT than females, and when accounting for males' seasonal differences, concentrations decreased significantly from spring to summer. Juveniles showed higher CORT values than adults, however, results should be interpreted with caution since the model revealed that date of ecdysis was significantly influencing CORT levels. Besides that, concentrations of CORT were not influenced by body region. Overall, the present study demonstrates a potential biological source of variation in shed skin CORT concentrations due to sex, age and season of skin ecdysis. Combined with other indicators, detection of CORT concentrations in shed skin could allow a systematic control of Komodo dragon's physiology, offering a useful tool for zoo management and providing key data for the species conservation.

Key words: Chronic stress; Ecdysis; Glucocorticoid; Saurian

## INTRODUCTION

he secretion and regulation of glucocorticoids (GCs) through the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis is a fundamental endocrine response to stress (Moberg & Mench, 2000; Sapolsky, 1992). These hormones have glucoregulatory functions and mobilise energy reserves to re-establish homeostasis (Turner et al., 2012). Acute increases in GCs, such as after a severe storm or pursuit by a predator, can trigger a suit of physiological and behavioural changes that facilitate survival (Johnstone et al., 2012; Dantzer et al., 2014). Nevertheless, long-term repeated or prolonged activation of the HPA axis and high levels of these hormones, known as chronic stress, can have detrimental effects on reproduction, the immune system, growth and the general health condition (Moberg & Mench, 2000; Reeder & Kramer, 2005). While there are many environmental factors that can cause either acute or chronic stress responses, several intrinsic factors related to the animal's biology can also influence GC levels (Cockrem, 2013; Busch & Hayward, 2009). Documenting how these biological attributes (e.g. species, body condition, age, sex) influence the stress responses is imperative for properly interpreting how environmental challenges or anthropogenic disturbances impact on animals' physiology (Dantzer et al., 2014; Busch & Hayward, 2009).

In reptiles, most stress-related studies use blood samples to measure corticosterone (CORT) (Tokarz & Summers, 2011), the main GC in reptiles (Cockrem, 2013). However, this method has important limitations. Circulating CORT levels can vary significantly over short periods of time, such as in response to capture and handling, or due to the circadian cycle (Romero & Reed, 2005). To solve these issues, some studies have tested the use of faeces as a non-invasive matrix to evaluate CORT concentrations (Ganswindt et al., 2014; Halliday et al., 2015; Kalliokoski et al., 2012; Rittenhouse et al., 2003). Levels of CORT in faeces have been successfully correlated to circulating hormone levels (Halliday et al., 2015) and also to ethological indicators of reptile stress (Kalliokoski et al., 2012). Corticosterone levels assessed through both blood and faeces are, however, indicative of relatively short-term activity of the HPA axis. Recently, the assessment of CORT concentrations in snake shed skin has been suggested to inform on the long-term HPA axis activity in a variety of species, including African house snake, Eastern Massasauga rattlesnake, Dumeril's boa and European asp (Carbajal et al., 2014a; Berkvens et al., 2013). The advantages of this sample type over traditional ones are that collection is non-invasive, samples are comparatively simple to obtain and easy to store at ambient temperatures. The

Correspondence: Annaïs Carbajal (anais.carbajal@uab.cat)



Figure 1. Collection of shed skin samples from a Komodo dragon. Samples were collected under protected contact using tweezers.

most significant improvement by analysing shed skin CORT concentrations is, indeed, that the window of hormone detection is expected to be extended to weeks or even months compared to the other conventional matrices (Berkvens et al., 2013). As hypothesised, CORT is deposited in the new epidermal layer during its differentiation and keratinisation, and possibly also while it is in place (Berkvens et al., 2013). Accordingly, shed skin CORT concentrations should reflect circulating CORT levels secreted at least since the previous moulting (ecdysis). Therefore, the measurement of shed skin CORT concentrations can be an excellent non-invasive method to assess long-term secretion of steroid hormones for both wild and captive animals, providing useful data for any conservation programme or for captive species management. However, as CORT can vary due to life-history differences or seasonal factors between individuals, validation of this matrix deserves more detailed evaluation.

The Komodo dragon (Varanus komodoensis), the world's largest living lizard (Auffenberg, 1981), endemic to five tiny islands in Eastern Indonesia (Purwandana et al., 2014). The species faces a variety of ecological and anthropogenic stressors, such as the loss of their natural habitat or the increasing human population and distribution, being classified as vulnerable by the IUCN (2014). Studies on free living Komodo dragons are mainly focused on the assessment of demographic parameters, such as population size and distribution (Jessop et al., 2007; Purwandana et al., 2014, 2016). When using captive individuals, most of the studies look at management issues, such as the breeding and husbandry of this species (Ley et al., 2006; Sunter, 2008; Trooper et al., 2004). Research on the endocrine activity can improve our understanding of animal biology since hormones affect many body tissues (Kersey & Dehnhard, 2014). Nevertheless, until the present, only one study has assessed the CORT stress response in a species of monitor lizards (Jessop et al., 2015), while the Komodo dragons' endocrinology remains largely unknown. The analysis of shed skin CORT concentrations in Komodo dragons could be of particular interest for non-invasively assessing stress-related hormones and thus gain further insights into the physiology of this species. Accordingly, the present study aimed to: (i) assess the feasibility to extract CORT from shed skin of this endangered species and biochemically validate the quantification of shed skin CORT concentrations by enzyme immunoassay (EIA); and (ii) to examine sources of variation in shed skin CORT that may reflect biological variation (sex, age, body region and season of ecdysis).

### **METHODS**

Animals were managed following the principles and guidelines of the Ethics Committee of Parc Zoològic de Barcelona.

#### Animals and shed skin sampling

Shed skin samples were collected between March and October 2014 from five Komodo dragons; two adult males, one adult female and two juvenile females, housed at Barcelona Zoo (Spain). Over the period of the study, 39 shed skins were collected with an interval time of  $10.56 \pm 16.29$  days (mean  $\pm$  SD) between sheds and stored at room temperature. Shed skin was collected with tweezers during training sessions under protected contact (Fig. 1). This technique allowed the collection and identification of shed skin samples originated from three different body regions (head, body and limbs) of each individual (Fig. 1).

#### Hormone extraction and analysis

Extraction procedures were performed during the following two weeks after all the samples had been collected. The extraction methodology was performed using a methanol-based technique modified from Berkvens et al. (2013). Each sample was placed into a 15-mL conical tube and first washed with distilled water to remove sand or small stones adhered at the shed skin. Distilled water was added to the conical tube until samples were completely covered by the liquid and vortexed vigorously for 2 min. Samples were allowed to dry for 48 h on a paper tissue at room temperature (20 - 25 °C).

Afterwards, samples were washed with 70% methanol to remove possible external sources of CORT coming from blood or faeces. Once samples were completely dried, they were minced with a ball mill (MM200 type, Retsch, Germany) for 2 minutes at 25Hz. For steroid extraction, between 50 and 100 mg of each powdered sample were incubated with 6 mL of 80% methanol (Scharlab, Spain) for 18 h at 30°C with gentle shaking (G24 Environmental Incubator Shaker; New Brunswick Scientific Co. Inc., Edison, USA). Following extraction, samples were centrifuged at 1750 x g for 15 min and 1.5 mL of the supernatant was transferred to a new aliquot. Samples were then placed in an oven at 38°C. Dried extracts were reconstituted with 0.2 mL of EIA buffer provided by the EIA kit. This reconstitution volume was selected following previous hormone extraction methodologies in other keratinous samples performed by our laboratory (feathers: Carbajal et al., 2014b, Monclús et al., 2017; hair: Tallo-Parra et al., 2015) and immediately stored at -20°C until analysis.

#### Hormone assay & biochemical validation of the EIA

Corticosterone concentrations from shed skin extracts and all the validation tests were determined by using competitive EIA kits (#402510 Neogen® Corporation Europe, Ayr, UK). Manufacturer reported crossreactivity as follows: Deoxycorticosterone = 38%, 6-hydroxycorticosterone = 19%, progesterone = 5.1%, tetrahydrocorticosterone = 2.7%, prednisolone = 1.5%, cortisol = 1.1%, pregnenolone = 0.85%, 11-epicorticosterone = 0.78%, cortisone = 27%, 21-desoxycortisol = 0.24%, d-aldosterone = 0.13%, testosterone = 0.12%, 17  $\alpha$ -hydroxyprogesterone = 0.12%, prednisone = 0.10%, dexamethasone = 0.03%, cholesterol < 0.01%.

The biochemical validation of the EIA was carried out by following the criteria for an immunological validation: specificity, accuracy, precision and sensitivity (Reimers & Lamb, 1991). Extracts from 10 random samples were pooled for the assay validation. Intra-assay coefficient of variation (CV), and thus precision, was calculated by running samples by duplicate. The specificity was evaluated with the linearity of dilution, determined by using 1:1, 1:2, 1:5 and 1:10 dilutions of the pool with EIA buffer. Specificity was also evaluated with a parallelism test by comparing two different calibration curves (the standard curve and a pool curve created with serial dilutions following the standard curve pattern). To test for accuracy, different volumes of the pool were spiked with different volumes of standard steroids of known concentrations (0.22, 2.13 and 7.81 ng CORT/ml). The spike recovery was assessed measuring the final recovery of the known amounts of CORT added to the sample pools. The sensitivity of the test was given by the smallest amount of hormone concentration detected.

#### **Statistical analysis**

Data were analysed using R software (R-project, Version 3.0.1, R Development Core Team, University of Auckland, New Zealand) with a *P*-value below 0.05 as a criterion for significance.

For the biochemical validation, Pearson's Product Moment correlation was used to evaluate the correlation between obtained and expected values from serial dilutions and from spiked pool extracts with hormone standards. The test was also applied to calculate the relationship of the parallelism between the standards and the serially diluted pool extract.

The assumption of normality was checked using a Shapiro-Wilk test and concentrations were logtransformed to achieve normality. A linear mixed model with all data could not be performed since samples were not uniformly distributed among the independent variables of study. Accordingly, three separate linear mixed models, with Komodo subjects as a random factor to control for pseudo-replication, were used. Model 1 accounted for sex differences in shed skin CORT concentrations employing samples from adult Komodo dragons collected during spring. Model 2 tested for age effects on CORT levels from adult and juvenile females. Finally, model 3 tested for seasonal patterns in shed skin CORT concentrations from adult male samples. Shed skins from three different body regions were obtained throughout the study, therefore, this variable was included as a fixed factor in each of the three separate models. Additionally, date of ecdysis was included as covariate in each model. Selection of the best fit model was performed based upon Aikake's Information Criteria corrected for small sample size (AICc). We calculated AICc, ΔAICc (difference between each model's AICc and that of the lowest model) and Akaike weights. Candidate set models were chosen for which  $\Delta AIC \leq 2$ .

#### RESULTS

#### **Biochemical validation of the EIA**

The intra-assay coefficient of variation was  $4.08 \pm 3.35 \%$  (mean ± S.D.). The obtained and expected corticosterone concentrations were significantly correlated (r = 0.99, P < 0.01; Fig. 2). In the spike-and-recovery test, hormone standards spiked with the pool presented a mean recovery percentage of  $103.77 \pm 11.82 \%$  (mean  $\pm$  S.D.) and obtained and expected values were significantly correlated (r = 0.90, P < 0.01). Corticosterone concentrations from the standard curve and the pool curve obtained in the parallelism test showed correlation (r = 0.99, P < 0.01; Fig. 3). The sensitivity of the assay was 0.22 pg CORT/mg shed skin.

#### Corticosterone concentration in shed skin

Corticosterone was detectable in all shed skin samples (Table 1). Shed skin CORT concentrations varied significantly between males and females (Table 2). When testing for age variances on shed skin CORT concentrations, juveniles presented significantly higher CORT levels than adult Komodo dragons although date of ecdysis showed an influence on shed skin CORT concentrations (Table 3). Season had a significant effect on CORT concentrations, with higher levels observed on skins shed during spring (Table 4). No influence of body region on shed skin CORT concentrations was detected in any of the models.



**Figure 2.** Correlation between observed and theoretical cortisol concentrations obtained in the dilution test (Pearson's correlation; r = 0.99, P < 0.01).



**Figure 3.** Parallelism relation between lines from the standard (black diamonds) and sample pool (white diamonds) curves obtained in the parallelism test (Pearson's correlation; r = 0.99, P < 0.01).

**Table 1.** Distribution of CORT concentrations (pg/mg) in Komodo dragon shed skin obtained for the four potential sources of variation analysed.

Variable	Level	# Samples	Mean ± S.D.	Median	Range
Sex	Female	11	11.10 ± 7.50	11.80	0.94 - 23.74
	Male	10	31.23 ± 19.70	25.78	16.9 - 76.37
Age	Adult	11	11.10 ± 7.50	11.80	0.94 - 23.74
	Juvenile	5	58.80 ± 18.50	53.66	33.73 - 78.37
Season	Spring	10	31.23 ± 19.70	25.78	16.9 - 76.37
	Summer	13	12.45 ± 7.02	11.87	4.22 - 25.58
Body	Head	10	21.87 ± 20.83	17.10	4.32 - 76.37
region	Body	14	17.87 ± 11.93	16.00	4.63 - 53.66
	Limbs	15	28.09 ± 26.16	25.58	0.94 - 78.37

#### DISCUSSION

Although the importance of studying threatened species endocrinology is evident, such studies are difficult to perform compared to studies on lab or domestic animals. One of the biggest challenges is that the access to samples is limited, even when using captive individuals. In addition, the invasiveness of most sampling methodologies hinders even more the study of these species physiology. In this paper we present a non-invasive and easy to obtain tool to study an emblematic threatened species which can give insight, for the first time, into their endocrine activity. Results of the current study show that CORT concentrations can be reliably measured in shed skin of Komodo dragons. To our knowledge, this is the first study reporting successful measurements of CORT levels in shed skin of any saurian. The sample processing and hormone extraction method presented here enabled the detection of CORT levels in all Komodo dragon samples. In addition, the detection of this hormone was biochemically validated, demonstrating the suitability of a commercial EIA kit in the quantification of CORT in samples processed through the stated methodology. As affirmed by Buchanan & Goldsmith (2004), this step is of primary importance when new techniques to measure steroid hormones are being developed.

In reptiles, as observed in other vertebrates, sex, age, body condition, health, season and the reproductive state can be sources of variation of the stress response (Moore & Jessop, 2003). We aimed to examine the effect of some of these factors on shed skin CORT concentrations with an attempt to explore the complex interaction between long-term levels of CORT and the physiological state of Komodo dragons. Sex, age and season of skin ecdysis had an effect on shed skin CORT concentrations. In contrast, no effect of the body region was observed.

Although sexual variation in the adrenocortical response has already been documented in different reptile species (Moore & Jessop, 2003), such information on Komodo dragons had never been addressed until the present. Here, we determined for the first time significant differences in shed skin CORT concentrations between adult males and females of Komodo dragon. Grassman & Hess (1992) also described sex differences in plasma CORT of six-lined racerunner (Cnemidophorus sexlineatus), detecting seasonal trends in those differences. These authors observed a decrease in circulating CORT levels from spring to summer only in males, concurring with the period of reproductive activity. To test for sex differences in the present study, only samples shed in spring could be used, hindering the detection of a potential seasonal connection with the sexual variation observed. Interestingly, we also observed seasonal differences on male shed skin CORT concentrations; levels declined significantly from spring to summer, a pattern similar to the one described in racerunners (Grasmann & Hess 1992) and in Texas horned lizards (Phrynosoma cornutum) (Wack et al., 2008). Reptiles can display fluctuations in circulating levels of CORT during the reproductive season (Moore & Jessop 2003), thus the decrease in male shed skin CORT concentrations could be partly influenced by the breeding period of the species. Accounting for the same seasonal fluctuations in females, in parallel with assessment of other reproductive indices, would be of interest to clarify the potential link of shed skin CORT concentrations with the reproductive activity of the species. The present study provides the first evidence that CORT levels detected on Komodo dragons shed skin could be influenced by the

#### A. Carbajal et al.

**Table 2.** Model 1 selection and final model output for linear mixed models studying the effect of sex in SSCC of Komodo dragons.

Model	k	AICc	Δ AICc	wi
SSCC ~ Sex	4	62.9	0.00	0.65
SSCC ~ null	3	65.3	2.42	0.19
SSCC ~ Sex + Date	5	66.0	3.11	0.14
SSCC ~ Sex + Body region + Date	7	71.8	8.90	0.01
SSCC ~ Sex + Body region + Date + Sex*Body region	9	72.5	9.65	0.00
Parameter	Estimate	S.E.	t (df)	P-value
Intercept	2.02	0.25	7.96 (21)	<0.01
Sex (male)	1.28	0.37	3.48 (21)	<0.01

Abbreviations: k is the number of parameters in the model; AICc is the bias-corrected Akaike's information criterion value;  $\Delta$ AICc is the difference between each model and the top model; wi are the model weights.

**Table 3.** Model 2 selection and final model output for linear mixed models studying the effect of age in SSCC of juvenile and adult Komodo dragons.

Model	k	AICc	Δ AICc	wi
SSCC ~ Age + Date	5	47.5	0.00	0.95
SSCC ~ Age	4	53.7	6.19	0.043
SSCC ~ null	3	57.5	10.03	0.01
SSCC ~ Age + Body region + Date	7	59.7	11.58	0.00
SSCC ~ Age + Body region + Date + Age*Body region	9	76.9	29.35	0.00
Parameter	Estimate	S.E.	t (df)	P-value
Intercept	2.02	0.27	7.49 (16)	<0.01
Age (juvenile)	2.01	0.49	4.13 (16)	<0.01
Date	0.06	0.02	3.86 (16)	<0.01

Abbreviations: k is the number of parameters in the model; AICc is the bias-corrected Akaike's information criterion value;  $\Delta$ AICc is the difference between each model and the top model; wi are the model weights.

Table 4.	Model 3	selection	and fina	l model	output for	· linear	mixed	models	studying	the effect	of the	season	in SSCC	C of
Komodo	dragons.													

Model	k	AICc	ΔAICc	wi
SSCC ~ Season	4	49.0	0.00	0.77
SSCC ~ Season + Date	5	52.0	3.09	0.16
SSCC ~ null	3	54.0	5.05	0.06
SSCC ~ Season + Date + Body region	7	59.5	10.55	0.00
SSCC ~ Season + Date + Body region + Season*Body region	9	66.0	17.08	0.00
Parameter	Estimate	S.E.	t (df)	P-value
Intercept	3.31	0.18	18.61 (23)	<0.01
Season (summer)	- 0.95	0.24	- 4.39 (23)	<0.01

Abbreviations: k is the number of parameters in the model; AICc is the bias-corrected Akaike's information criterion value;  $\Delta$ AICc is the difference between each model and the top model; wi are the model weights.

season when ecdysis occurred. Results obtained here provide a further intriguing prospect for future research on the influence that reproduction can have on Komodo dragon's CORT levels.

In addition, we found that shed skin CORT concentrations differed significantly between juveniles and adult females. As reported by using short-term GC measures, baseline and stressor-induced GC levels can vary among ages (Dantzer et al., 2014; Sopinka et al., 2015). A higher metabolic rate in juvenile Komodo dragons

could result in higher shed skin CORT concentrations, as previously described in other reptile species by using conventional matrices (Gregory et al., 1996; Jessop et al., 2000). Importantly, the model also detected that date of ecdysis was influencing shed skin CORT concentrations, possibly since all juvenile samples has been shed on the same day. In order to reliably confirm that juveniles differ from adults in shed skin CORT concentrations, further research should include a larger sample size shed at different periods. Despite differences expected among body regions, we found no evidence of an effect on shed skin CORT concentrations. Previous research on snake's shed skin described higher CORT concentrations in tail sections than in the head and middle sections (Berkvens et al., 2013). Komodo dragons shed skin differs in thickness and shape of scales among body regions, but presumptively, it did not have an effect on CORT levels.

In conclusion, this paper demonstrates, for the first time, that CORT can be successfully measured in shed skin of Komodo dragon with the methodology presented above. Importantly, results demonstrate a potential biological source of variation in shed skin CORT concentrations due to the sex, age and season of skin ecdysis. The analysis of GC in shed skin may be the only method available to obtain a long-term and retrospective measurement of hormonal levels in reptiles. Combined with other indicators, detection of CORT concentrations in shed skin could allow a systematic control of Komodo dragon's physiology, offering a useful tool for zoo management and providing key data for the species conservation.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the Barcelona Zoological Park Research and Conservation Programme Grant awarded by the Barcelona Zoo Foundation. We would like to thank all the staff at Barcelona Zoo who participated in the collection of shed skin samples for this report.

## REFERENCES

- Auffenberg, W. (1981). Behavioral ecology of the Komodo monitor. University Presses of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- Berkvens, C. N., Hyatt, C., Gilman, C., Pearl, D. L., Barker, I. K. & Mastromonaco, G. F. (2013). Validation of a shed skin corticosterone enzyme immunoassay in the African house snake (*Lamprophis fuliginosus*) and its evaluation in the Eastern Massasauga rattlesnake (*Sistrurus catenatus catenatus*). *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, 194, 1–9.
- Buchanan, K.L. & Goldsmith, A.R. (2004). Noninvasive endocrine data for behavioural studies: the importance of validation. *Animal Behaviour* 67, 183–185.
- Busch, D. S., & Hayward, L. S. (2009). Stress in a conservation context: A discussion of glucocorticoid actions and how levels change with conservation-relevant variables. *Biological Conservation* 142, 2844–2853.
- Carbajal, A., Fernandez-Bellon, H., Tallo-Parra, O., Almagro, V., Sabes-Alsina, M. & Lopez-Bejar M. (2014a). Corticosterone determination in shed skin from lizards and snakes: A potential tool for assessing chronic stress. The proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Diseases of Zoo and Wild Animals, Warsaw, Poland, 28-31 May, pp 114.
- Carbajal, A., Tallo-Parra, O., Sabes-Alsina, M., Mular, I. & Lopez-Bejar, M. (2014b). Feather corticosterone evaluated by ELISA in broilers: a potential tool to evaluate broiler welfare. *Poultry Science* 93, 2884–2886.
- Cockrem, J. F. (2013). Individual variation in glucocorticoid stress responses in animals. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 181, 45–58.

- Dantzer, B., Fletcher, Q. E., Boonstra, R. & Sheriff, M. J. (2014). Measures of physiological stress: a transparent or opaque window into the status, management and conservation of species? *Conservation Physiology* 2, 1–18.
- Ganswindt, S. B., Myburgh, J. G., Cameron, E. Z. & Ganswindt, A. (2014). Non-invasive assessment of adrenocortical function in captive Nile crocodiles (*Crocodylus niloticus*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology-Part A : Molecular and Integrative Physiology* 177, 11–17.
- Gregory, L. F., Gross, T. S., Bolten, A. B., Bjorndal, K. A. & Guillette, J. L. J. (1996). Plasma Corticosterone Concentrations Associated with Acute Captivity Stress in wild loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*). *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 104, 312–320.
- Grassman, M. & Hess, D.L. (1992). Sex differences in adrenal function in the lizard *Cnemidophorus sexlineatus*. II.
   Responses to acute stress in the laboratory. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 264, 183–188.
- Halliday, W. D., Gilmour, K. M. & Blouin-Demers, G. (2015). Faecal corticosterone metabolite concentrations are not a good predictor of habitat suitability for common gartersnakes. *Conservation Physiology* 3, 1–8.
- Jessop, T. S., Hamann, M., Read, M. A., Limpus, C. J. (2000). Evidence for a hormonal tactic maximizing green turtle reproduction in response to a pervasive ecological stressor. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 118, 407–417.
- Jessop, T. S., Madsen, T., Ciofi, C., Jeri Imansyah, M., Purwandana, D., Rudiharto, H., ... Phillips, J. A. (2007). Island differences in population size structure and catch per unit effort and their conservation implications for Komodo dragons. *Biological Conservation* 135, 247–255.
- Jessop, T. S., Anson, J. R., Narayan, E. & Lockwood, T. (2015). An introduced competitor elevates corticosterone responses of a native lizard (*Varanus varius*). *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* 88, 237–245.
- Johnstone, C. P., Reina, R. D. & Lill, A. (2012). Interpreting indices of physiological stress in free-living vertebrates. *Journal* of Comparative Physiology B: Biochemical, Systemic, and Environmental Physiology 182, 861–879.
- Kalliokoski, O., Timm, J. A., Ibsen, I. B., Hau, J., Frederiksen, A. M. B. & Bertelsen, M. F. (2012). Fecal glucocorticoid response to environmental stressors in green iguanas (*Iguana iguana*). *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 177, 93–97.
- Kersey, D. C. & Dehnhard, M. (2014). The use of noninvasive and minimally invasive methods in endocrinology for threatened mammalian species conservation. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 203, 296–306.
- Ley, R., Turnbaugh, P., Klein, S. & Gordon, J. (2006). Parthenogenesis in Komodo dragons. *Nature* 444, 1022–3.
- Moberg, G. P. & Mench, J. A. (Ed.). (2000). The Biology of Animal Stress. Basic principles and implications for animal welfare. New York, CABI Pub.
- Monclús, L., Carbajal, A., Tallo-Parra, O., Sabés-Alsina, M., Darwich, L., Molina-López, R.A. & Lopez-Bejar, M. (2017).
   Relationship between feather corticosterone and subsequent health status and survival in wild eurasian sparrowhawk. *Journal of Ornithology* 158, 773–783.
- Moore, I. T. & Jessop, T. S. (2003). Stress, reproduction, and adrenocortical modulation in amphibians and reptiles. *Hormones and Behavior* 43, 39–47.

Purwandana, D., Ariefiandy, A., Imansyah, M. J., Rudiharto, H.,

Seno, A., Ciofi, C., ... Jessop, T. S. (2014). Demographic status of Komodo dragons populations in Komodo National Park. *Biological Conservation* 171, 29–35.

- Purwandana, D., Ariefiandy, A., Imansyah, M. J., Seno, A., Ciofi, C., Letnic, M. & Jessop, T. S. (2016). Ecological allometries and niche use dynamics across Komodo dragon ontogeny. *Die Naturwissenschaften* 103, 27.
- Reeder, D. M. & Kramer, K. M. (2005). Stress in Free-Ranging Mammals: Integrating Physiology, Ecology, and Natural History. *Journal of Mammalogy* 86, 225–235.
- Rittenhouse, C. D., Illspaugh, J. J., Washburn, B. E. & Hubbard, M.
   W. (2003). Effects of radio-transmitters on fecal glucocorticoid levels in captive dickcissels. *The Condor* 105, 805–810.
- Romero, L. M. & Reed, J. M. (2005). Collecting baseline corticosterone samples in the field: is under 3 min good enough? *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part A, Molecular & Integrative Physiology* 140, 73–9.
- Sapolsky, R. (1992). Neuroendocrinology of the stress response, pp. 287–324, in J. B. Becker, S. M. Breedlove, and D. Crews (eds.). Behavioral Endocrinology MIT Press, Massachusetts.
- Sopinka, N. M., Patterson, L. D., Redfern, J. C., Pleizier, N. K., Belanger, C. B., Midwood, J. D., ... Cooke, S. J. (2015). Manipulating glucocorticoids in wild animals : basic and applied perspectives, *Conservation Physiology* 3(1), 1–16.

- Sunter, G. (2008). Management and reproduction of the Komodo dragon *Varanus komodoensis* Ouwens 1912 at ZSL London Zoo. *International Zoo Yearbook* 42, 172–182.
- Tallo-Parra, O., Manteca, X., Sabes-Alsina, M., Carbajal, A. & Lopez-Bejar, M. (2015). Hair cortisol detection in dairy cattle by using EIA: protocol validation and correlation with faecal cortisol metabolites. *Animal* 9, 1059–64.
- Tokarz, R. R. & Summers, C. H. (2011). Stress and Reproduction in Reptiles. *Hormones and Reproduction of Vertebrates -Volume* 3. Elsevier.
- Trooper, W., Visser, G. & Lewis, R. (2004). Komodo Dragon Husbandry Manual of the AZA / SSP & EAZA / EEP. *Natural History*, 1–21.
- Turner, A. I., Keating, C. & Tilbrook, A.J. (2012). Sex differences and the role of sex steroids in sympatho-adrenal medullary system the hypothalamo-pituitary adrenal axis responses to stress. Pp. 115-136 In: S. M. Kahn (Ed.) Sex steroids. Tech Publishing, Croatia.
- Wack, C. L., Fox, S. F., Hellgren, E. C., & Lovern, M. B. (2008). Effects of sex, age, and season on plasma steroids in freeranging Texas horned lizards (*Phrynosoma cornutum*). *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 155, 589–596.

Accepted: 29 May 2018

FULL PAPER



# Temporal trends in agile frog *Rana dalmatina* numbers: results from a long- term study in western France

Roger Meek

7 rue George Clemenceau, Chasnais, France

Reports of amphibian declines have highlighted the urgent need for long-term data sets to increase understanding of population changes. To detect population changes in the agile frog *Rana dalmatina* in Vendée, western France, counts were made of spawn masses over 16 years and road mortalities over 13 years. Long-term trends were evaluated using regression analysis of the logarithmic transforms of annual mortalities and egg masses as dependent variables against year as the independent variable. Tests of the regressions against a 0 hypothetical coefficient, indicative of population stability, gave coefficients that were positive for road mortalities and negative for spawn counts. However, neither was significantly different from 0, indicating a stable population. Further analysis using jackknifing produced a series of pseudo-regression coefficients, which agreed with the true regressions. Results from both datasets were therefore congruent and indicated wide annual fluctuations, with a major increase in numbers between 2009 and 2014. Data from spawn deposition in a recently established pond suggested that the presence of invasive crayfish *Procambarus clarkii* influenced both deposition sites and long-term population changes.

Key words: Amphibians, Rana dalmatina, long-term populations, spawn counts, road mortalities.

## **INTRODUCTION**

mphibians are widely reported as the vertebrate class Amost affected by the worldwide biodiversity decline (e.g. Blaustein et al., 1994; Alford & Richards, 1999; Hitchings & Beebee, 1997; Houlahan et al., 2000; Fischer, 2000; Cushman, 2006). No single contributing factor has been identified in the decline, although multifaceted interactions have been proposed (e.g. Collins & Storfer, 2003). These include time lags in density dependent responses leading to chaotic dynamics (e.g. Wilbur, 1990), climatic effects and habitat alterations by humans (e.g. Hartel, 2005; Gollmann, et al., 2002). Given the role of amphibians as both predator and prey in many ecosystems, insight into changes in their population status provides key ecological information. Current knowledge indicates frequent widespread population fluctuations with high increases in certain years, offset by moderate decreases over periods of several years (Pechmann et al., 1991; Pechmann and Wilbur 1994; Meyer et al. 1998). This suggests that short-term monitoring may introduce a degree of error when attempting to evaluate trends and hence, longer time series are required.

The primary objective of this study was to examine for changes in the numbers of agile frog *Rana dalmatina*, a species found across Europe and listed as under threat in Appendix II of the Bern Convention. It is an example of a pond-breeding amphibian that moves widely across the landscape. Population studies in several regions of Europe including Romania (Hartel, 2008a; 2008b), Sweden (Stromberg, 1995), Austria (Gollmann et al., 1998, 2002), Greece (Sofianidou et al., 1983) and France (Combes et al., 2018) have shown that numbers fluctuate widely but none showed evidence of major long-term declines. There have been few studies of R. dalmatina in fragmented landscapes (Wederkinch, 1988), environments that are universally implicated in the biodiversity decline (e.g. Fischer, 2000). This paper describes changes in R. dalmatina numbers in a fragmented habitat in western France that includes areas of extensive agriculture bisected by hedgerows, woodland and urban areas. Additionally, in the agricultural areas, fertilisers and pesticides are applied annually, including during the breeding season (Fig. 1) and have been implicated as contributing to population decline (Beebee & Griffiths, 2005).

The data are derived from two sources; counts of spawn masses and road mortalities. Egg mass counts have been used in previous studies of *R. dalmatina* and employed as proxies to estimate the size of breeding populations. As the spawn moves to the pond surface (see example in Meek, 2012b), it is relatively easy to count compared to breeding females (e.g. Pechmann & Wilbur, 1994: Grant et al., 2005) and so reduces observer error. In addition, these frogs are frequently killed on roads and in the study locality, second only to *Bufo bufo* in this respect (Meek, 2012a). However, they differ from sympatric



**Figure 1.** Google Earth map of the study locality showing sampling areas for spawn masses and surrounding habitat consisting of agricultural fields, hedgerows, woodland and urban areas. Continuous lines indicate ditches adjacent to hedgerows or woodland, broken lines ditches alongside roads. New Pond and Old Pond locations are also highlighted.

amphibians in that the peak period for road mortalities is during the summer months and hence appear not to be primarily associated with migration (Meek, 2012a). Road mortalities have been used previously to estimate population changes in amphibians (e.g. Meyer et al. 1998), snakes (Capula et al., 2014; Rugiero et al., 2018), and mammals (e.g. Mallick et al., 1998; Baker et al., 2004; Widenmaier & Fahrig, 2006). Road mortalities give only an index of abundance but are independent of spawn count and avoids double counting and autocorrelation.

#### **METHODS**

The study area  $(46^{\circ}27^{\circ}N;1^{\circ}53^{\circ}W)$  is a fragmented landscape dominated by agriculture that had experienced little or no major changes in land use during the study period from 2003 to 2018. The climate is mild oceanic (June, July and August monthly mean air temperature =  $26^{\circ}C$ ; November through to February monthly mean =  $10.2^{\circ}C$ ), with a period of high precipitation usually falling from October until January (monthly mean = 85.7 mm). During the summer months of June, July, and August when rainfall is low (monthly mean = 51.3 mm) it is normal for all but the largest water bodies to dry up. Figure 1 shows a map of the area where spawn masses were counted with key areas identified.

Spawn is readily visible rising to the surface of the water within days of deposition (see examples in Meek, 2012b). Daily counts were made by a single observer each spring beginning February 2003 along the edge of ditches and ponds until the end of March 2018 after which no spawn masses were deposited. Annual peak

counts were derived from the maximum number of spawn masses counted at a site in a given year. Spawn deposition was recorded in three ditches and two ponds in a woodland/wetland area on the edge of the village of Chasnais (Fig. 1). Total ditch length, using the measuring tool in Google Earth, was 1,377 m of which 1,081 m was at the roadside and 296 m next to hedgerow or woodland. New Pond (see Fig. 1) had an approximate surface area of 945 m<sup>2</sup> and was created during the summer/autumn of 2009, with the first spawn recorded in February 2010. The smaller pond (Old Pond) with a surface area of 64.1 m<sup>2</sup> had been established prior to 2003.

Data on road mortalities were collected on roads (total distance  $\approx 16$  km) between a wetland area close to the village of St Denis du Payre and the wetland next to Chasnais. The distance between the two is approximately 6 km (see Meek, 2012a for a schematic view). Surveying for road mortalities commenced in January 2005 and was undertaken between four and six times every month throughout each year until December 2017 in both study localities. Surveys were carried out by a single observer on a bicycle travelling at 5–10 km/hour. Road traffic volume increased slightly during the 13 year period from initial surveying 2005–2017 (see Meek (2012a) for traffic volumes).

#### Statistical analysis

Road mortalities and spawn masses were tested for departures for equality of annual counts using a *G*-test goodness-of-fit at n-1 d.f.. This gives the expected annual probability for spawn mass across 16 years of sampling as 1/16 = 0.0625 and for 13 years of road mortality data



Figure 2. Changes in annual spawn counts in ditches (black bars), Old Pond (grey bars) and New Pond (open bars). See text for further details.



**Figure 3.** Histograms showing annual numbers of spawn mass **(A)** and road mortalities **(B)** as black bars. Open bars represent expected frequencies under a null hypothesis of equality of year counts. See text for further details.

as 1/13 = 0.077. The data for road mortalities were not normally distributed (Anderson-Darling;  $a^2 = 0.996$ , P = 0.008). Therefore to compare variation in annual counts of road mortalities with spawn masses, the data sets were subjected to a Leven's test for homoscedasticity. This is less sensitive to departures from normality and considers the distances of the observations from their sample medians. The test is robust for smaller samples (Box & Jenkins, 1976) and rejects equality of variance when

$$W > F\alpha$$
, <sub>k-1, N-k</sub>

where *W* is the test statistic,  $F\alpha$ ,  $_{k-1, N-k}$  the upper critical value of the *F*-distribution *k*-1 and *N-k* degrees of freedom with significance  $\alpha$ .

To identify long-term trends in population parameters, regression analysis was applied to the logarithms of annual mortalities and spawn masses as dependent variables with year as the independent variable giving

$$\log_N = b + m^*$$
year,

where  $\log_e N$ , represents either numbers of spawn masses or road mortalities, *m* the regression coefficient and *b* the y-intercept. The null hypothesis is that  $\log_e N$  is stable when *m* = 0; significant departures from *m* indicate population change. Departures from 0 were evaluated using a *t*-test at n-2 d.f. (Bailey, 1995). Since unusually high or low year counts may have an inordinate effect on *m*, a test for influence function (Gotelli & Ellison, 2004) to estimate the errors of the true regression coefficients was made using jackknifing (Sahinler & Topuz, 2007). This method has the advantage of giving exact repeatable results by systematically removing one-year data sets from the sample. Regression analysis was re-applied to produce a series of pseudo-*m* values that were then compared against the true coefficients.

#### RESULTS

A total of 836 road mortalities were found in the surrounding area between 2005 and 2017, consisting of 338 large adults and 498 smaller frogs (*mean* number per year =  $64.3\pm42.2$ ). Sexing adults was usually not possible

Table 1. Regression analysis of the logarithms of temporal changes in annual numbers of frog spawn masses or road mortalities
as dependent variables against year as an independent variable. The regression coefficient m is shown with standard errors.
The t-tests and P-values are derived from tests of the true coefficients against a hypothetical of $m = 0$ , which would indicate
long-term population stability. For comparison, data for R. dalmatina given by Stromberg (1995) and Hartel (2008b) has
been subject to the same analysis. Length of the study in years is shown as n and actual numbers of spawn masses or road
mortalities as $\Sigma$ n. See text for further details.

	m	±	t	р	n	source	Σn	Reference
France	- 0.048	0.023	1.98	0.07	16	Spawn counts	678	This study
France	0.03	0.04	0.87	0.40	13	Rd/mortalities	836	This study
Sweden	0.067	0.037	1.18	0.10	12	Spawn counts	1692	Stromberg (1995)
Hungary	- 0.013	0.03	0.46	0.66	11	Spawn counts	4484	Hartel (2008b)

due to carcass degradation due to the time present on roads. Snout to vent lengths ranged from 18 and 92 mm (mean = 49.7±14.1) with the distribution skewed towards smaller individuals (s = 0.34,  $a^2 = 2.19$  P<0.0001). Spawn masses totalled 678 between 2003 and 2018; 397 in 3 ditches, 139 in Old Pond and 141 in New Pond; hence the majority (58.6%) were found in ditches (Fig. 2).

Annual road mortalities differed significantly from equal year counts G = 304.09, df =12, P<0.0001). The regression of log annual road mortalities against year gave a coefficient of  $m = 0.03\pm0.04$ , which did not differ significantly from 0 (t = 0.87, p = 0.40) suggesting general long-term population stability. *Mean* of the tests for pseudo-m was  $0.03\pm0.038$ , which was in agreement with the true m. The test for influence function of road mortalities highlighted 2012 and 2010 as unusually high observations, 2.41 and 2.2 times greater than expected respectively (Fig. 3b). None of the pseudo-m values exceeded the 95% confidence interval (P-values 0.06– 0.67).

Spawn mass counts differed significantly from annual regularity (G = 120.9 P < 0.0001, d.f. = 15). Regression analysis of log spawn masses against year gave a negative coefficient -0.048±0.023 that, although not significantly different from 0, was close to the 95% confidence interval (t = 1.98, P = 0.07). Jackknifing produced a *mean* pseudo-*m* of 0.046±0.06 with the test for influence function indicating 2011 as unusually high (x2.0) and 2013 as unusually low ( $\div$ 2.64) years (Fig. 3a). Re-analysis after first removing 2011 and then 2013, gave marginally significant results (P = 0.04 in both). This represents 12.5% of the 16 samples and suggests a possible moderate long-term decline in numbers. Variances of annual road mortalities and annual spawn mass counts were not significantly different (W = 3.3, p = 0.08).

#### DISCUSSION

Road mortality and egg mass counts showed similar levels of population fluctuation and long-term trends. Spawn mass counts were closer to the 95% interval in the regression and might suggest moderate population decline but the jackknife analysis supported the true regression. Changes in population levels indicating decline in amphibians have been misinterpreted in earlier studies, especially when data sets are gathered over limited time periods and populations fluctuate widely (Pechmann et al., 1991). For example, Pechmann & Wilbur (1994) suggested that amphibian populations are likely to be in decline most of the time, followed by short increases after a period of high recruitment (but see Alford & Richards, 1999). This agrees with the general pattern of change found here and with R. dalmatina in other areas where wide annual variation appears to be the norm, including in France (e.g. Combes et al., 2018). Application of coefficients of variation (Cv =  $\delta$ /mean, where  $\delta$  is the standard error; Scherer & Tracey, 2011) to other R. dalmatina time series gave 0.5 for Sweden (Stromberg, 1995) and 0.29 for populations in Romania (Hartel, 2008b). This compares to 0.46 for egg mass counts and 0.64 for road mortalities in the present study indicating similar levels of fluctuation and long-term trends (Table 1). Values ranging from 0.29 to 1.29 have been found in North American time series for anuran egg masses cited in Scherer & Tracey (2011).

Breeding phenology showed little change during the study period and Combes et al. (2018) found no effect of precipitation and temperature on egg-clutch abundance during the active period leading up to reproduction. However, climate data from the weather station at La Rochelle-Le Bout Blanc (around 25 km from the study locality) indicated rainfall from 2009 - 2011 was higher than average, which is in good agreement with high frog numbers from 2009-2014. The subsequent years of a general decline in frog numbers could involve these high densities, since increases in intra-specific competition in larvae may impact on metamorphosis (Scott, 1990; Scott 1994). Periods of extreme cold can increase embryo mortality by encasing floating egg masses in ice. This was observed during February 2012 (Meek, 2012b) and 2018. Estimates of larval mortalities in two spawn masses in a period of freezing during 2012 that lasted for several weeks indicated survivorship of 2.7 and 3.4% (Meek, 2012b) but inspection of several ice-impacted spawn during a 7 day freezing in 2018 indicated fewer eggs were affected, especially those positioned lowest in the egg mass.

Frequent cohort failure in amphibians is often connected to pond hydroperiod and cited as an underlying cause of population fluctuation (Beebee & Griffiths, 2005; Denoel & Ficetola, 2008). Extensive dry periods with low precipitation, especially during February, may impact on the survival of *R. dalmatina* larvae through ditch drying. This has been observed in other *R. dalmatina* populations (Hartel 2005; 2008b). Throughout the study period water was present in the ditches until around June /July but from 2016 through to 2017, low precipitation resulted in early ditch drying. Additionally, topsoil from agricultural fields (see Fig. 1) drifting into ditches during dry summers and bank burrowing activities of Coypu (*Myocastor coypus*) result in ditch silting and early drying. Larval survival was more likely affected by hydroperiod in ditches than in deeper ponds where reasonable levels were usually present later into summer.

In other areas of France, introduced predators have been cited as partly influencing the reproduction dynamics of R. dalmatina (Combes et al., 2018), which is in agreement with the present study. Spawn mass number decline in New Pond were likely due to the presence of alien crayfish Procambarus clarkii, which is known to impact on adult and especially the larvae of R. dalmatina and other amphibians (Ficetola et al., 2011). The decline in spawn mass numbers began 2012 and continued to 2015 when they reached zero. This trend coincided with first sightings of P. clarkii in New Pond during 2012 with numbers peaking in 2015. However, breeding female R. dalmatina returned in small numbers in spring 2018 (see Fig. 3) coinciding with *P. clarkii* absence from at least 2017. The return of algae and some macrophytes, which are heavily grazed by P. clarkii and mostly not present during peak numbers, suggests the decline/absence was real. Although its natural dispersal capability has been cited as low (e.g. Geiger et al., 2005), P. clarkii fulfils the criteria of Article 4(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament—a species wide spread in Europe and impossible to eradicate in a cost-effective manner (Souty-Grosset et al., 2016). However, an adaptive trait in R. dalmatina may be wide foraging behaviour (up to 1,100 m from the egg deposition site; Blab, 1986) and lack of site fidelity (Waringer-Loschenkohl, 1991; Gollmann et al., 2002; Ficetola et al., 2006) enabling breeding site selection and avoidance of P. clarkii. Five out of nine European species of anurans showed behaviour changes in response to P. clarkii presence, signalled by chemical cues from predated or injured conspecifics (Nunes et al., 2013). Removal of alien species, for example introduced goldfish (Carassius auratus), successfully restored Triturus carnifex populations in Central Italy (Mori et al., 2016) and trout removal enabled rapid recovery of Rana muscosa in North America (Vredenberg, 2004).

A potential weakness in any long-term study of amphibian populations concerns funding limitations and time factors involved in field work. There is also the question of whether or not the study populations form a series of meta-populations with boundaries that are difficult to delimit. Wide foraging and lack of breeding site fidelity suggests that individual *R. dalmatina* may reproduce in areas outside the study locality in certain years. However, the data for road mortalities were collected up to 6 km from the spawning area and when split into an approximate 50/50 east–west geographic, were congruent in both fluctuations and long-term trends. Hence, breeding aggregations may have some continuity and are valuable as sampling sites. Continual monitoring of spawn mass and road mortality in addition to collecting potentially important environmental/ climatic data alongside monitoring to try and identify population drivers remains a useful tool in monitoring population trends (Temple & Cox, 2009).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Rick Hodges, Richard Griffiths, Rob North and an anonymous reviewer for valuable comments on an earlier version on the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- Alford, R.A., Richards, S.J., (1999). Global amphibian declines: a problem in applied ecology. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 30, 133–165.
- Bailey, N.T.J. (1995). Statistical Methods in Biology. Cambridge University Press, UK, pp. 255.
- Baker, P., Harris, S., Robertson, C., Saunders, G. & White, P. (2004). Is it possible to monitor mammal population changes from counts of road traffic casualties? An analysis using Bristol's red foxes *Vulpes vulpes* as an example. *Mammal Review* 34, 115–130.
- Beebee, T.J.C & Griffiths, R.A. (2005). The amphibian decline crisis: A watershed for conservation biology? *Biological Conservation* 125, 271–285
- Blab, J. (1986). Biologie, Ökologie und Schutz von Amphibien (Biology, Ecology and Protection of Amphibians).
  Schriftenreihe für Landschaftsplege und Naturschutz. Heft 18. Kilda Verlag, Bonn, pp. 150.
- Blaustein, A. R., Wake, D. B. & Sousa, W. P. (1994). Amphibian declines: judging stability, persistence, and susceptibility of populations to local and global extinctions. *Conservation Biology* 8, 60–71.
- Box, G. E. P. and Jenkins, G. (1976). *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*, Holden-Day, pp 575.
- Capula. M., Rugiero, L., Capizzi, D., Luiselli, L. (2014). Long-term, climate change-related shifts in monthly patterns of roadkilled Mediterranean snakes (*Hierophis viridifavus*). *Herpetological Journal* 24, 97–102.
- Collins, J.P & Storfer, A. (2003). Global amphibian declines: sorting the hypotheses. *Diversity and Distributions* 9, 89–98.
- Combes, M., Pinaud, D., Barbraud, C., Trotignon, J. & Brischoux, F. (2018). Climatic influences on the breeding biology of the agile frog (*Rana dalmatina*). *The Science of Nature* (2018) 105: 5.
- Cushman S. A. (2006). Effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on amphibians: a review and prospectus. *Biological Conservation* 128, 231–240.
- Denoel, M, & Ficetola, G. F. (2008) Conservation of newt guilds in an agricultural landscape of Belgium: the importance of aquatic and terrestrial habitats. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 18, 714–728
- Ficetola, G. F., Valota M. & de Bernardi F. 2006. Temporal variability of spawning site selection in the frog *Rana dalmatina*: consequence for habitat management. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation* 29, 157–163.

Ficetola, G.F., Siesa, M.E., Manenti, R., Bottoni, L., De Bernardi,

F., Padoa- Schioppa, E. (2011). Early assessment of the impact of alien species: differential consequences of an invasive crayfish on adult and larval amphibians. *Diversity and Distributions* 17, 1141–51

- Fischer, M. (2000). Species loss after habitat fragmentation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 15, 396.
- Geiger, W. P., Alcorlo, P., Baltanas, A. & Montes, C. (2005). Impact of an introduced crustacean on the trophic webs of Mediterranean wetlands. *Biological Invasions* 7, 49–73
- Gollmann, G., Baumgartner, C., Gollmann, B. & Waringer-Löschenkohl, A. (1998). Breeding phenology of syntopic frog populations, *Rana dalmatina* and *R. temporaria* in suburban Vienna. *Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft für Ökologie* 29, 357–361.
- Gollmann, G., Gollmann, B., Baumgartner, C. & Waringer-Löschenkohl, A. (2002). Spawning site shifts by *Rana dalmatina* and *R. temporaria* in response to habitat change. *Biota* 3/1–2, 35–42.
- Gotelli, N.J. & Ellison, A.M. (2004). A Primer of Ecological Statistics. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, USA, pp. 510
- Grant, E.H.C, R.E. Jung, J.D. Nichols, & Hines, J.E. (2005). Doubleobserver approach to estimating egg mass abundance of pool-breeding amphibians. Wetlands Ecology and Management 13, 305–320.
- Hartel, T. (2005). Aspects of breeding activity of *Rana dalmatina* and *R. temporaria* reproducing in a semi -natural pond. *North-Western Journal of Zoology* 1, 5–13.
- Hartel, T. (2008a). Long-term within pond variation of egg deposition sites in the agile frog, *Rana dalmatina*. *Biologia* 63, 1–4.
- Hartel, T. (2008b). Weather conditions, breeding date and population fluctuation in *Rana dalmatina* from central Romania. *Herpetological Journal* 18, 40–44.
- Hitchings, S. P. & Beebee, T. J. C. (1997). Genetic sub-structuring as a result of barriers to gene flow in urban *Rana temporaria* (common frog) populations: implications for biodiversity conservation. *Heredity* 79, 7117–27.
- Houlahan J. E., Findlay, C. S., Schmidt, B.R., Meyer, A. H., Sergius,
  L. & Kuzmin, S. L. (2000). Quantitative evidence for global amphibian population declines. *Nature* 404, 752–55.
- Mallick S. A., Hocking G. J., & Driessen M. M. (1998). Road kills of the eastern barred bandicoot (*Perameles gunnii*) in Tasmania: an index of abundance. *Wildlife Research* 2, 139–145.
- Meek, R. (2012a). Patterns of amphibian road-kill in the Vendée region of western France. *Herpetological Journal* 22, 51–58.
- Meek, R. (2012b). Low survivorship of *Rana dalmatina* embryos during pond surface freezing. *Herpetological Bulletin* 120, 32–33.
- Meyer, A. H., Schmidt, B.R. & Grossenbacher, K. (1998). Analysis of three amphibian populations with quarter century long time series. Proceedings of the Royal Society, London 265, 523–28.
- Mori, E., Menchetti, M., Cantini, M., Bruni, G., Santini, G & Bertolino, S. (2016). Twenty years monitoring of a population of Italian crested newts *Triturus carnifex*: strong site fidelity and shifting population structure in response to restoration. *Ethology, Ecology & Evolution* 2016, 1–14.
- Nunes, A.L., Richter-Boix, A., Laurila, A., Rebelo, R., (2013). Do anuran larvae respond behaviourally to chemical cues from an invasive crayfish predator? A community-wide study. *Oecologia* 171, 115–27.

- Pechmann, J. H. K., Scott, D. E., Semlitsch, R. D., Caldwell, J. P., Vitt, L. J. & Gibbons, J.W. (1991) Declining amphibian populations: the problem of separating human impacts from natural fluctuations. *Science* 253, 892–95.
- Pechmann, J. H. K. & Wilbur, H. M. (1994). Putting declining amphibian populations into perspective: natural fluctuations and human impacts. *Herpetologica* 50, 65–84.
- Rugiero, L., Capula, M., Capizzi, D., Amori, G., Milana, G., Lai, M., Luiselli, L. (2018). Long-term observations on the number of roadkilled *Zamenis longissimus* (Laurenti, 1768) in a hilly area of central Italy. *Herpetozoa* 31, in press.
- Sahinler, S & Topuz, D. (2007). Bootstrap and jackknifing resampling algorithms for estimation of regression parameters. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods* 2, 188–99.
- Scherer, R. D., & Tracey, J.A. (2011). A power analysis for the use of counts of egg masses to monitor wood frog (*Lithobates sylvaticus*) populations. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology* 6, 81–90.
- Scott, D. E. (1990). Effects of larval density in Ambystoma opacum: an experiment in large scale field enclosures. Ecology 71, 296–306.
- Scott, D. E. (1994). The effect of larval density on adult demographic traits in *Ambystoma opacum*. Ecology 75, 1383–1396.
- Sofianidou T.S. & Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou P. (1983). Studies on the biology of the frog, *Rana dalmatina*, during the breeding season in Greece. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 4, 125–36.
- Souty-Grosset, C., Anastácio, P.M., Aquiloni, L, Banha, F, Choquer, J., Chucholld, C. & Tricarico E. (2016). The red swamp crayfish *Procambarus clarkii* in Europe: Impacts on aquatic ecosystems and human well-being. *Limnologica* 78–93.
- Stromberg G. (1995). The yearly cycle of the jumping frog (*Rana dalmatina*) in Sweden. A 12 year study. *Scientia* (1995), 185–86.
- Temple H. J. & Cox N. A. (2009). European Red List of Amphibians. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Vredenberg, V.T. (2004). Reversing introduced species effects: experimental removal of introduced fish leads to rapid recovery of a declining frog. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 101, 7646–50.
- Waringer-Loschenkohl A. 1991. Breeding ecology of *Rana dalmatina* in Lower Austria: a 7–year study. *Alytes* 9, 121–34.
- Wederkinch, E. (1988): Population size, migration barriers and other observations of *Rana dalmatina* populations near Koge, Zeeland, Denmark. *Memoranda Societatis pro Fauna et Flora Fennica* 64, 101–03.
- Widenmaier K., & Fahrig L., (2006). Inferring white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) population dynamics from wildlife collisions in the City of Ottawa. In: Irwin C.L., Garrett P., McDermott K.P. (Eds.). Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Ecology and Transportation. Center for Transportation and the Environment, San Diego, California, 589–602.
- Wilbur, H. M. (1990). Coping with chaos: toads in ephemeral ponds. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 5, 37.

Accepted: 5 June 2018

FULL PAPER



# Effects of chronic corticosterone increases on the maternal behaviour of the prairie skink, *Plestiodon septentrionalis*

Alexander J. Anton<sup>1</sup>, Tracy Langkilde<sup>2</sup>, Sean Graham<sup>2,3</sup> & James D. Fawcett<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE, 68182, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, Intercollege Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, and The Center for Brain, Behavior and Cognition, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802, USA

<sup>3</sup>Sul Ross State University, Alpine, TX, 79832, USA

Maternal care behaviour is rare in reptiles and the hormonal control of this behaviour is less well known than in other vertebrates. The steroid hormone, corticosterone, suppresses maternal behaviour in avian species. We investigate whether corticosterone similarly affects maternal behaviour of a lizard. We artificially elevated corticosterone in female prairie lizards, *Plestiodon septentrionalis*, during egg brooding and assessed effects on maternal behaviour (versus females receiving a vehicle control). The application of exogenous corticosterone significantly decreased the amount of time that females spent in contact with their eggs. These results suggest that, as in birds, corticosterone acts to reduce maternal behaviours in reptiles. This provides important insight into the hormonal control of, and effects of stress on, parental care in reptiles.

Key words: Brooding, stress, eggs, hormone, lizard, parental care, reptile

# INTRODUCTION

arental behaviour in reptiles appears to be relatively rare but does exist. Parental care is widespread in crocodilians (Somma, 2003) and, although there have been relatively few studies of parental care in squamates, there is evidence of nest defence in skinks (Huang & Pike, 2011a,b), shivering thermogenesis in pythons (Aubret et al., 2005) and the suggestion that skinks and pythons actively maintain appropriate moisture levels within their nest (Somma & Fawcett, 1989; Lourdais et al., 2007). Females of some viperid (Hoss & Clark, 2014; Greene et al., 2002) and scincid species (Langkilde et al., 2007; O'Connor & Shine 2004) also remain associated with their young and provide them care and protection. While these studies have advanced our knowledge of reptilian parental behaviours, there are few studies addressing the hormonal control of this behaviour (but see Hoss et al., 2014; Lind et al., 2017).

There has been a great deal of research on the hormonal control of parental behaviour in birds, where parental care is nearly universal. It is generally accepted that prolactin (PRL) induces parental behaviour in birds (Buntin et al., 1991) and recent studies have revealed that PRL can interact with the stress hormone corticosterone (CORT), suggesting a possible role of CORT in parental behaviour. Specifically, increased CORT can cause a decrease in PRL, which leads to decreased parental effort and in extreme cases, nest abandonment (Chastel & Lormee, 2005; Chastel et al., 2005; Groscolas et al., 2008; Angelier et al., 2009). Reptiles are closely related to birds and so CORT may similarly affect parental care in reptiles.

We test the effect of CORT on maternal care behaviour in the Northern Prairie Skink, Plestiodon septentrionalis, a small lizard (70 mm SVL) that occurs from Kansas to Canada. Plestiodon septentrionalis and closely related species are known to exhibit parental care in the form of egg brooding (Breckenridge, 1943; Noble & Mason, 1993; Somma, 2003). During egg brooding, the female remains with the eggs until hatching, exhibiting near constant nest attendance (Breckenridge, 1943). During this time, the female may reposition eggs within the nest, retrieve displaced eggs, or coil her body around the eggs (Table 1). The female may even consume eggs that become infected with fungus in order to prevent the infection spreading to the other eggs (Somma, 1989). We experimentally elevated plasma CORT of female P. septentrionalis twice daily during brooding and quantified effects on maternal brooding behaviour.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### **Study species**

Eight female and eight male skinks were captured from Pawnee and Douglas Counties, Nebraska in April and May 2012. Reproductive maturity was determined by orange mating colouration on the neck in males and SVL above 60 mm in females (Ballinger et al., 2010). All skinks were returned to the laboratory at the University of Nebraska **Table 1.** Descriptions of maternal brooding behavioursrecorded in this study (from Somma & Fawcett, 1989)

Name of behaviour	Description					
Positional Behaviours						
Contact	Female positions herself in contact with the eggs.					
Coiling	Female tightly coils around eggs.					
No Contact	Female is under the shelter but is not in contact with the eggs.					
Not Present	Female is absent from the shelter.					
Active Behaviours						
Biting	Female bites an egg.					
Digging	Female excavates the nest or area around it using her forelimbs.					
Nudging	Female nudges an egg but does not change its position.					
Pushing	Female changes the position of an egg with- out overturning it.					
Rolling	Female changes the position of an egg by overturning it.					

at Omaha. Each female was temporarily housed with a single male for mating. Once females were gravid, as indicated by abdominal swelling, males were removed from the enclosure. Enclosures consisted of 37.85 litre aquariums filled with 2,000 grams of commercial topsoil mixed with 500 grams of sand. Each enclosure contained a translucent red acrylic plate (15 x 15.5 cm, L x W) for shelter and for females to nest beneath. These plates allowed us to view females through the shelters using night vision cameras without disturbing them. Room lighting was on from 0600h to 2000h. Ultraviolet lighting (R-Zilla UVA/UVB 48") in reflective hoods was hung 1.5 metres above enclosures and 50-watt heat lamps were positioned over one side of each enclosure to allow the lizard to thermoregulate. Lizards were fed to satiation daily and water was available ad libitum.

#### **Experimental design**

Females were randomly assigned to one of two treatments, CORT application or vehicle control, which they received each day at 0800h and 1400h. CORT application began the day after oviposition. The CORT application treatment consisted of 45ug CORT dissolved in 4.5ul of sesame oil and the control treatment consisted of 4.5ul of sesame oil (n=4 for each treatment group). Treatments were applied to the lizard's backs using a pipette. Females were not handled during this process. If females were on the nest, the shelters were lifted slightly to facilitate application. The lipophilic nature of lizard skin means that the oil or oil/hormone mixture is quickly absorbed (Belliure & Clobert, 2004). This treatment method has been previously used to temporarily increase plasma CORT levels in reptiles (Knapp & Moore, 1997; Cote et al., 2006; Trompeter & Langkilde, 2011). A pilot study revealed that this CORT application regime resulted in elevated plasma CORT concentrations for P. septentrionalis at 6 hrs post application (baseline mean = 39.1 ng/ml, post CORT-application mean = 67.2 ng/ ml; repeated measures ANOVA: F1,9 = 4.91, p=0.054;

A. Anton & T. Langkilde, unpublished data). Soil samples were carefully taken from the edge of each nest at 0830h, after females had nested. This rarely scared females off the nest. These were analysed for moisture content and water was added to the nest as necessary to maintain these at 20% moisture. Video trials began at 0930h the day after the females had laid their eggs and ended at 1330h each day. Two camcorders simultaneously recorded behaviour of two randomly selected females for one hour, and were then moved to another pair of females. Each female was video recorded for one hour per day and the order in which the females were recorded was rotated each day. Video trials continued daily until the female's eggs were determined either unviable, as indicated by a shrivelled or mouldy appearance, or had hatched. The number of eggs that successfully hatched was recorded for each female.

#### Analysis

Video recordings were analysed using Windows Media Player 12 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA). Videos were scored blind to treatment. Two types of behaviours were quantified: positional and active (as per Somma & Fawcett, 1989). Positional behaviours describe the female presence and position in relation to the eggs within the nest and have been suggested to alter moisture loss and gain of eggs (Somma & Fawcett, 1989) (Table 1). Active behaviours are those in which an individual physically interacted with the nest or eggs (Table 2). Both types of behaviour were recorded using presenceabsence sampling at 30-second intervals. The total observations of each behaviour were weighted for the number of observations made and used in analyses. Data are presented in figures as percentage of observations a female exhibited for each behaviour. Data were analysed using separate Mann-Whitney U tests in Minitab 17 (Minitab Inc., State College, PA) with the weighted occurrence of each behaviour as the dependent variable and treatment as the factor.

#### RESULTS

#### **Positional Behaviours**

CORT-treated females tended to spend less time present at the nest and, when on the nest, were less likely to be in contact with the with the eggs and spent less time coiled around the eggs than did females in the control group (Table 2, Figs. 1 and 2). For all other positional behaviours, no significant effect of CORT treatment was found (Table 2).

#### **Active Behaviours**

No significant effects of CORT treatment were found between control and experimental groups for any of the five active behaviours (Table 2).

## DISCUSSION

We found effects of application of CORT on maternal-care behaviour; females treated with CORT after oviposition tended to spend more time away from the nest. When CORT-treated females were at the nest, they spent



**Figure 1.** The percentage of observations in which female *P. septentrionalis* in the CORT-application and control treatment were coiled around their eggs (n = 4 per treatment). The box encompasses the 1st to 3rd quartile of the samples. The line within the box indicates the median value. The top and bottom of each vertical line represents the maximum and minimum values.



**Figure 2.** Percentage of observations in which female *P. septentrionalis* in the CORT-application and control treatment were within the nest but not in contact with their eggs (n = 4 per treatment). The box encompasses the 1st to 3rd quartile of the samples. The line within the box indicates the median value. The top and bottom of each vertical line represents the maximum and minimum values.

**Table 2.** The results of Mann-Whitney tests for the effect of treatment (application of corticosterone versus vehicle control) on behaviour of *P. septentrionalis*. n = 4 per treatment. Significant results are indicated by bold text.

Name of behaviour	Z	Р
Positional Behaviours		
Contact	0.13	0.19
Coiling	-0.36	0.03
No Contact	0.08	0.03
Not Present	0.16	0.06
Active Behaviours		
Biting	>0.001	0.67
Digging	0.01	0.66
Nudging	-0.01	0.67
Pushing	0.01	0.89
Rolling	0.01	0.31

significantly less time in any contact with their eggs and less time coiled around the eggs. If the primary function of maternal care in P. septentrionalis is to maintain moisture levels as has been previously suggested (Somma & Fawcett, 1989), then less time spent in the nest in contact with the eggs could lead to detrimental conditions and lower hatching success. In our experiment, despite differences in female behaviour, hatching success was low in both the treatment and control groups (only two control females had at least one egg hatch and no eggs from CORT-treated females hatched), possibly due to the soil composition of our artificial nests, and so we were unable to determine the consequences of this change in behaviour for offspring. It is also possible that the nesting substrate and low viability of eggs could have impacted maternal behaviour. Future research should test for additional CORT-associated changes in maternalcare behaviour and for implications of these changes for the females (e.g., effects on body condition) and their offspring (e.g., survival, body condition).

Our results suggest that increases in CORT may decrease parental behaviour in reptiles, as it does in birds (Groscolas et al., 2008; Angelier et al., 2009). CORT has been implicated in the natural cessation of maternal care in cottonmouth snakes (Hoss et al., 2014). This effect may also be mediated by an interaction between CORT and the hormone prolactin, which is primarily responsible for the induction and maintenance of parental behaviour in birds (Buntin et al., 1991), but the mechanism is currently unknown. In species of reptile that exhibit parental care, elevations in CORT induced by anthropogenic activities such as urbanisation (French et al., 2008), pollution (Wikelski, 2001), tourism (Romero & Wikelski, 2002; French et al., 2010) or the introduction of non-native species (Graham et al., 2012) may thus negatively affect parental behaviour and therefore reproductive success.

Even with a small sample size, significant effects of CORT on maternal care behaviour of *P. septentrionalis* were detected, indicating that future studies on this phenomenon would be useful. Further research on the relationship between CORT and maternal care in this and other reptile species would shed important light onto the hormonal controls of this behaviour, and possible implications of increased stress.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank D. Fogell for help with lizard collection and C.M. Rauter for the use of necessary equipment. C.M. Rauter, J.A. French and L.A. Somma provided valuable comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. The research presented in this article adheres to the Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research and was approved by the University of Nebraska at Omaha Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC #11-037-05-EP) and animal collection was permitted by the state. Funding was provided in part by the National Science Foundation (IOS1051367 to T.L.), the University of Nebraska at Omaha Department of Biology, the University of Nebraska at Omaha Committee on Research and Creative Activity, and the Nebraska Herpetological Society.

## REFERENCES

Angelier, F., Clement-Chastel, C., Welcker, J. & Chastel, O. (2009). How does corticosterone affect parental behavior and reproductive success? A study of prolactin in blacklegged kittiwakes. *Functional Ecology* 23, 784-793.

Aubret, F., Bonnet, X., Shine, R. & Maumelat, S. (2005). Energy expenditure for parental care may be trivial for brooding pythons, *Python regius*. *Animal Behaviour* 69, 1043-1053.

- Ballinger, R.E., Lynch, J.D. & Smith, G.R. (2010). *Amphibians and Reptiles of Nebraska*. Oro Valley, Arizona, Rusty Lizard Press.
- Belliure, J. & Clobert, J. (2004). Behavioral sensitivity to corticosterone in juveniles of the wall lizard *Podacris muralis*. *Physiological Behavior* 81, 121-127.
- Breckenridge, W.J. (1943). The life history of the black-banded skink *Eumeces septentrionalis septentrionalis*. *American Midland Naturalist* 29, 591-606.
- Buntin J., Becker, G. & Ruzycki, E. (1991). Facilitation of parental behavior in ring doves by systemic or intracranial injections of prolactin. *Hormones and Behavior* 25, 424-444.
- Chastel O., Lacroix, A., Weimerskirch, H. & Gabrielsen, G.W. (2005). Modulation of prolactin but not corticosterone responses to stress in relation to parental effort in a longlived bird. *Hormones and Behavior* 47, 459-466.
- Chastel, O. & Lormee, H. (2005). Patterns of prolactin secretion in relation to incubation failure in a tropical seabird, the red-footed booby. *Condor* 104, 873-876.
- Cote, J., Clobert, J., Meylan, S. & Fitze, P.S. (2006). Experimental enhancement of corticosterone levels positively affects subsequent male survival. *Hormones and Behavior* 49, 320-327.
- French, S., Fokidis, H. & Moore, M. (2008). Variation in stress and innate immunity in the tree lizard (*Urosaurus ornatus*) across an urban-rural gradient. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* 178, 997-1005.
- French, S., Denardo, D.F., Greives, T.J., Strand, C.R. & Demas, G.E. (2010). Human disturbance alters endocrine and immune responses in the Galapagos marine iguana (*Ambylrhynchus cristatus*). Hormones and Behavior 58, 792-799.
- Graham, S.P., Freidenfelds, N.A., McCormick, G.L. & Langkilde, T. (2012). The impacts of invaders: basal and acute stress glucocorticoid profiles and immune function in native lizards threatened by invasive ants. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 176, 400-408
- Greene, H. W., May, P. G., Hardy Sr, D. L., Sciturro, J. M. & Farrell,
  T. M. (2002). Parental behavior by vipers. In G. W. Schuett,
  M. Höggren, M. E. Douglas, & H. W. Greene (Eds.), *Biology* of the Vipers (pp. 179-205). Eagle Mountain Utah: Eagle Mountain Publishing.
- Groscolas, R., Lacroix, A. & Robin, J. (2008). Spontaneous egg or chick abandonment in energy-depleted king penguins: A role for corticosterone and prolactin? *Hormones and Behavior* 53,1: 51-60.

- Hoss, S. K., Garcia, M. J., Earley, R. L. & Clark, R. W. (2014). Finescale hormonal patterns associated with birth and maternal care in the cottonmouth (*Agkistrodon piscivorus*), a North American pitviper snake. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 208, 85-93.
- Hoss, S. K. & Clark, R. W. (2014). Mother cottonmouths (*Agkistrodon piscivorus*) alter their antipredator behavior in the presence of neonates. *Ethology* 120, 933-941.

Huang, W.S. & Pike, D.A. (2011a). Does maternal care evolve through egg recognition or directed territoriality? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 24, 1984-1991.

- Huang, W.S. & Pike, D.A. (2011b). Determinant of homing in nest-guarding females: balancing risks while travelling through unfamiliar landscapes. *Animal Behaviour* 882, 263-270.
- Knapp, R. & Moore, M.C. (1997). A non-invasive method for sustained elevation of hormone levels in reptiles. *Herpetological Review* 28, 33-35.
- Langkilde, T., O'Connor, D. & Shine, R. (2007). The benefits of parental care: do juvenile lizards obtain better-quality habitat by remaining with their parents? *Austral Ecology* 32, 950-954.
- Lind, C. M., Birky, N. K., Porth, A. M. & Farrell, T. M. (2017). Vasotocin receptor blockade disrupts maternal care of offspring in a viviparous snake, *Sistrurus miliarius*. *Biology Open* bio-022616.
- Lourdais, O., Hoffman Ty, C.M. & DeNardo, D.F. (2007). Maternal brooding in the children's python (*Antaresia childreni*) promotes egg water balance. *Journal of Comparative Physiology* B 177, 569-577.
- Noble, G.K. & Mason, E.R. (1933). Experiments on the brooding habits of *Eumeces* and *Ophisaurus*. *American Museum novitates* 619, 1-29.
- O'Connor, D. & Shine, R. (2003). Lizards in 'nuclear families': a novel reptilian social system in *Egernia saxatilis* (Scincidae). *Molecular Ecology* 12, 743-752.
- Romero, L.M. & Wikelski, M. (2002). Exposure to tourism reduces stress-induced corticosterone levels in Galapagos marine iguanas. *Biological Conservation* 108, 371-374.
- Somma, L.A. (1989). Oophagous behavior in brooding prairie skinks, *Eumeces septentrionalis*. *Herpetological Review* 20, 3-4.
- Somma, L.A. (2003). *Parental behavior in lepidosaurians and testudinian reptiles*. Krieger Publishing Company: Malabar, Florida.
- Somma, L.A. & Fawcett, J.D. (1989). Brooding behaviour of the Prairie Skink, *Eumeces septentrionalis*, and its relationship to the hydric environment of the nest. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 95, 245-256.
- Trompeter, W.P. & Langkilde, T. (2011). Invader Danger: lizards faced with novel predators exhibit an altered behavioral response to stress. *Hormones and Behavior* 60, 152-158.
- Wikelski, M. (2001). Marine iguanas oiled in the Galapagos. *Science* 292, 437-438.

Accepted: 12 June 2018

FULL PAPER



# Genetic diversity of common toads (*Bufo bufo*) along the Norwegian coast: disjunct distribution of locally dominant haplotypes

Serap Şenol Tuncay<sup>1</sup>, Steffen Roth<sup>2</sup>, Fevzi Bardakci<sup>1</sup> & Robert Jehle<sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>2</sup>The Natural History Collections, University Museum of Bergen, Bergen N-5020, Norway

<sup>3</sup>School of Environment and Life Sciences, University of Salford, Manchester M5 4WT, United Kingdom

Little is known about the phylogeographic history of amphibian populations along the western Fennoscandinavian coast. In the present study, we focus on the common toad (*Bufo bufo*) and document the spatial distribution of mitochondrial DNA (cytb) haplotypes at 20 localities along its coastal Norwegian range. Two common haplotypes (out of eight haplotypes in total) were represented by 142 out of the 154 (92%) investigated individuals. However, they were shared at only three localities and clustered at two separate geographic regions each. The most common haplotype (55% of individuals) has previously been found to be abundant across central and eastern Europe, whereas the second most common haplotype (37% of individuals) has so far only been recorded in Sweden. The disjunct distribution of genetic lineages is in line with an assumption that the Norwegian coastline was postglacially colonised both from the south as well as across mountain passes from the east. Our data support previous studies on the phylogeography of Fennoscandinavia that revealed that post-glacial recolonisation patterns led to a pronounced spatial structure of local populations.

Key words: phylogeography, Fennoscandinavia, cytb, mitochondrial DNA, Bufonidae

# INTRODUCTION

he historical biogeography of Europe is markedly shaped by glacial cycles. While initial seminal studies identified the Mediterranean peninsulas as the most important refugia during cold periods (Hewitt, 1996; 2000), subsequent research revealed a more complex picture with further important refugial areas in central and eastern Europe (e.g. Stewart & Lister, 2001; Babik et al., 2004; Schönswetter et al., 2005). Fennoscandinavia in northern Europe is generally characterised by a postglacial recolonisation of lineages that arrive either via existing land connections from the east or via the Baltic Sea, leading to secondary contact zones between two distinct sets of populations for some species (e.g. Taberlet et al., 1995; Kontula & Väinölä, 2001). In addition, specific islands along the Norwegian coastline may represent isolated northern refugia for plants and mammals (Fedorov & Stenseth, 2001; Printzen et al., 2003; Brunhoff et al., 2006).

Due to their low vagility and water dependency, amphibians are particularly spatially structured and are therefore excellent models for phylogeographic and conservation genetic investigations (Beebee, 2005; Zeisset & Beebee, 2008; McCartney-Melstad & Shaffer, 2015). The most comprehensive studies on the phylogeography of Fennoscandinavian amphibians were conducted on brown frogs (*Rana temporaria* and *R. arvalis*), which confirmed a post-glacial recolonisation both via the Baltic Sea as well as from the east (Palo et al., 2004; Knopp & Merilä, 2009; Cortázar-Chinarro et al., 2017). Other anurans such as the pool frog (*Pelophylax lessonae*) only reside in southern Fennoscandinavian areas, where they represent distinctly northern clades (e.g. Zeisset & Hoogesteeger, 2018).

The common toad Bufo bufo (Linnaeus 1758, Anura, Bufonidae) is widely distributed from Western Europe to Asia and is among the European amphibians with the northernmost occurrences (Sillero et al., 2014). However, while its species delimitation and phylogeography has recently attracted significant attention at the continental scale (e.g. García-Porta et al., 2012; Recuero et al., 2012; Arntzen et al., 2017), the specific biogeographic history of B. bufo in Fennoscandinavia has received little attention so far. In Norway, B. bufo generally occurs in the south of the country as well as along the western coastline, where it reaches 68.01° in latitude; it is currently absent in inland areas of higher altitudes (Pedersen & Dolmen, 1994; Artsdatabanken, 2015; Roth et al., 2016; Syvertsen, 2016). The aim of the present study is to determine the spatial genetic structure of B. bufo populations along the Norwegian coast using mtDNA cytochrome b (cytb) haplotypes and to integrate the revealed patterns of variation into previously published haplotype distributions across the species' range. In particular, we investigate whether the Norwegian coast is inhabited by

Correspondence: Robert Jehle (r.jehle@salford.ac.uk)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Adnan Menderes University, Aydin 09100, Turkey



**Figure 1.** Sampling localities and haplotype distribution of *B. bufo* in Norway. Top left: Distribution range of *B. bufo*. For more details on sampling localities and haplotypes see Tables 1 and 2

a single or several genetic lineages attributable to postglacial recolonisation routes (the latter was observed for other anurans at a wider Fennoscandinavian scale: Palo et al., 2004; Knopp & Merilä, 2009; Cortázar-Chinarro et al., 2017). We also investigate whether a post-glacial recolonisation from southern refugia is reflected in a south-north decline in genetic variation, which is expected to arise through serial genetic bottlenecks during range expansion (Hewitt, 1996).

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

Field work was conducted in spring 2007 and 2008, broadly across the entire distribution of *B. bufo* along the Norwegian coast (Fig. 1). In total, 154 samples across 20 localities spanning over 1000 km of latitude were included. Eleven localities were situated on the mainland and nine localities were situated on offshore islands; for two localities (Sandness, SAH, and Hitra, HI), 2 or 3 populations at a geographic distance not exceeding individual migration capabilities (about 2 km) were pooled (Table 1, Fig. 1). DNA was collected from toe clips (opportunistically from fresh roadkills and deceased individuals) and skin swabs from adults using cotton buds, supplemented with a maximum of two sacrificed tadpoles for each locality. Sample size per locality ranged between 1 and 21; to maximise geographic coverage under logistic constraints, numbers were generally lower when localities were at closer geographic proximity (such as around the city of Bergen, see the insert in Figure 1). Samples were stored in 96% ethanol immediately in the field.

Total genomic DNA was extracted using the Purelink DNA isolation kit according to the manufacturer's protocol (Invitrogen Corporation, Carlsbad, CA). A 722bp long fragment of the mtDNA cytb region (excluding primers) was amplified using PCR primers described in Recuero et al. (2012) (F: ATCTACCTTCACATCGGACGAG, R: AGTTTRTTTTCTGTGAGTCC). PCR was performed in 25  $\mu$ l reaction volumes containing 50 ng DNA, 1x Taq DNA polymerase buffer, 2 mM MgCl2 (25 mM; Fermentas, MBI), 0.2 mM dNTPs (0.05 mM each; Fermentas, MBI), 0.5 U Tag DNA polymerase (Fermentas, MBI) and 0.1 µM of each primer. The amplification conditions were 2 min at 96°C, followed by 37 cycles of 30 s at 94°C, 45 s annealing at 53°C, and 1 min 30 s at 72°C, followed by a final 5 min at 72°C. PCR products were purified using the Purelink PCR purification kit (Invitrogen Corporation, Carlsbad, CA) following the manufacturer's protocol and visualised by electrophoresis in 1.5 % agarose gels

Table 1.	Sampling localities and codes,	sample size, loc	ality coordinates	s and sampling da	ates for <i>B. bufo</i> s	amples colle	ected along
the Norv	wegian coast.						

Localities	Code	Sample Size	Coordinates	Date
Kristiansand, Flekkerøy	KRF	18	58.0692N 7.9939E	30.04.08
Mandal, Skjernøy	MAS	21	57.9946N 7.5234E	01.05.08
Time, Kvernaland	ТІК	4	58.7855N 5.7348E	29.04.08
Sandness, Hommarsåk	SAH	14	58.9488N 5.8904E;	02.05.08
			58.942083 5.9415E	
Egersund, Egerøy	EGE	18	59.0175N 5.7803E	29.04.08
Vindfjord	VI	1	59.6538N, 5.6744E	02.05.07
Moster, Revsnes	MOR	1	59.7037N, 5.3937E	02.05.07
Bømlo, Andal	BØA	3	59.6328N, 5.2361E	03.05.07
Stord, Landathørn	STL	3	59.7772N, 5.4685E	02.05.07
Stord, Vikånes	STV	3	59.7765N 5.3678E	25.04.07
Bømlo, Ekhornsaeter	BØE	2	59.7841N 5.2553E	21.04.07
Tysnes, Heie	TYH	3	60.0172N 5.4853E	17.05.07
Austevoll, Huftarøy	AUH	1	60.0418N 5.2651E	17.05.07
Nes	NE	3	60.1656N 5.9369E	01.05.08
Bergen, Samdalsvatnet	BES	1	60.3035N 5.5061E	01.05.08
Øygarden	ØY	11	60.5144N 4.9035E	02.06.08
Bremanger, Myrevatnet	BRM	6	61.8039N 4.9540E	11.05.08
Volda, Ullalandsvanet	VOU	8	62.1126N 6.2320E	11.05.08
Hitra	н	15	63.5165N 9.0323E;	12.05.08
			63.4841N 8.8846E;	
			63.4834N 8.7855E	
Dønna	DØ	18	66.0904N 12.5148	13.05.08

stained with Safe ViewTM Nucleic Acid Stains (abm) and photographed with a Vilber Loumart gel documentation and visualisation system. Sequencing was carried out single-stranded by Macrogen Corporation (Netherlands) using the Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Kit (Applied Biosystems) and an ABI 3730XL capillary seauencer.

Together with the 154 new sequences generated in this study, we also considered further cytb sequences previously deposited in the GenBank database (Genbank UID: 353256652, Recuero et al., 2012, n = 325). Sequences were aligned using Clustal W (Thompson et al., 1994) in BioEdit ver 7.1.3.0 (Hall, 1999). Haplotype numbers (h), haplotype diversities (Hd), and nucleotide diversities ( $\pi$ , Nei, 1987) were estimated using DNAsp ver. 5.10 (Rozas et al., 2003). To investigate genetic structuring in Norway, we performed an Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA, Excoffier et al., 1992) based on alternative grouping of populations using Arlequin 3.5 (Excoffier & Lischer, 2010). Significance was determined based on 10000 permutations and we show the five population groupings explaining the highest amount of variation. To quantify genetic differences between populations, pairwise genetic distances values between Norwegian populations (FST) were calculated also in Arlequin, using sequential Bonferroni corrections for adjustment of statistical levels of multiple tests (Holm, 1979). Principal component analysis (PCA) performed using GenAlex ver 6.501 (Peakall & Smouse, 2012) for the eight populations

with n > 8 (DØ, EGE, HI, KRF, MAS, ØY, SAH, and VOU) revealed whether principle components characterising genetic properties of populations are reflected in their spatial settings. To illustrate the population share across haplotypes, and to distinguish between ancestral and derived haplotypes, Network 4.6.1.3 (Fluxus Technology Ltd.-http://www.fluxus-engineering.com/sharenet.htm) was used to compile a median-joining (MJ) network. The best substitution model selected by the Akaike information criterion (AIC) was TrN+G implemented in MODELTEST 3.7 (Posada & Crandall, 1998). Whether genetic variation of B. bufo populations in Norway is subject to non-random processes such as selection or demographic population contraction or expansion was determined using Tajima's selective neutrality as well as Fu and Li's neutrality test using DNAsp (Tajima, 1989; Fu & Li, 1993).

### RESULTS

All newly produced sequences have been deposited in Genbank (accession numbers KX230483- KX230490 for Haplotypes 1-8). Among these sequences, we found 715 monomorphic and seven segregating sites across the 154 B. bufo individuals, with four singleton variable sites and three parsimony informative sites defining eight haplotypes. The majority of individuals were represented by two haplotypes (Haplotype 1: 55% of individuals, Haplotype 2: 37% of individuals), which were **Table 2.** Haplotype distributions across *B. bufo* sampling localities in Norway. h: number of haplotypes; \*Seven polymorphic sites (invariable sites excluded)

	KRF	MAS	тік	SAH	EGE	VI	MOR	BØA	STL	STV	BØE	түн	AUH	NE	BES	ØΥ	BRM	VOU	ні	DØ	Н*
H_1	1	21	2	14	18	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	7	6	8	9	18	AGGATAT
H_2 H_3	15	21	Z			T	I	5	5	T	2	Z		1		4					AAGACAT
H_4										1											AGGGCAT
H_5												1									AGGATGT
H_6										1											GGGACAT
H_7	2																				AGAACAT
H_8																			6		AGGATAC
h	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	

**Table 3.** Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) of *B. bufo* samples distributed in Norway. \*: p < 0.05; \*\*: p < 0.001. Groupings are shown in descending amount of overall variation explained, and different groups are separated with the symbol •. Va: Percentage variation,  $F_{sc}$ : differences between localities within groups,  $F_{st}$ : genetic differences within localities,  $F_{ct}$ : genetic differences between groups.

Group	Va	F <sub>sc</sub>	F <sub>st</sub>	<b>Γ</b> <sub>сτ</sub>
1. KRF, MAS●TIK, SAH, EGE●VI, MOR, BØA●STL, STV, BØE●TYH, AUH, NE, BES ● ØY, BRM, VOU, HI, DØ	60.32	0.33**	0.73**	0.60**
2. KRF, MAS•TIK, SAH, EGE•VI, MOR, BØA, STL, STV, BØE•TYH, AUH, NE, BES, ØY • BRM, VOU, HI, DØ	60.17	0.31**	0.73**	0.60**
3. KRF, MAS•TIK, SAH, EGE•VI, MOR, BØA, STL, STV, BØE•TYH, AUH•NE, BES, ØY • BRM, VOU•HI•DØ	60.09	0.28**	0.71*	0.60*
4. KRF, MAS•TIK, SAH, EGE•VI, MOR, BØA•STL, STV, BØE•TYH, AUH • NE, BES • ØY, BRM, VOU, HI, DØ	60.03	0.33**	0.73**	0.60**
5. KRF, MAS•TIK, SAH, EGE•VI, MOR, BØA•STL, STV, BØE•TYH, AUH, NE, BES, ØY • BRM, VOU, HI, DØ	59.91	0.38**	0.73**	0.60**



**Figure 2.** Principal Coordinates Analysis of eight *B. bufo* populations based on  $F_{\rm st}$  values for cytb sequences. Percentages explaining variation by axes are shown; only localities with a minimum of eight sequenced haplotypes are considered.

shared in only three localities (KRF, TIK, ØY; Fig. 1, Table 2). Remarkably, both haplotypes were clustered at two separate regions across our study area. Haplotype 1 was dominant in two populations south of Stavanger (SAH and EGE) as well as in the northernmost populations (AUH, BES, ØI, BRM, VOU, HI, and DØ), whereas Haplotype 2 predominated in the southernmost localities (KRF and MAS) as well as around the city of Bergen (VI, MOR, BØA, STL, BØE, TYH). Four further haplotypes were represented by a single individual across three localities, in addition to two site-specific haplotypes represented by two and six individuals each, respectively (Table 2).

Corresponding to haplotype numbers and distributions, overall measures of haplotype and nucleotide diversities in Norway were estimated as 0.560 and 0.001, respectively. Tajima's D was not significantly

negative (D = -1.08, p > 0.05), suggesting a lack of selection on the cytb locus across all Norwegian populations. Fu and Li's test was however significantly negative (D = -2.54, p < 0.05; F = -2.42, p < 0.05), suggesting either positive selection or population expansion of Norwegian populations. Genetic differentiation among localities was overall high ( $F_{st}$ : 0.71, p<0.001, see Supplementary Materials, Table 1 for pairwise comparisons between populations). The disjunct distribution of major haplotypes resulted in main principle components which do not represent geographic settings (Fig. 2). The first axis explained > 99% of the observed variation and distinguished all populations fixed for Haplotype 1 (SAH, EGE, VOU and  $D\emptyset$ ) from populations dominated by or fixed for Haplotype 2 (KRF, MAS, ØY and HI). The five most likely groupings revealed by the AMOVA explained at least 59.91% of the observed variation (Table 3). The highest support was found for a grouping that identified six population clusters, three of which corresponded to the distribution of the two common haplotypes as outlined above; the remaining three clusters encompassed the populations around Bergen which are represented by low sample sizes. Other groupings comprised at least five clusters, and all groupings contained two identical clusters comprised of the five southernmost localities (Table 3). The haplotype network presents Haplotype 2, which comprises the two southernmost populations as well as the populations around Bergen, as ancestral (Fig. 3).

Integrating our findings into existing knowledge of mtDNA cytb haplotype distribution across the range of *B. bufo* (Recuero et al., 2012) revealed that the common Haplotype 1 is widespread in eastern Europe, whereas our second-most common Haplotype 2 as well as

🗣 KRF 🤚 MAS 📒 TIK 🕘 SAH 🕘 EGE 🌑 VI 🌑 MOR 🥌 BØA 🥮 STL 🌑 STV 🌑 BØE 💿 TYH 🥥 AUH 🜑 NE 💿 BES 🛑 ØY 🌑 BRM 🚳 VOU 👁 HI 🚳 DØ



**Figure 3.** Median Joining Haplotype Network of *B. bufo* cytb sequences distributed along the Norwegian coast. Nucleotide positions of mutated sites are showed as numbers; shared haplotypes are divided into colours representing populations.

Haplotype 8 (represented by six individuals at a second northernmost locality) have previously been found only in Sweden (Supplementary Materials, Table 2). Our five rare haplotypes (Haplotypes 3-7, represented by one or two individuals each) have not previously been found elsewhere in the species' range.

#### DISCUSSION

Our findings from coastal Norwegian mtDNA haplotypes in B. bufo are generally in line with previous studies on Fennoscandinavian amphibians, which revealed pronounced spatial genetic structuring linked to a post-glacial recolonisation which took place from different directions (Palo et al., 2004; Knopp & Merilä, 2009; Cortázar-Chinarro et al., 2017). The significant diversity of haplotypes harboured by the study area also conforms to a previous spatially more-restricted study, which revealed high levels of genetic variation at the level of nuclear microsatellite markers (Roth & Jehle, 2016). Our study is, however, hampered by low sample sizes for some of the localities, which, jointly with their rather uneven spatial distribution, precludes a fine-scale capture of genetic variation at local levels. Four of the eight encountered haplotypes are represented by a single individual and have not been previously found elsewhere in Europe. As we were unable to repeat amplification and sequencing of these samples we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that these four haplotypes may be the result of PCR or sequencing errors, but consider it unlikely. Although introductions of B. bufo to offshore islands are occasionally reported (Dolmen & Seland, 2016), we assume that our populations are generally of natural origin (see also Roth & Jehle, 2016).

In contrast to previous work that covered larger areas in Sweden and Finland (e.g. Knopp & Merilä, 2009;

see also e.g. Taberlet et al., 1995 for an early study on mammals), we did not reveal a single zone dividing northern populations from their southern counterparts. It is noteworthy that Haplotype 1, represented by more than half of our study individuals and common in central and eastern Europe, has not previously been found among eight B. bufo individuals from Sweden (Recuero et al., 2012). This suggests that this haplotype represents a genetic lineage that might have colonised the Norwegian coast from the Baltic Sea, an area that is also at closer geographic proximity to our study area than eastern land bridges into Fennoscandinavia. Haplotypes 2 and 8, together comprising 41% of our study individuals, have previously been found in adjacent Sweden but so far remained unreported elsewhere across the B. bufo range (Recuero et al., 2012). We were however unable to draw any conclusive inferences about their origins compared to the other haplotypes observed, as Haplotype 2 was characterised as ancestral whereas Haplotype 8 was characterised as distal in the MJ network. Denser sampling and a consideration of additional mitochondrial and nuclear loci is desirable to reveal whether Fennoscandinavia is inhabited by unique genetic lineages of B. bufo.

Amphibian species residing in Norway are generally distributed across southern parts of the country as well as along the coast (e.g. Dolmen, 1982; Sillero et al., 2014). The significant signature of population expansion based on Fu and Li's neutrality test is generally in line with the hypothesis that *B. bufo* recolonised our study area after cold periods. Our study did however not reveal a gradual reduction of genetic variation towards northern regions in line with the assumption that recolonisation took place only uni-directionally from south to north. That the post-glacial recolonisation did not take place exclusively northward is also supported by the disjunct alternating distribution of the two dominant haplotypes, which, due to their fixed nature in the majority of localities where they occur, is unlikely caused by for example incomplete lineage sorting. Mutations arising during expansions would also lead to range-edge haplotypes being distally positioned in a haplotype network. This is the case for Haplotype 8, which is only found towards the northern edge of the *B. bufo* range (HI).

Based on distribution data of urodeles, Dolmen (1982) already suggested that amphibians might have reached the central Norwegian coast also from Jämtland in Sweden through mountain passes during temporarily more favourable climatic conditions during the Atlantic (5500-300 B.C.) and/or sub-boreal (3000 - 500 B.C.) age (see also Gislen & Kauri, 1959, as well as, for example, O'Brien et al. (2015) for another range expansion by a Northern European amphibian at similar spatial and temporal scales). Indeed, the distribution of Haplotypes 2 and 8 would be in line with the hypothesis that genetic lineages documented for Sweden reached central Norway around Bergen, as well as Hitra more than 500 km further north, across the currently unoccupied terrain of the Scandinavian mountain range. Wider sampling across Norway and Sweden is required to for example reveal why Haplotype 2 is also dominant at the two southernmost localities.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was carried out in conformity with the Norwegian legislation (forsøksdyrforskriften). We are grateful to Donal Smith for his help with compiling Figure 1.

## REFERENCES

- Arntzen, J.W., de Vries, W., Canestrelli, D. & Martínez-Solano, I. (2017). Hybrid zone formation and contrasting outcomes of secondary contact over transects in common toads. *Molecular Ecology* 26, 5663-5675.
- Artsdatabanken (2015). Nordpadde *Bufo bufo*. Species map service 1.6. http://artskart.artsdatabanken.no/ FaneArtSok.aspx.
- Babik W., Branicki W., Sandera, M., Litvinchuk, S., Borkin L. J., Irwin, J. T. & Rafinski, J. (2004). Mitochondrial phylogeography of the moor frog, *Rana arvalis*. *Molecular Ecology* 13, 1469–1480.
- Beebee, T.J.C. (2005). Conservation genetics of amphibians. *Heredity* 95, 423–427.
- Brunhoff, C., Yoccoz, N. G., Ims, R. A. & Jaarola, M. (2006). Glacial survival or late glacial colonization? Phylogeography of the root vole (*Microtus oeconomus*) in north-west Norway. *Journal of Biogeography* 33, 2136-2144.
- Cortázar-Chinarro, M., Lattenkamp, E. Z., Meyer-Lucht, Y., Luquet, E., Laurila, A. & Höglund, J. (2017). Drift, selection, or migration? Processes affecting genetic differentiation and variation along a latitudinal gradient in an amphibian. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 17, 189.
- Dolmen, D. (1982). Zoogeography of *Triturus vulgaris* and *T. cristatus* (Laurenti) (Amphibia) in Norway, with notes on their vulnerability. *Fauna Norvegica Ser. A* 3, 12-25.

disperse? Introductions, distribution and dispersal of the common frog *Rana temporaria* and the common toad *Bufo bufo* on a coastal island in Central Norway. *Fauna Norvegica* 36, 33-46.

- Excoffier, L., Smouse, P. E. & Quattro, J.M. (1992). Analysis of molecular variance inferred from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: Application to human mitochondrial DNA restriction data. *Genetics* 131, 479–491.
- Excoffier, L., & Lischer, H. E. L. (2010). Arlequin suite ver 3.5: A new series of programs to perform population genetics analyses under Linux and Windows. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 10, 564–567.
- Fedorov, V.B. & Stenseth, N.C. (2001). Glacial survival of the Norwegian lemming (*Lemmus lemmus*) in Scandinavia: inference from mitochondrial DNA variation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* B 268, 809–814.
- Fu, Y.-X. & Li, W.-H. (1993). Statistical tests of neutrality of mutations. *Genetics* 133, 693–709.
- García-Porta, J., Litvinchuk, S.N., Crochet, P.A., Romano, A., Geniez, P.H., Lo-Valvo., M., Lymberakis, P. & Carranza, S. (2012). Molecular phylogenetics and historical biogeography of the westpalearctic common toads (*Bufo bufo* species complex). *Molecular Phylogenetics* and Evolution 63, 113-130.
- Gislen, T. & Kauri, H. (1959). Zoogeography of the Swedish amphibians and reptiles with notes on their growth and ecology. *Acta Vertebratica* 1, 193-397.
- Hewitt, G. M. (1996). Some genetic consequences of ice ages, and their role in divergence and speciation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 58, 247–276.
- Hewitt, G. M. (2000) The genetic legacy of the Quaternary ice ages. *Nature* 405, 907–913.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 6, 65–70.
- Hall, T. A. (1999). Bioedit: a user friendly biological sequence aligment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. *Nucleic Acids Symposium Series* 41, 95–98.
- Knopp, T. & Merilä, J. (2009). The postglacial recolonization of northern Europe by *Rana arvalis* as revealed by microsatellite and mitochondrial DNA analyses. *Heredity* 102, 174-181.
- Kontula T. & Väinölä R. (2001). Postglacial colonization of northern Europe by distinct phylogeographic lineages of the bullhead, *Cottos gobio*. *Molecular Ecology* 10, 1983–2002.
- McCartney-Melstad E., Shaffer H. B. (2015). Amphibian molecular ecology and how it has informed conservation. *Molecular Ecology* 24, 5084–5109.
- Nei, M. (1987). Molecular evolutionary genetics. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- O'Brien, C. D., Hall, J. E., Orchard, D., Barratt, C., Arntzen, J. W. & Jehle, R. (2015). Extending the natural range of a declining species: Genetic evidence for native great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) populations in the Scottish Highlands. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 61, 27-33.
- Palo, J. U., Schmeller, D., Laurila, A., Primmer, C. R., Kuzmin,S. I. & Merilä, J. (2004). High degree of population subdivision in a widespread amphibian. *Molecular*

Dolmen, D. & Seland, J. (2016). How fast do amphibians

Ecology 13, 2631-2644.

- Peakall, R. & Smouse, P. E. (2012). GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research-an update. *Bioinformatics* 28, 2537–2539.
- Pedersen, J. & Dolmen, D. (1994). Dønna ny nordgrense for padde i Norge. *Fauna* 47, 177.
- Posada, D. & Crandall, K. A. (1998). Modeltest: testing the model of DNA substitution. *Bionformatics* 14, 817–818.
- Printzen, C., Ekman, S. & Tønsberg, T. (2003). Phylogeography of Cavernularia hultenii: evidence of slow genetic drift in a widely disjunct lichen. *Molecular Ecology* 12, 1473–1486.
- Recuero, E., Canestrelli D., Voros J., Szabo K., Poyarkov N. A., Arntzen J. W., Crnobrnja Isailovic J., Kidov A. A., Cogalniceanu D., Caputo F. P., Nascetti G. & Martínez-Solano I. (2012). Multilocus species tree analyses resolve the radiation of the widespread *Bufo bufo* species group (Anura, Bufonidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 62, 71–86.
- Roth, S. & Jehle, R. (2016). High genetic diversity of common toad (*Bufo bufo*) populations under strong natural fragmentation on a northern archipelago. *Ecology and Evolution* 6, 1626–1636.
- Roth, S., Dolmen, D., Nes, K., Olsen, O., Wangen, G. & Scheidt, U. (2016). Large populations of the common toad *Bufo bufo* in Norway. *Herpetology Notes* 9, 325-330.
- Rozas, J., Sanchez-Del Barrio, J.C., Messeguer, X. & Rozas, R. (2003). DnaSP: DNA polymorphism analyses by the coalescent and other methods. *Bioinformatics* 19, 2496–2497.
- Schönswetter, P., Stehlik, I., Holderegger, R. & Tribsch, A. (2005). Molecular evidence for glacial refugia of mountain plants in the European Alps. *Molecular Ecology* 14, 3547–3555.

- Sillero, N., Campos, J., Bonardi, A., Corti, C., Creemers, R., Crochet, P.-A., Crnobrnja-Isailović, J., Denoël, M., Ficetola, G. F., Gonçalves, J., Kuzmin, S., Lymberakis, P., de Pous, P., Rodríguez, A., Sindaco, R., Speybroeck, J., Toxopeus, B., Vieites, D. R. & Vences M. (2014). Updated distribution and biogeography of amphibians and reptiles of Europe. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 35, 1-31.
- Stewart, J. R. & Lister, A. M. (2001). Cryptic northern refugia and the origins of the modern biota. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 16, 608–613.
- Syvertsen, P.O. (2016). The common toad *Bufo bufo* in Nordland County, northern Norway. *Fauna 69*, 108-112.
- Taberlet, P., Swenson, J. E., Sandegren, F. & Bjärvall, A. (1995). Localization of a contact zone between two highly divergent mitochondrial DNA lineages of the brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) in Scandinavia. *Conservation Biology* 9, 1255–1261.
- Tajima, F. (1989). Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA polymorphism. *Genetics* 123, 585–595.
- Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G. & Gibson T.J. (1994). CLUSTAL W: improving the sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleic Acids Research* 22, 4673–4680.
- Zeisset, I. & Beebee, T. J. C. (2008). Amphibian phylogeography: a model for understanding historical aspects of species distributions. *Heredity* 101, 109– 119.
- Zeisset, I. & Hoogesteger, T. (2018). A reassessment of the biogeographic range of northern clade pool frogs (*Pelophylax lessonae*). *Herpetological Journal* 28, 63-72.

Accepted: 20 June 2018

Please note that the Supplementary Material is available online via the Herpetological Journal website: https:// thebhs.org/publications/the-herpetological-journal/volume-28-3-july-2018

SHORT NOTE



# Evidence of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*, Linnaeus, 1758) injuries caused by Rapido (beam) trawling in the Mediterranean

Alessandro Lucchetti<sup>1</sup>, Valeria Angelini<sup>2</sup>, Giovanni Furii<sup>3</sup>, Sauro Pari<sup>2</sup>, Claudio Vasapollo<sup>1</sup>, Massimo Virgili<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Research Council (CNR), Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) of Ancona, Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 - 60125 Ancona, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Fondazione Cetacea Onlus, Viale Torino 7/A - 47838 Riccione, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Legambiente, Marine Turtle Rescue Centre - Manfredonia, Italy

The loggerhead turtle (Caretta caretta, Linnaeus, 1758) is the most abundant sea turtle species in the Mediterranean Sea, where commercial fishing appears to be the main driver of mortality. The North Adriatic Sea (central Mediterranean) is a major feeding habitat for turtles in the demersal stage. Its shallow and flat seabed is ideal for bottom-towed gears, making interactions with sea turtles and incidental catches unavoidable. We provide evidence of the impact of Rapido trawls (a type of beam trawl) on sea turtles through the analysis of the distinctive injuries sustained by four turtles.

Key words: Caretta caretta; Loggerhead turtle; Sea turtlefisheries interaction, Rapido trawl, Sea turtle injuries, Mediterranean Sea.

he loggerhead turtle (Caretta caretta, Linnaeus, L 1758) is the most abundant sea turtle species in the Mediterranean Sea (Casale & Margaritoulis, 2010; Lucchetti and Sala, 2010; Lucchetti et al., 2017) and a priority species listed in Appendix II/IV of the Habitats Directive, the cornerstone of Europe Union's nature conservation policy ("least concern" status; Casale, 2015). The main threats to marine turtle populations in the Mediterranean Sea are related to human activities such as incidental capture by fishing gears, degradation of habitats (mainly of nesting beaches), and marine litter (Margaritoulis et al., 2003). Incidental capture (or bycatch) is probably the most significant danger to sea turtles as well as to several other species worldwide. According to recent data, more than 50,000 turtle capture events are estimated to take place in Italian waters each year; of these, 10,000 are believed to result in death, sketching a more alarming scenario than expected based on earlier estimates (Lucchetti et al., 2017). The most harmful fishing gears are towed gears; in particular, a turtle bycatch hotspot has been identified in the Adriatic Sea (central Mediterranean Sea; Lucchetti & Sala, 2010; Lucchetti et al., 2016a). The shallow seabed and the rich benthic communities characterising this semi-enclosed basin provide a major feeding habitat for loggerhead sea turtles in the demersal stage, especially the populations nesting in Greece (Lazar et al., 2004; Zbinden et al., 2008).

The turtle rescue centres (MTRCs) operating in the Adriatic periodically collect stranded turtles exhibiting distinctive, regularly spaced carapace injuries that are commonly attributed to vessel propellers. In this study we propose a different explanation and provide evidence that at least some of them are caused by fishing gears such as Rapido trawls.

The Rapido trawl is a type of beam trawl (Fig. 1). It is mainly used in the Adriatic Sea to target flatfish (*Solea* spp., *Platichthys flesus*, *Psetta maxima*, *Scophthalmus rhombus*) in muddy inshore areas and, rarely, pectinids (*Pecten jacobaeus*) in sandy offshore grounds in the northern area of the basin. The modern Rapido gear resembles a toothed beam trawl. It consists of a box dredge (about 4 m wide, 120 kg in weight) rigged with





Correspondence: Alessandro Lucchetti (a.lucchetti@an.ismar.cnr.it)

Of the four injured specimens of *C. caretta* described in this study, two were retrieved by the local MTRCs – Fondazione Cetacea (Riccione, North Adriatic Sea) and Legambiente (Manfredonia, South Adriatic Sea) and two by a research institute, the National Research Council (CNR) of Ancona (Central Adriatic Sea) in winter 2016-2017. Whereas three were stranded, the fourth was incidentally caught by a Rapido trawler. Two died at the MTRC from deep bowel perforations a few days after being rescued.

The four specimens were measured (Table 1). All were sub-adults with a curved carapace length of 42 to 60 cm. All bore from two to four regularly spaced wounds on the carapace (Fig. 2). The space between wound pairs was measured. To establish whether the injuries could have been caused by a Rapido trawl, the space between the rake teeth was measured in four Rapido trawls randomly selected from different fishing vessels. All measurements were performed with both a calliper and a tape measure. To minimise errors, each measurement was also recorded with a photograph. Photographs were processed with ImageJ software (Rasband, 2010) to measure the distance between two consecutive wounds and two consecutive rake teeth.

Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were computed. Data analysis with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that there was no significant difference in wound spacing among the four turtles (p = 0.598), in rake tooth spacing among the four trawls (p = 0.142), or between wound spacing ( $80.39 \pm 6.26$  mm) and tooth spacing ( $79.92 \pm 5.71$  mm) (p = 0.848). The fact that the individual incidentally caught by the trawler presented the same wounds as the other three (Fig. 2) reinforced the hypothesis that all four specimens had been injured by a Rapido rake.

Information on sea turtle bycatch by Rapido trawls is still scarce and unreliable (Lucchetti et al., 2017). However, considering that around 70 vessels operate in the central-northern Adriatic Sea for a total of 130 fishing days per year, and that a Rapido trawler can explore a wide area (ca. 224,000 m<sup>2</sup> per hour) in a single fishing day, interactions with sea turtles are highly likely, especially in winter, when turtles forage near the coast in the same grounds exploited by trawlers (Lucchetti et al., 2016b). As shown by our data, the high towing speed of this gear can injure sea turtles severely and even cause their death.

Interactions between sea turtles and towed gears similar to the Rapido trawl are a major conservation issue in some fisheries, such as the sea scallop dredge in the US, where bycatch is well documented. Although some bycatch-reducing devices have already been tested and adopted (i.e. in US; Haas et al., 2008), the size and



**Figure 2.** (Top) One of the three stranded sea turtles presenting regularly spaced wounds: **a)** dorsal view, **b)** ventral view. (Bottom) Sea turtle incidentally caught by a Rapido trawler and detail of wounds: **c)** dorsal view, **d)** close up view of the three wounds.

configuration of Rapido trawls (especially its teeth and limited height) and the non-sedentary nature of target species hamper their use in this fishery. Given that the Rapido trawl is banned in the rest of the Mediterranean, management measures, at least spatial and temporal closed areas, should be adopted also in Italy.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted with the contribution of the LIFE financial instrument of the European Community, project TartaLife - Reduction of sea turtle mortality in professional fishing (LIFE12 NAT/IT/000937). It does not necessarily reflect the European Commission's views and in no way anticipates future policy. We are grateful to Word Designs (www.silviamodena.com) for the language revision.

## REFERENCES

- Casale, P. & Margaritoulis, D. (2010). Sea turtles in the Mediterranean: distribution, threats and conservation priorities. IUCN, Gland. Switzerland. IUCN. 294 pp. http:// iucn-mtsg.org/publications/med-report/
- Casale, P. (2015). Caretta caretta. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015. http://www.iucnredlist.org/ details/83644804/0
- Giovanardi, O., Pranovi, F. & Franceschini, G. (1998). "Rapido" trawl fishing in the Northern Adriatic: preliminary observations of the effects on the macrobenthic communities. *Acta Adriat*. 39 (1): 37-52.
- Haas, H.L., La Casella, E., LeRoux, R., Milliken, H. & Hayward, B. (2008). Characteristics of sea turtles incidentally captured in the U.S. Atlantic sea scallop dredge fishery. *Fisheries Research* 93(3), 289-295.
- Lazar, B., Margaritoulis, D. & Tvrtkovic, N. (2004). Tag recoveries of the loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta* in the eastern Adriatic Sea: implications for conservation. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. UK. 84, 475-80. http://journals.cambridge.org/ action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=210599

- Lucchetti, A. & Sala, A. (2010). An overview of Loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) bycatch and technical mitigation measures in the Mediterranean Sea. *Reviews in Fish Biologies and Fisheries* 20, 141–161.
- Lucchetti A., Punzo E. & Virgili M. (2016a). Flexible Turtle Excluder Device (TED): an effective tool for Mediterranean coastal multispecies bottom trawl fisheries. *Aquatic Living Resources* 29, 201. 10.1051/alr/2016016.
- Lucchetti, A., Pulcinella, J., Angelini, V., Pari, S., Russo, T. & Cataudella, S. (2016b). An interaction index to predict turtle bycatch in a Mediterranean bottom trawl fishery. *Ecological Indicators* 60, 557–564.
- Lucchetti, A., Vasapollo, C. & Virgili, M. (2017). An interview-based approach to assess sea turtle bycatch in Italian waters. PeerJ 5:e3151. DOI.org/10.7717/peerj.3151
- Margaritoulis, D., Argano, R., Baran, I., Bentivegna, F., Bradai, M.N., Camiñas, J.A., Casale, P., De Metrio, G., Demetropoulos, A., Gerosa, G., Godley, B.J., Haddoud, D.A., Houghton, J., Laurent, L. & Lazar, B. (2003). Loggerhead turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: Present knowledge and conservation perspectives. In Loggerhead Sea Turtles, 175-198. Bolten, A.B. and Witherington, B.E. (eds). Washington, DC, Smithsonian Books.
- Pranovi, F., Raicevich, S., Franceschini, G., Farrace, M.G. & Gionavardi, O. (2000). Rapido trawling in the northern Adriatic Sea: effects on benthic communities in an experimental area. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 57: 517-524.
- Rasband, W.S. (2010). IMAGEJ [online]. US National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij.
- Zbinden J.A., Aebischer A., Margaritoulis D. & Arlettaz D. (2008). Important areas at sea for adult loggerhead sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: satellite tracking corroborates findings from potentially biased sources. *Marine Biology* 153: 899–906.

Accepted: 10 April 2018

#### Instructions to Authors (Revised November 2013)

1) The Herpetological Journal publishes a range of features concerned with reptile and amphibian biology. These include: *Full Papers* (no length limit); *Reviews and Mini-reviews* (generally solicited by a member of the editorial board); *Short Notes*; and controversies, under *Forum* (details available from the Editor). Faunistic lists, letters and results of general surveys are not published unless they shed light on herpetological problems of wider significance. Authors should bear in mind that the *Herpetological Journal* is read by a wide range of herpetologists from different scientific disciplines. The work should therefore appeal to a general herpetological audience and have a solid grounding in natural history.

2) All submissions and illustrations should initially be sent by e-mail to the Scientific Editor as a single MS Word or PDF document, with a final size of 2 MB or less, containing the text and figures. At this stage, figures do not need to be at high resolution as long as the information contained in them can be clearly seen by the reviewers. Please inform the Scientific Editor that you intend to submit before sending any files. If submission by e-mail is not possible, please contact the Scientific Editor for advice. All papers will be subject to peer review by at least two referees. Authors are invited to suggest the names of up to three suitable reviewers for their manuscript, although the Editor reserves the right to use alternative referees. Papers will be judged on the basis of the reports supplied by referees, scientific rigour and the degree of general interest in the subject matter. The Editor's decision will be final.

3) Authors should consult a recent edition of the *Journal* for general guidance. Papers should be concise with the minimum number of tables and illustrations. Submitted manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins all round. The usual rules of zoological nomenclature apply.

4) For all papers, the title page should contain only the following: title of paper; name(s) and brief addresses of the author(s); a running title of five words or less; and the name and full address of the corresponding author with (if available) an e-mail address. The text of the paper should begin on page 2 and be produced in the following order: Abstract, Key words, Text, Acknowledgements, References, Appendices. Full papers and reviews should have the main text divided into sections. The first subhead will be centred in capitals, the second shouldered in bold lower case, and the third run on in italics. Footnotes are not permitted. Short Notes (generally less than six manuscript pages and accompanied by a single data set, i.e. one table *or* one figure) should be produced as continuous text, preceded by an abstract of no more than 100 words.

5) Papers should be written in UK English (including figure labels) and spelling should be that of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Times and dates should conform to the following formats: for time of day use 0900, 1000 etc; for dates: 7 July 2008. Please avoid using bold text, all caps or small caps for emphasis or for headings. If emphasis is required, use italics.

6) Tables are numbered in arabic numerals, e.g. **Table 1**; they should be as simple as possible and typed double-spaced on separate sheets with a title/short explanatory paragraph above the table. Horizontal and vertical lines should be avoided, as should tables that split over more than one page or that need to be set in landscape format.

7) Line drawings and photographs are numbered in sequence in arabic numerals, e.g. **Fig. 1**. Colour photographs can only be included at cost to the author (contact the Managing Editor for a quotation). If an illustration has more than one part, each should be identified as (A), (B), etc. A metric scale must be inserted in micrographs etc. Legends for illustrations should be typed on a separate sheet.

8) References in the text should be given as in the following examples: "Smith (1964) stated –"; "- as observed by Smith & Jones (1963)." "- as previously observed (Smith, 1963; Jones,

1964; Smith & Jones, 1965)". For three or more authors, the first author's surname followed by "et al." should be used (Smith et al., 1972). In the list of references, the full title of the journal should be given. Articles "submitted" or "in prep." may not be cited in the text or references. The following examples illustrate the style and presentation used by the *Journal*:

Bellairs, A.d'A. (1957). Reptiles. London: Hutchinson.

- Boycott, B.B. & Robins, M.W. (1961). The care of young red-eared terrapins (*Pseudemys scripta elegans*) in the laboratory. *British Journal of Herpetology* 2, 206–210.
- Dunson, W.A. (1969a). Reptilian salt glands. In *Exocrine Glands*, 83– 101. Botelho, S.Y., Brooks, F.P. & Shelley, W.B. (eds). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dunson, W.A. (1969b). Electrolyte excretion by the salt gland of the Galapagos marine iguana. *American Journal of Physiology* 216, 995–1002.

9) The *Journal* is typeset direct from the author's electronic text, so final acceptance of a paper will depend upon the production by the author of PC-compatible computer file(s) ready for the press. At this stage, figures should be supplied separately as high-quality files and NOT embedded in the text file. Preferred file format for text is MS Word, with figures supplied as MS Excel, Bitmap, TIFF, Windows Metafiles (.wmf, .emf) or JPEG files. Authors should note that figures are normally reduced to a single column width and should bear this in mind when drawing figures, e.g. ensuring that font sizes will be legible once reduced. Minimum resolution required is 1800 pixels wide for reproduction at single column width.

10) Proofs are prepared as PDF files and corrections should be returned to the Managing Editor by return of e-mail. Alterations should be kept to the correction of errors; more extensive alterations will be charged to the author.

11) A PDF of the paper is provided free of charge. Note that paper reprints are no longer supplied.

12) All submissions are liable to assessment by the editorial board for ethical considerations, and publication may be refused on the recommendation of this committee. Contributors may therefore need to justify killing or the use of other animal procedures, if these have been involved in the execution of work. Likewise, work that has involved the collection of endangered species or disturbance to their habitat(s) will require full justification.

13) Open access: The *Journal* supports "green" open access as outlined by the Research Councils UK, to facilitate deposition of articles e.g. at institutional repositories. The *Journal* also offers the option of open access for individual articles (free of charge for members of the British Herpetological Society, and at an article processing charge of £97 for non-members).

All contributions should be addressed to the Scientific Editor:

Dr. Rachael Antwis. E-mail: bhsherpetologicaljournal@gmail.com

#### Associate Scientific Editors:

Richard P. Brown (Liverpool, UK); Mirco Solé (Ilhéus, Brazil); Anthony Herrel (Paris, France); Simon Loader (Basel, Switzerland); Robert Puschendorf (Plymouth, UK); Robert Jehle (Salford, UK).

#### Managing Editor:

Sarah Berry (info@sarahberryonline.com)

#### Advertisements

The Herpetological Journal accepts advertisements subject to approval of contents by the Managing Editor, to whom enquiries should be addressed.

Herpetological Journal website:

https://www.thebhs.org/publications/the-herpetological-journal

Volume 28, Number 3, 2018

# Contents

## **Full papers**

Deep Mitochondrial and Morphological Differentiation of <i>Hemidactylus persicus</i> Anderson, 1872 (Squamata: Gekkonidae) in Iran Mahboubeh Sadat Hosseinzadeh, Mansour Aliabadian, Eskandar Rastegar-pouyani, Inga Zeisset & Tom Hoogesteger	101-109
Corticosterone measurement in Komodo dragon shed skin Annaïs Carbajal, Oriol Tallo-Parra, Laura Monclús, Manel Aresté, Hugo Fernández-Bellon, Vanessa Almagro & Manel Lopez-Bejar	110-116
Temporal trends in agile frog <i>Rana dalmatina</i> numbers: results from a long- term study in western France <i>Roger Meek</i>	117-122
Effects of chronic corticosterone increases on the maternal behaviour of the prairie skink, <i>Plestiodon septentrionalis Alexander J. Anton, Tracy Langkilde, Sean Graham &amp; James D. Fawcett</i>	123-126
Genetic diversity of common toads ( <i>Bufo bufo</i> ) along the Norwegian coast: disjunct distribution of locally dominant haplotypes <i>Serap Şenol Tuncay, Steffen Roth, Fevzi Bardakci &amp; Robert Jehle</i>	127-133

#### Short notes

Evidence of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*, Linnaeus, 1758) injuries caused by Rapido (beam) trawling in 134-136 the Mediterranean *Alessandro Lucchetti, Valeria Angelini, Giovanni Furii, Sauro Pari, Claudio Vasapollo & Massimo Virgili*