

# Chloroplast microsatellites: measures of genetic diversity and the effect of homoplasy.

M. Navascués, B. C. Emerson

### ▶ To cite this version:

M. Navascués, B. C. Emerson. Chloroplast microsatellites: measures of genetic diversity and the effect of homoplasy. Molecular Ecology, 2005, 14 (5), pp.1333-41. 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02504.x. hal-00373681

HAL Id: hal-00373681

https://hal.science/hal-00373681

Submitted on 6 Apr 2009

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Chloroplast microsatellites: measures of genetic diversity and the effect of homoplasy
- 2 M. NAVASCUÉS and B.C. EMERSON
- 3 Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Conservation, School of Biological Sciences,
- 4 University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

- 6 Keywords: chloroplast microsatellites, genetic diversity, homoplasy, coalescent
- 7 simulation, conifers
- 8 Correspondence: Brent Emerson, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK.
- 9 Telephone: (44) 01603 592237. Fax: (44) 01603 592250. E-mail: b.emerson@uea.ac.uk

10

Running title: Chloroplast microsatellite homoplasy

12

- 13 The definitive version is available at www.blackwell-synergy.com
- 14 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02504.x

#### Abstract

Chloroplast microsatellites have been widely used in population genetic studies of conifers in recent years. However, their haplotype configurations suggest that they could have high levels of homoplasy, thus limiting the power of these molecular markers. A coalescent-based computer simulation was used to explore the influence of homoplasy on measures of genetic diversity based on chloroplast microsatellites. The conditions of the simulation were defined to fit isolated populations originating from the colonization of one single haplotype into an area left available after a glacial retreat. Simulated data were compared with empirical data available from the literature for a species of *Pinus* that has expanded north after the last glacial maximum. In the evaluation of genetic diversity, homoplasy was found to have little influence on Nei's unbiased haplotype diversity ( $H_e$ ) while Goldstein's genetic distance estimates ( $D^2_{sh}$ ) were much more affected. The effect of the number of chloroplast microsatellite loci for evaluation of genetic diversity is also discussed.

#### Introduction

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Microsatellites, or simple sequence repeats (SSRs), are sequences of repetitive DNA where a single motif consisting of one to six base pairs is repeated tandemly a number of times. Microsatellite sequences have been identified in the three eukaryote genomes: nucleus, chloroplast (Powell et al., 1995) and mitochondria (Soranzo et al., 1999) Nuclear microsatellite loci are usually highly polymorphic with alleles varying in the number of repeat units; they are codominant and inherited in a mendelian mode. These characteristics, plus being considered selectively neutral, have made them a popular marker for population genetic studies (Sunnucks, 2000). With respect to the organelle genomes, mitochondrial microsatellites have had little impact so far, but chloroplast microsatellites have been increasingly used in population genetics since their discovery. Conserved primers for the amplification of chloroplast microsatellites (cpSSRs) have been reported for conifers (Vendramin et al., 1996), gramineae (Provan et al., 2004) and dicotyledons (Weising & Gardner, 1999), but it is among conifers, for studies of population genetics, that chloroplast microsatellite markers have mainly been used (e.g. Cuenca et al., 2003; Fady et al., 2003; Gómez et al., 2003).

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

Chloroplast microsatellites typically consist of mononucleotide motifs that are repeated eight to fifteen times. Levels of polymorphism in cpSSRs are quite variable across loci and across species, and some loci have been found to be monomorphic in all species studied. There are two important features that differentiate chloroplast from nuclear microsatellites. First, chloroplasts are uniparentally inherited. Some species have maternal inheritance of the chloroplast, others paternal. This means that cpSSRs provide

information for the lineages of only one of the sexes. Also, the chloroplast chromosome is a non-recombinant molecule and, therefore, all cpSSR loci are linked. The genotyping of cpSSRs will result in haplotypes that will be composed of the combination of alleles found at each cpSSR locus.

Mutation rates for length variation in microsatellites have been found to be higher (10<sup>-2</sup> to 10<sup>-6</sup>) than point mutations rates (Li *et al.*, 2002). In order to explain this difference two kinds of mutational mechanism have been proposed: replication slippage (Tachida & Iizuka, 1992) and recombination with out-of-phase aligning (Harding *et al.*, 1992). Both processes result in changes in the number of repeat units which is compatible with the observed size polymorphism of microsatellites. One consequence of these mutational mechanisms is that the same genetic state (i.e. number of repeats) may evolve in two different microsatellite lineages through independent mutational events, a phenomenon known as homoplasy.

Homoplasy may cause problems in population genetic analysis as it can affect measures of genetic diversity, gene flow, genetic distances (both between individuals and populations), neighborhood size, assignment methods and phylogenetic analysis (see Estoup *et al.*, 2002 for a review). Homoplasy within cpSSRs is considered as a potential limitation for its use as a genetic marker (Provan *et al.*, 2001), however the problem has only been addressed at the genus level (Doyle *et al.*, 1998; Hale *et al.*, 2004). Researchers have generally considered homoplasy levels low enough to allow population genetic analysis, and even when homoplasy has been evident (i.e. a haplotype network with up to

nine loops) it has been considered as "moderate" and its potential for confounding results disregarded (Cuenca *et al.*, 2003).

In the present study, simulation analysis was used to investigate the evolution of cpSSRs in conifers and how homoplasy may influence the informativeness of these markers. Instead of a more traditional simulation approach where the whole population is considered, only the genetic makeup of a sample of individuals was studied, following a coalescence-based approach. The strategy consists of: first, generating a genealogy for a sample of individuals from the last generation; and second, placing random mutations on the genealogy to generate the genetic state of the sample (Hudson, 1990). This approach has proved useful for the study of levels of homoplasy in nuclear microsatellites under different mutational models (Estoup *et al.*, 2002).

#### Modelling chloroplast microsatellite evolution

91 Simulation of Coalescent Events

The probability of a coalescent event for any two lineages in a given generation depends

on the population size, the population structure and the mating system. Thus, it became

necessary to establish the biological scenario of the simulation, which would determine

the shape of the genealogy.

After the last glacial maximum most conifer distributions shifted northward leaving their refugia (Jackson *et al.*, 2000). When populations were established, they had a period of expansion followed by a period of approximately constant population density until the present time (MacDonald & Cwynar, 1991). Our simulations reproduced populations under such conditions. A range of population ages (i.e. coalescence times) were investigated with population origins at 50, 100, 150, 200 or 250 generations before the present to simulate colonization events at different stages of the glacial retreat [assuming: 1 generation=100 years (as in Provan *et al.*, 1999) and the last glacial maximum=20

000YBP (Hewitt, 1996)]. Population growth was determined by the logistic equation:

 $N_{t+1} = N_t e^{r\left(1 - \frac{N_t}{K}\right)}$  (1)

where  $N_t$  is the population size in the generation t ( $N_0$ =1), r is the population growth rate and K is the carrying capacity of the population. This model has been widely employed to describe population growth following colonization events (Shigesada & Kawasaki, 1997). The growth rate was set at r=0.7, producing a period of expansion with a duration of 22 generations (~2200 years), which is within the range observed for *Pinus* (MacDonald & Cwynar, 1991). Then, population size remained constant at carrying capacity for the

remaining 28, 78, 128, 178 or 228 generations. Because effective population sizes are considered to be "large" in forest trees (Muona & Harju, 1989), carrying capacity was arbitrarily set at K=10~000; a size big enough to avoid the effects of genetic drift (Savolainen & Kuittinen, 2000).

Generally, chloroplasts are considered paternally inherited in conifers, although there is a possibility that low levels of maternal leakage and heteroplasmy may be present (Cato & Richardson, 1996). Thus, the coalescent process influencing the genealogy of chloroplast haplotypes was considered to be the simplest case possible: a neutral, haploid, non-recombinant genome with every individual having the same probability of being the parent of any individual in the following generation. With the demographic history determined, the genealogy was constructed using a generation-by-generation algorithm. This type of algorithm allows the simulation of complex demographic and dispersal models, contrasting with other coalescence algorithms which are faster for computational time (Leblois *et al.*, 2003).

The algorithm worked backward in time, starting with the last generation and finishing in the first one (t=0). In every generation the coalescent events were generated by an algorithm that assigned to every individual, x, from the sample (x $\in$ [1,...,  $n_t$ ]) in generation t, its ancestor, y, in the previous generation t-1 (Fig. 1). Every individual x from the sample in generation t had a probability P= $n_{t-1}/N_{t-1}$  (where  $n_{t-1}$  is the number of ancestors already assigned and  $N_{t-1}$  is the population size in generation t-1) to share its ancestor y with any of the individuals from the sample which ancestors had already been

assigned. A random number, 0 < R < 1, drawn with a uniform probability distribution function, is used to determine the occurrence of a coalescent event. When  $R < n_{t-1}/N_{t-1}$ , the ancestor y of the individual x is within the  $n_{t-1}$  previously assigned ancestors ( $y \in [1, ..., n_{t-1}]$ ). In order to determine which ancestor, y took the value of the integer part of  $1+R\cdot N_{t-1}$  (int $(1+R\cdot N_{t-1})\in [1,...,n_{t-1}]$  when  $R < n_{t-1}/N_{t-1}$ ). The generation and lineages involved in this coalescent event were recorded to construct the genealogy of the sample. When  $R > n_{t-1}/N_{t-1}$ , the ancestor y was a new individual and y took the value  $n_{t-1}+1$ ; for the next individual x+1 the value of  $n_{t-1}$  increased by one unit.

Coalescent events were simulated using this algorithm on every generation until all lineages converged to a single lineage. Because the population size in the first generation (t=0) is only one individual ( $N_0$ =1) the probability for any number of individuals to share their ancestors was P= $n_{t-1}/N_{t-1}$ =1, i.e. all the lineages coalesced at least at the first generation. This allowed controlling the coalescence time within the range of time for the phenomenon simulated (i.e. colonization after glacial retreat). It is important to note that due to the non-recombinant nature of the chloroplast genome all cpSSR loci were linked and shared the same genealogical history.

## Simulation of Mutational Events

Several theoretical mutational models have been proposed to describe microsatellite evolution, each one of them with recognized weaknesses and strengths (Estoup & Cornuet, 1999). All of them refer to, and have been tested against, nuclear microsatellites, where mutational events are believed to occur by two mechanisms: replication slippage

and recombination (Li *et al.*, 2002). To our knowledge, no specific model has been developed for cpSSRs (where no recombination occurs) so the stepwise mutation model (SMM) was chosen since it is the simplest realistic model for microsatellites. Mutation rate estimates for cpSSRs are scarce and vary from  $10^{-3}$  (Marshall *et al.*, 2002) to  $10^{-5}$  (Provan *et al.*, 1999) per locus per generation, so simulations were run under four different mutation rates:  $10^{-3}$ ,  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $10^{-4}$ ,  $10^{-5}$  per locus, per generation.

The genetic state of nine cpSSR loci in samples of 25 individuals was simulated under 20 different combinations of population ages and mutation rates (Table 1). For each of these simulations 20 replicates were run. The output of every replicate consisted of the genotypic information of all the individuals from the sample and the genealogical tree that describe their relationships, with information on the number of mutations and number of generations for every branch. The raw data obtained was analyzed as described in the following section.

## Genetic diversity analysis

The effect of homoplasy was studied on a number of standard measures of genetic diversity for cpSSRs: total number of haplotypes, N (direct count of different haplotypes); effective number of haplotypes,  $N_e$  (reciprocal of the chance that two randomly chosen alleles are identical); unbiased haplotype diversity,  $H_e$  (Nei, 1978), and average genetic distances among individuals,  $D_{sh}^2$  (Goldstein *et al.*, 1995) applied to cpSSRs by Morgante *et al.* (1998):

181 
$$N_e = 1 / \sum_{h=1}^{N} p_h^2$$
 (2)

182 
$$H_e = \left[ \frac{n}{n-1} \left( 1 - \sum_{h=1}^{N} p_h^2 \right) \right]$$
 (3)

183 
$$D^{2}_{sh} = \frac{2}{[n(n-1)]} \cdot \frac{1}{L} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} d_{ij}^{2}$$
 (4)

184 
$$d_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{L} |a_{ik} - a_{jk}|$$
 (5)

where n is the number of individuals in the simulated sample,  $p_h$  is the relative frequency of the  $h^{th}$  haplotype, N is the number of different haplotypes in the simulated sample, L is the number of loci simulated,  $a_{ik}$  is the size (measured in repeat units) of the allele for the  $i^{th}$  individual and at the  $k^{th}$  locus, and  $a_{jk}$  is the size of the allele for the  $j^{th}$  individual and at the  $k^{th}$  locus.

Indices N,  $N_e$  and  $H_e$  were calculated both for the stepwise mutation model (SMM; where haplotypes were defined by their genetic state) and for the infinite allele model (IAM; where every mutation defined a new haplotype, even if the haplotype produced was

already present in the sample). The difference between the SMM and IAM values represents information about genetic diversity that is lost due to homoplasy.

Estoup *et al.* (2002) defined an index of homoplasy, *P*, to quantify theoretically the effects of mutational and population variables on homoplasy. This index of homoplasy is the probability that two haplotypes sharing the same genetic state are not identical by descent. We have calculated a similar index generated from Nei's genetic diversity for the SMM and IAM:

202 
$$P = 1 - \left(\frac{1 - H_{eIAM}}{1 - H_{eSMM}}\right)$$
 (6)

The number of mutations occurring between every pair of lineages was scored and the average genetic distance, based on number of mutations ( $D^2_M$ ), was calculated following Equation (4) where  $d_{ij}$  is substituted for the number of mutations scored between the individual i and j. Due to the possibility of recurrent mutation and back mutations under the SMM, the genetic distance estimate is expected to be incongruent to some degree with the actual number of mutations between lineages. The differences between the absolute values  $D^2_{sh}$  and  $D^2_M$  were compared. In addition, the correlation of the matrices of actual and estimated genetic distances was analyzed with a Mantel test (Mantel, 1967) when the difference between  $D^2_{sh}$  and  $D^2_M$  was large.

#### **Results and discussion**

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

The results for all the simulations are presented in Figures 2 and 3. Each of the 20 replicates performed for each simulation is equivalent to an independent random sampling from the same population. Hence, for any of the genetic diversity indices, the mean value for the 20 replicates is interpreted as an estimate for the actual population value of that statistic and the standard deviation as the error associated to the sample size used. The effect of sample size was assessed by performing some simulations with larger sample sizes. Not surprisingly this resulted in a reduction of the variance for the different measures; for instance, gene diversity in simulation 16 ( $H_{eIAM}$ =0.552±0.178;  $H_{eSMM}$ =0.542±0.178 for 25 individuals, as shown in Figure 3G;  $H_{eIAM}$ =0.561±0.037;  $H_{eSMM}$ =0.553±0.036 for 1000 individuals) and average genetic distance in simulation 20  $(D_{sh}^2=1.665\pm0.382;\ D_{M}^2=2.746\pm0.706$  for 25 individuals, as shown in Figure 3H;  $D_{sh}^2 = 1.696 \pm 0.185$ ;  $D_{M}^2 = 2.589 \pm 0.292$  for 1000 individuals). The effect of the sample size could be eliminated by simulating the coalescent history for the whole population. However that would require excessive computational time, and it does not appear to be a problem warranting this.

229

230

231

232

233

As was expected, the simulations with parameters that produced higher genetic diversity also showed higher levels of homoplasy (see Table 1 and Fig. 4). For simulations with mutation rates higher than 10<sup>-4</sup>, homoplasy caused an underestimation, to different degrees, for the four diversity indices. However, Nei's haplotypic diversity values for SMM and IAM were very close in all simulations.

235

In order to understand the effect of homoplasy on Goldstein's genetic distance estimates, a more complex approach is necessary. A difference between the values of  $D_{sh}^2$  and  $D_{M}^2$  will lead to an underestimation of the absolute time of coalescence for that sample. However, the actual and estimated distances between individuals could be correlated, and if that were the case, then the distance estimates could be used, or even corrected, to study relative genetic distances. In order to test that correlation, simulation 20 was chosen as it presents the biggest differences between estimated and actual distances. The Mantel test performed for the correlation of the actual and estimated genetic distance resulted in a significant correlation (p-value < 0.025) for all the replicates, with the correlation coefficient, r, ranging from 0.52 to 0.82. Since the correlation with the actual genetic distances is significant but not predictable, we conclude that, for populations with high genetic diversity, the Goldstein's genetic distance estimates can be misleading, and any attempt to apply a correction to these estimates would be prone to error.

The different effect of homoplasy on the various indices is explained by the nature of these indices. The three indices based on the number of haplotypes  $(N, N_e \text{ and } H_e)$  seem to perform better for assessing levels of genetic diversity than the one based on distance estimates  $(D^2_{sh})$ . Estimated distances are influenced by every parallel mutation and back mutation; however, these mutations may have no influence in the number of haplotypes in the sample. For example, two lineages with unique and parallel mutations will have two distinct haplotypes at the final generation, thus the number of haplotypes will not be reduced. However, the genetic distance will be underestimated because of the parallel mutations. Within the indices based on number of haplotypes, the indices that consider

their frequencies ( $N_e$  and  $H_e$ ) were less affected by homoplasy. This result is due to the low frequency that most of the homoplasic haplotypes had within the simulated populations.

In the present work, methods for phylogenetic reconstruction have not been assessed. However, our results discourage the use of cpSSR to infer phylogenetic relationships. For instance, in simulation 20, the high occurrence of homoplasic mutations (78.8% parallel mutations and 6.4% back mutations) would make parsimony method useless. There would be an effect on distance methods too, because distance estimates are affected by homoplasy. However, further work would be necessary to estimate rates of error.

The number of cpSSR loci studied also influenced levels of homoplasy. A set of simulations performed for four loci produced higher values for the homoplasy index, P, and higher differences between expected and actual average distances than the equivalent simulations performed for nine loci (Fig. 4). Thus, the linkage of cpSSRs can be seen as beneficial for the analysis of genetic diversity. With a greater number of loci analyzed one has more power to distinguish haplotypes with homoplastic alleles at a given cpSSR loci through the polymorphism of linked loci.

Mutation rate and time of coalescence are the two factors influencing the levels of genetic diversity our simulations. The different combinations of these parameters produced a broad range of genetic diversity, from simulation 01 with null diversity to simulation 20 with the highest diversity (see Fig. 2 and 3). This set of simulations reproduces the

simplest scenario that could describe the recent history of a conifer population: an isolated population originating from a single colonization event, followed by a population expansion. The recent population history of *Pinus resinosa* would seem to be consistent with such conditions. During the last glaciation *P. resinosa* was restricted to southern refugial populations and has colonized northern areas after the glacial retreat (Fowler & Morris, 1977). A study of the population genetics of *P. resinosa* with cpSSRs also supports a metapopulation with restricted gene flow between populations (Echt *et al.*, 1998) This case provides us with an empirical study of a conifer with isolated populations and with different colonization ages (either because of the metapopulation dynamics or colonization after glacial retreat). Also, the number of cpSSR loci and sample sizes (nine loci, 21-24 individuals) were similar to the simulations presented here, providing an appropriate combination of conditions for comparison.

The patterns of genetic diversity found in the empirical study of P. resinosa with cpSSRs (Echt et al., 1998) can be best compared with simulations 11-15. In both cases the populations are composed of one high frequency haplotype (the ancestral haplotype in the simulations) plus several low frequency haplotypes. The diversity levels for the different indices, N,  $N_e$ ,  $H_e$  and  $D^2_{sh}$ , are also comparable and consistent. Therefore, we can argue that the genetic diversity and distances were unlikely to have been underestimated within P. resinosa (see Fig. 2E, 2F, 3E and 3F).

Any further comparison of our simulations with other conifer species studied with cpSSRs has to be done with caution. The simulations we have performed do not take into

account a number of additional factors that may influence homoplasy. Thus the current set of simulations will represent the minimum amount of homoplasy that could be present within a given population. Demographic scenarios including migration or more ancient coalescent events (where colonization events were produced by more than one haplotype), would result in increased levels of homoplasy. Higher mutation rates and size constraints in the mutational model will also increase the levels of homoplasy (Estoup *et al.*, 2002).

To conclude, further simulation studies would be beneficial for the understanding of the homoplasy in the analysis of cpSSRs. In particular, we are now working in the implementation of the generation-by-generation algorithm for the simulation of multipopulation scenarios with dispersal that will allow us to understand the effects of homoplasy in the measurement of gene flow and genetic distances among populations. Regarding future empirical studies with cpSSRs, it is strongly recommended that studies use as many cpSSR loci as are available in order to reduce the negative consequences of homoplasy on estimations of genetic diversity. In order to assess levels of genetic diversity Nei's index seems to perform the best, being least affected by homoplasy. In contrast conclusions made with Goldstein's genetic distances should be regarded with caution, as these can underestimate absolute distances.

325	References
326	Cato SA, Richardson TE (1996) Inter- and intraspecific polymorphism at chloroplast SSR
327	loci and the inheritance of plastids in Pinus radiata D. Don. Theoretical and
328	Applied Genetics 93, 587-592.
329	Cuenca A, Escalante AE, Piñero D (2003) Long-distance colonization, isolation by
330	distance, and historical demography in a relictual Mexican pinyon pine (Pinus
331	nelsonii Shaw) as revealed by paternally inherited genetic markers (cpSSRs).
332	Molecular Ecology 12, 2087-2097.
333	Doyle JJ, Morgante M, Tingey SV, Powell W (1998) Size homoplasy in chloroplast
334	microsatellites of wild perennial relatives of soybean (Glycine subgenus Glycine).
335	Molecular Biology and Evolution 15, 215-218.
336	Echt CS, DeVerno LL, Anzidei M, Vendramin GG (1998) Chloroplast microsatellites
337	reveal population genetic diversity in red pine, Pinus resinosa Ait. Molecular
338	Ecology 7, 307-316.
339	Estoup A, Cornuet JM (1999) Microsatellite evolution: inferences from population data.
340	In: Microsatellites. Evolution and Applications (eds. Goldstein DB, Schlötterer
341	C), pp. 49-65. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
342	Estoup A, Jarne P, Cornuet JM (2002) Homoplasy and mutation model at microsatellite
343	loci and their consequences for population genetics analysis. Molecular Ecology
344	<b>11</b> , 1591-1604.
345	Fady B, Lefèvre F, Reynaud M, et al. (2003) Gene flow among different taxonomic units:
346	evidence from nuclear and cytoplasmic markers in Cedrus plantation forests.
347	Theoretical and Applied Genetics 107, 1132 -1138.

348	Fowler DP, Morris RW (1977) Genetic diversity in red pine: evidence of low genic
349	heterozygosity. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 7, 343-347.
350	Goldstein DB, Linares AR, Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW (1995) An evaluation of
351	genetic distances for use with microsatellite loci. Genetics 139, 463-471.
352	Gómez A, González-Martínez SC, Collada C, Gil L, Climent J (2003) Complex
353	population genetic structure in an endemic Canary Island pine using chloroplast
354	microsatellite markers. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 107, 1123-1131.
355	Hale ML, Borland AM, Gustafsson MH, Wolff K (2004) Causes of size homoplasy
356	among chloroplast microsatellites in closely related Clusia species. Journal of
357	Molecular Evolution 58, 182-190.
358	Harding RM, Boyce AJ, Clegg JB (1992) The evolution of tandemly repetitive DNA:
359	recombination rules. Genetics 132, 847-859.
360	Hewitt GM (1996) Some genetic consequences of ice ages, and their role in divergence
361	and speciation. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 58, 247-276.
362	Hudson RR (1990) Gene genealogies and the coalescent process. In: Oxford Surveys in
363	Evolutionary Biology Vol. 7 (eds. Futuyma D, Antonovics J), pp. 1-44. Oxford
364	University Press, Oxford.
365	Jackson ST, Webb RS, Anderson KH, et al. (2000) Vegetation and environment in
366	Eastern North America during the last glacial maximum. Quaternary Science
367	Reviews 19, 489-508.
368	Leblois R, Estoup A, Rousset F (2003) Influence of mutational and sampling factors on
369	the estimation of demographic parameters in a "continuous" population under
370	isolation by distance. Molecular Biology and Evolution 20, 491-502.

371	Li Y-C, Korol AB, Fahima T, Beiles A, Nevo E (2002) Microsatellites: genomic		
372	distribution, putative functions and mutational mechanisms: a review. Molecular		
373	Ecology 11, 2453-2465.		
374	MacDonald GM, Cwynar LC (1991) Post-glacial population growth rates of <i>Pinus</i>		
375	contorta ssp. latifolia in Western Canada. Journal of Ecology 79, 417-429.		
376	Mantel NA (1967) The detection of disease clustering and a generalized regression		
377	approach. Cancer Research 27, 209-220.		
378	Marshall HD, Newton C, Ritland K (2002) Chloroplast phylogeography and evolution of		
379	highly polymorphic microsatellites in lodgepole pine (Pinus contorta).		
380	Theoretical and Applied Genetics 104, 367-378.		
381	Morgante M, Felice N, Vendramin GG (1998) Analysis of hypervariable chloroplast		
382	microsatellites in <i>Pinus halepensis</i> reveals a dramatic genetic bottleneck. In:		
383	Molecular Tools for Screening Biodiversity. Plants and Animals (eds. Karp A,		
384	Isaac PG, Ingram DS), pp. 407-412. Chapman and Hall, London.		
385	Muona O, Harju A (1989) Effective population sizes, genetic variability, and mating		
386	system in natural stands and seed orchards of Pinus sylvestris. Silvae Genetica 38		
387	221-228.		
388	Nei M (1978) Estimation of average heterozygosity and genetic distance from a small		
389	number of individuals. Genetics 89, 583-590.		
390	Powell W, Morgante M, McDevitt R, Vendramin GG, Rafalski JA (1995) Polymorphic		
391	simple sequence repeat regions in chloroplast genomes: applications to the		
392	population genetics of pines. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of		
393	the United States of America 92, 7759-7763.		

394	Provan J, Biss PM, McMeel D, Matnews S (2004) Universal primers for the
395	amplification of chloroplast microsatellites in grasses (Poaceae). Molecular
396	Ecology Notes 4, 262-264.
397	Provan J, Powell W, Hollingsworth PM (2001) Chloroplast microsatellites: new tools for
398	studies in plant ecology and evolution. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 16, 142-
399	147.
400	Provan J, Soranzo N, Wilson NJ, Goldstein DB, Powell W (1999) A low mutation rate
401	for chloroplast microsatellites. <i>Genetics</i> <b>153</b> , 943-947.
402	Savolainen O, Kuittinen H (2000) Small population processes. In: Forest Conservation
403	Genetics. Principles and Practice (eds. Young A, Boshier D, Boyle T), pp. 91-
404	100. CABI Publishing, Oxon.
405	Shigesada N, Kawasaki K (1997) Biological Invasions: Theory and Practice Oxford
406	University Press, Oxford.
407	Soranzo N, Provan J, Powell W (1999) An example of microsatellite length variation in
408	the mitochondrial genome of conifers. Genome 42, 158-161.
409	Sunnucks P (2000) Efficient genetic markers for population biology. Trends in Ecology
410	& Evolution <b>15</b> , 199-203.
411	Tachida H, Iizuka M (1992) Persistence of repeated sequences that evolve by replication
412	slippage. Genetics 131, 471-478.
413	Vendramin GG, Lelli L, Rossi P, Morgante M (1996) A set of primers for the
414	amplification of 20 chloroplast microsatellites in Pinaceae. Molecular Ecology 5,
415	595-598.

416	Weising K, Gardner RC (1999) A set of conserved PCR primers for the analysis of
417	simple sequence repeat polymorphisms in chloroplast genomes of dicotyledonous
418	angiosperms. Genome 42, 9-19.
419	

# Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the help of Guillermo de Navascués in the program development. We are also grateful to Jo Ridley, Kamal Ibrahim and Godfrey Hewitt for useful comments on early versions of the manuscript. We are grateful to the University of East Anglia for the provision of a PhD studentship to MN.

**Fig. 1** Coalescence events were simulated with a generation by generation algorithm. This algorithm assigned to every individual, x, of the generation t, its ancestor in the immediately previous generation, t-1. The probability for this ancestor to be shared with another individual was calculated from the population size in the previous generation,  $N_t$ -1, and the number of ancestors already assigned,  $n_{t-1}$  (see text for details).

Fig. 2 Number of haplotypes, N, and effective number of haplotypes,  $N_e$ , for the 20 simulations. Each graph represents the values for one of the indices, N or  $N_e$ , for the five simulations with the mutation rate,  $\mu$ , shown on the left and the coalescence time (in number of generations) shown on the abscissa axis. The mean and standard deviation (from 20 replicates) is shown for each simulation. Both indices were calculated under the stepwise mutation model (SMM) and the infinite allele model (IAM). The difference between both values represents the extent to which information is lost due to homoplasy.

Fig. 3 Unbiased haplotype diversity,  $H_e$ , and average genetic distances among individuals,  $D^2$ , for the 20 simulations. Each graph represents the values for one of the indices,  $H_e$  or  $D^2$ , for the five simulations with the mutation rate,  $\mu$ , shown on the left and the coalescence time (in number of generations) shown on the abscissa axis. The mean and standard deviation (from 20 replicates) is represented for each simulation.  $H_e$  was calculated for the stepwise mutation model (SMM) and the infinite allele model (IAM).  $D^2$  was calculated for estimated distances ( $D^2_{sh}$ ) based on the number of observed mutations and for the true distances based on the actual number of mutations ( $D^2_M$ ). The difference between both values represents the extent to which information is lost due to homoplasy.

**Fig. 4** Levels of homoplasy plotted against genetic diversity for every replicate of the 20 simulations (see Table 1 for simulation conditions). Levels of homoplasy are represented: (A) with the homoplasy index, P, and (B) with the difference between the actual average genetic distance  $(D^2_M)$  and the estimated genetic distance  $(D^2_{sh})$ . Filled circles represent simulations with nine loci and empty circles represent equivalent simulations with only four loci.

**Table 1** Combinations of parameters for coalescence time and mutation rate used in different simulations, and the index of homoplasy found for each.

	Coalescence time <sup>a</sup>	Mutation rate, $\mu$	Homoplasy index, P b
Simulation 01	50	10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.00
Simulation 02	100	10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.00
Simulation 03	150	10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.00
Simulation 04	200	10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.00
Simulation 05	250	10 <sup>-5</sup>	0.00
Simulation 06	50	$10^{-4}$	0.00
Simulation 07	100	$10^{-4}$	0.00
Simulation 08	150	$10^{-4}$	0.00
Simulation 09	200	$10^{-4}$	0.00
Simulation 10	250	$10^{-4}$	0.00
Simulation 11	50	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	0.01
Simulation 12	100	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	0.03
Simulation 13	150	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	0.03
Simulation 14	200	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	0.07
Simulation 15	250	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	0.17
Simulation 16	50	10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.02
Simulation 17	100	10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.06
Simulation 18	150	10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.11
Simulation 19	200	10 <sup>-3</sup>	0.33
Simulation 20	250	10-3	0.43

460 a coalescence time in number of generations; b mean from 20 replicates







