

Cryptic Patterns of Speciation in Cryptic Primates: Microendemic Mouse Lemurs and the Multispecies Coalescent

Jelmer Poelstra, Jordi Salmona, George P Tiley, Dominik Schüssler, Marina Blanco, Jean Andriambeloson, Olivier Bouchez, Ryan Campbell, Paul D. Etter, P. A. Hohenlohe, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Jelmer Poelstra, Jordi Salmona, George P Tiley, Dominik Schüssler, Marina Blanco, et al.. Cryptic Patterns of Speciation in Cryptic Primates: Microendemic Mouse Lemurs and the Multispecies Coalescent. Systematic Biology, 2021, 70 (2), pp.203-218. 10.1093/sysbio/syaa053. hal-03098432

HAL Id: hal-03098432

https://hal.science/hal-03098432

Submitted on 5 Jan 2021

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.



Cryptic Patterns of Speciation in Cryptic Primates:

Microendemic Mouse Lemurs and the Multispecies Coalescent

3	Running	title: (Cryptic	speciation	in mouse	lemurs
---	---------	----------	---------	------------	----------	--------

4

1

2

- 5 Jelmer Poelstra^{1#}, Jordi Salmona^{2#}, George P. Tiley^{1#}, Dominik Schüßler³, Marina B. Blanco^{1,4},
- Jean B. Andriambeloson⁵, Olivier Bouchez⁶, C. Ryan Campbell^{1†}, Paul D. Etter⁷, Paul A.
- Hohenlohe⁸, Kelsie E. Hunnicutt^{1@}, Amaia Iribar², Eric A. Johnson⁷, Peter M. Kappeler⁹, Peter
- 8 A. Larsen^{1&}, Sophie Manzi², José M. Ralison⁵, Blanchard Randrianambinina^{10,11}, Rodin M.
- 9 Rasoloarison⁹, David W. Rasolofoson¹⁰, Amanda R. Stahlke⁸, David Weisrock¹², Rachel C.
- Williams^{1,4}, Lounès Chikhi^{2,13}, Edward E Louis Jr. 14, Ute Radespiel 15*, Anne D. Yoder 1*

11

- 12 12: Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA
- ²: CNRS, Université Paul Sabatier, IRD; UMR5174 EDB (Laboratoire Évolution & Diversité 11
- 14 Biologique), 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, France
- ³: Research Group Ecology and Environmental Education, Institute of Biology and Chemistry,
- 16 University of Hildesheim, Universitaetsplatz 1, 31141 Hildesheim, Germany
- 17 ⁴: Duke Lemur Center, Duke University, Durham, NC 27705, USA
- ⁵: Zoology and Animal Biodiversity, University of Antananarivo, Antananarivo 101, Madagascar
- 19 ⁶: INRA, US 1426, GeT-PlaGe, Genotoul, Castanet-Tolosan, France

20	: Institute of Molecular Biology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, USA
21	⁸ : Institute for Bioinformatics and Evolutionary Studies, Department of Biological Sciences,
22	University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844, USA
23	⁹ : Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology Unit, German Primate Center, Kellnerweg 6, 37077
24	Göttingen, Germany
25	¹⁰ : Groupe d'Etude et de Recherche sur les Primates de Madagascar (GERP); BP 779,
26	Antananarivo 101, Madagascar
27	¹¹ : Faculté des Sciences, University of Mahajanga, Mahajanga, Madagascar
28	¹² : Department of Biology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, 40506, USA
29	¹³ : Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, Rua da Quinta Grande, 6, 2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal
30	¹⁴ : Grewcock Center for Conservation and Research, Omaha's Henry Doorly Zoo and Aquarium
31	Omaha, NE
32	¹⁵ : Institute of Zoology, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover, Buenteweg 17, 30559
33	Hannover, Germany
34	
35	#: joint first authors
36	*: joint senior authors (corresponding authors)
37	@: current address: Department of Biological Sciences, University of Denver, Denver, CO
38	80208

39	&: current address: Department of Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, University of Minnesota,
40	Saint Paul, MN 55108
41	†: current address: Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, NC
42	27708, USA
43	
44	<u>Corresponding authors</u> :
45	Ute Radespiel, Institute of Zoology, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover, Germany,
46	email: <u>ute.radespiel@tiho-hannover.de</u>
47	Anne D. Yoder, Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, email:
48	anne.yoder@duke.edu
49	
50	Author contributions:
51	- Conception and design of study:
52	JP, GPT, DS, JS, LC, UR, ADY
53	- Data collection:
54	DS, MBB, JBA, EELJ, DWR, RMR, PK, JMR, BR collected samples in the field.
55	- Data analysis and interpretation:
56	DS, JS, LC, OB, PE, CRC, PAL, ARS, DW, AIP, PH, KEH, EJ, SM, RCW, EELJ, UR, ADY
57	generated sequencing data.

58	JP, GPT, DS, JS, LC, UR, ADY conducted population genetic and phylogenetic analyses.
59	- Drafting and revising manuscript:
60	JP, GPT, DS, JS, LC, UR, ADY drafted the manuscript.
61	
62	All co-authors revised and agreed on the last version of the manuscript.
63	
64	Data Availability Statement
65	- Raw sequencing data is available at NCBI BioProject PRJNA560399.
66	- All other data is available from the Dryad Digital Repository at
67	https://datadryad.org/stash/share/-
68	q8Ez_lXqi7LiDsBHJTAgM1JpdPOCGep0nU5gZ_EH9k

ABSTRACT

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

Mouse lemurs (*Microcebus*) are a radiation of morphologically cryptic primates distributed throughout Madagascar for which the number of recognized species has exploded in the past two decades. This taxonomic revision has prompted understandable concern that there has been substantial oversplitting in the mouse lemur clade. Here, we investigate mouse lemur diversity in a region in northeastern Madagascar with high levels of microendemism and predicted habitat loss. We analyzed RADseq data with multispecies coalescent (MSC) species delimitation methods for two pairs of sister lineages that include three named species and an undescribed lineage previously identified to have divergent mtDNA. Marked differences in effective population sizes, levels of gene flow, patterns of isolation-by-distance, and species delimitation results were found among the two pairs of lineages. Whereas all tests support the recognition of the presently undescribed lineage as a separate species, the species-level distinction of two previously described species, M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara is not supported – a result that is particularly striking when using the genealogical discordance index (gdi). Non-sister lineages occur sympatrically in two of the localities sampled for this study, despite an estimated divergence time of less than 1 Ma. This suggests rapid evolution of reproductive isolation in the focal lineages, and in the mouse lemur clade generally. The divergence time estimates reported here are based on the MSC calibrated with pedigree-based mutation rates and are considerably more recent than previously published fossil-calibrated

relaxed-clock estimates. We discuss the possible explanations for this discrepancy, noting that

89	there are theoretical justifications for preferring the MSC estimates in this case.
90	
91	Keywords: effective population size, cryptic species, multispecies coalescent, species
92	delimitation, speciation, microendemism

88

INTRODUCTION

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

Mouse lemurs (*Microcebus* spp.) are small, nocturnal primates that are widespread in the forests of Madagascar (Mittermeier et al. 2010), one of the world's most biodiverse environments (Myers et al. 2000; Goodman and Benstead 2005; Estrada et al. 2017). Mouse lemur diversity was long overlooked (Zimmermann and Radespiel 2014) until the introduction of genetic analyses made it feasible to identify diverging lineages comprised of lemurs with similar phenotypes and ecological niches. This genetic perspective has led to the description of many new species, with 24 species recognized at present. In one such study, Radespiel et al. (2008) surveyed the forests of the Makira region (Fig. 1) in northeastern Madagascar and found evidence for three divergent mitochondrial lineages occurring in sympatry. One of these was identified as M. mittermeieri (Louis et al. 2006), while the second was newly described as M. macarthurii. A third lineage, provisionally called M. sp. #3, was hypothesized to represent a new species closely related to M. macarthurii but was not formally named because the data were limited to mtDNA sequence data from one individual. Furthermore, two other species occur in the region, M. lehilahytsara (Roos and Kappeler in Kappeler et al. 2005) at higher elevations, and M. simmonsi (Louis et al. 2006) in lowland forests in the south (Fig. 1).

Given that many previous taxonomic descriptions of mouse lemurs have relied strongly, if not entirely, on mtDNA sequence divergence, there has been criticism that mouse lemurs (and

lemurs more generally) may have been oversplit (Tattersall 2007; Markolf et al. 2011). Species delimitation using only mtDNA is now widely regarded as problematic, given that the mitochondrial genome represents a single non-recombining locus whose gene tree may not represent the underlying species tree (e.g., Pamilo and Nei 1988; Maddison 1997). Mitochondria are also maternally inherited and therefore susceptible to effects of male-biased dispersal (e.g., Dávalos and Russell 2014), which is prevalent in mouse lemurs (reviewed in Radespiel 2016). Moreover, previous attempts to resolve mouse lemur relationships using nuclear sequences have been complicated by high gene tree discordance, consistent with strong incomplete lineage sorting (e.g., Heckman et al. 2007; Weisrock et al. 2010). These issues can be overcome with genomic approaches, which provide power for simultaneously resolving phylogenetic relationships and estimating demographic parameters such as divergence times, effective population sizes, and rates of gene flow — even among closely related species (e.g., Palkopoulou et al. 2018; Pedersen et al. 2018).

Given that cryptic species are by definition difficult to identify based on phenotypic characters (Bickford et al. 2007), recently developed methods for genomic species delimitation have advanced our ability to recognize and quantify their species diversity. In the past decade, both theory and methods for species delimitation have seen substantial progress, especially those which leverage the multispecies coalescent (MSC) model (Pamilo and Nei 1988; Rannala and Yang 2003). MSC-based species delimitation methods have been increasingly applied to

genomic data (e.g. Carstens and Dewey 2010; Yang and Rannala 2010; Grummer et al. 2014;
Dincă et al. 2019; Hundsdoerfer et al. 2019), though they have also been considered
controversial (Edwards and Knowles 2014; Sukumaran and Knowles 2017; Barley et al. 2018).
The controversy largely relates to the idea that strong population structure can be mistaken for
species boundaries, which may lead to oversplitting (Jackson et al. 2017; Sukumaran and
Knowles 2017; Luo et al. 2018; Leaché et al. 2019; Chambers and Hillis 2020). To overcome this
potential weakness, Jackson et al. (2017) proposed a heuristic criterion, the genealogical
divergence index (gdi) , with Leaché et al. (2019) further suggesting that gdi helps to differentiate
between population structure and species-level divergence. In parallel, sophisticated statistical
approaches have been developed that can detect the presence and magnitude of gene flow during
or after speciation (Gronau et al. 2011; Dalquen et al. 2017; Wen et al. 2018). Taken together,
these analytical developments are crucial to our ability to recognize the patterns that characterize
the speciation process, despite the challenge of identifying species without universally agreed
upon criteria (de Queiroz 2007).

In this study, we use a structured framework starting with phylogenetic placement of lineages and culminating with the MSC to delimit species, estimate divergence times, identify post-divergence gene flow, and to estimate both current and ancestral effective population sizes (Fig. S1). We take advantage of increased geographic, population-level, and genomic sampling to comparatively examine speciation dynamics for two pairs of closely related lineages in the

region (described below as Clades I and II) and perform MSC species delimitation methods with Restriction-site Associated DNA sequencing (RADseq) data to infer divergence times, effective population sizes, and rates of gene flow between these lineages. We also provide a novel wholegenome assembly for the previously undescribed lineage and compare inferences of effective population size (N_e) through time from whole-genome versus RADseq data. We find notably different species delimitation results for the lineages in the two mouse lemur clades and believe that the comprehensive analytic framework here used can be applied more generally to allow investigators to test hypotheses of population- versus species-level differentiation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Summary of Analyses

We generated RADseq data for 63 individuals from 6 lineages, of which 48 were from the two focal clades and passed quality control. First, we used maximum likelihood approaches to infer relationships among lineages and to provide a framework for subsequent species delimitation analyses (Fig. 2A and C). To delimit species, we performed clustering (Fig. 2B) and PCA analyses (Fig. 3A-C), as well as formal MSC species delimitation analyses using SNAPP and BPP. We also used the recently developed genealogical divergence index *gdi* based on BPP parameter estimates (Fig. 3D) and performed an isolation-by-distance analysis (Fig. 4). To determine to what extent ongoing and ancestral gene flow may have contributed to current

patterns of divergence, we used G-PhoCS and D-statistics (Fig. 5). Finally, we generated and assembled whole-genome sequencing data for a single M. sp. #3 individual. The whole-genome sequences of M. sp. #3 reported here for the first time and M. mittermeieri from a previous study (Hunnicutt et al., 2020) were used to infer N_e though time with Multiple Sequentially Markovian Coalescent (MSMC) analysis and compared with estimates from G-PhoCS (Fig. 6). Below, we describe the methods in more detail, while further details can be found in the Supplementary Material.

Study Sites and Sampling

Microcebus samples were obtained by taking ~2 mm² ear biopsies of captured (and thereafter released) individuals between 2008 and 2017 at seven humid evergreen forest sites (50-979 m a.s.l.) in the Analanjirofo and Sava regions of northeastern Madagascar (Fig. 1; Table S1). Additional samples were used from Riamalandy, Zahamena National Park (NP), Betampona Strict Nature Reserve (SNR) and Tampolo (Louis et al. 2006; Weisrock et al. 2010; Louis and Lei 2016) (Fig. 1). With this sampling strategy, we expected to include all mouse lemur species thought to occur in the region (from north to south): M. mittermeieri, M. macarthurii, M. sp. #3, M. lehilahytsara, and M. simmonsi (Fig. 1). Microcebus murinus, which occurs in western and southeastern Madagascar, was used as an outgroup.

Sequencing Data, Genotyping and Genome Assembly

We generated RADseq libraries using the *Sbf*I restriction enzyme, following three protocols (Supplementary Methods, Table S1). Sequences were aligned to the *M.* sp. #3 nuclear genome generated by this study, and to the published *M. murinus* mitochondrial genome (LeCompte et al. 2016). We used two genotyping approaches to ensure robustness of our results. First, we estimated genotype likelihoods (GL) with ANGSD v0.92 (Nielsen et al. 2012; Korneliussen et al. 2014), which retains information about uncertainty in base calls, thereby alleviating some issues commonly associated with RADseq data such as unevenness in sequencing depth and allele dropout (Lozier 2014; Pedersen et al. 2018; Warmuth and Ellegren 2019). Second, we called genotypes with GATK v4.0.7.0 (DePristo et al. 2011), and filtered GATK genotypes following the "FS6" filter of O'Leary et al. (2018; their Table 2). We furthermore used three mtDNA fragments [Cytochrome Oxidase II (COII), Cytochrome B (cytB), and d-loop] that were amplified and Sanger sequenced.

The genome of the *M*. sp. #3 individual sampled in Mananara-Nord NP (Table S3) was sequenced with a single 500bp insert library on a single lane of an Illumina HiSeq 3000 with paired-end 150bp reads. We used MaSuRCA v3.2.2 (Zimin et al. 2013) for contig assembly and SSPACE (Boetzer et al. 2011) for scaffolding. Scaffolds potentially containing mitochondrial or X-chromosome sequence data were removed in downstream analyses.

Phylogenetic Analyses

We used three phylogenetic approaches to infer relationships among lineages: (1) maximum likelihood using RAxML v8.2.11 (Stamatakis 2014), (2) SVDquartets, an MSC method that uses phylogenetic invariants, implemented in PAUP v4a163 (Chifman and Kubatko 2014), and (3) SNAPP, a full-likelihood MSC method for biallelic data that does not require joint gene tree estimation (v1.3.0; Bryant et al. 2012). Analyses with RAxML and SVDquartets used all available individuals, whereas SNAPP analyses were performed with subsets of 12 and 22 individuals for computational feasibility (see Supplementary Methods).

Species Delimitation

Clustering approaches and summary statistics. — Clustering analyses were performed using corresponding methods based on ANGSD genotype likelihoods [clustering in NgsAdmix v32 (Skotte et al. 2013) and PCA in ngsTools va4d338d (Fumagalli et al. 2014)] and on GATK-called genotypes [clustering in ADMIXTURE v1.3.0 (Alexander et al. 2009) and PCA using the glPca() function in adegenet v2.1.1 (Jombart and Ahmed 2011)]. These analyses were run for Clade I and Clade II together and separately.

MSC-based approaches. — We used SNAPP to test if the two lineages each in Clade I and II could be delimited using Bayes factors (Leaché et al. 2014), interpreting 2ln Bayes factors greater than six as strong evidence for a given model (Kass and Raftery 1995). We also applied guided species delimitation analyses with BPP (Yang and Rannala 2010; Rannala and Yang

2013) using full-length fasta files for a subset of individuals based on the species tree estimated
by SVDquartets and SNAPP.

gdi. — Coalescent node heights (τ) and ancestral effective population sizes (θ) estimated by BPP were used to compute the genealogical divergence index (gdi; Jackson et al. 2017; Leaché et al. 2019) for the lineages in Clade I and Clade II. We calculated gdi as in Leaché et al. (2019), using their equation 7 ($gdi = 1 - e^{-2\tau/\theta}$), where $2\tau/\theta$ represents the population divergence time between two taxa in coalescent units. θ is taken from one of the two taxa and therefore, gdi was calculated twice for each species pair, alternating the focal taxon. We computed gdi using τ and θ parameter estimates for each posterior BPP sample to incorporate uncertainty in the estimates. Jackson et al. (2017) suggested the following interpretation of gdi values: the taxon pair (a) is unambiguously a single species for gdi < 0.2, (b) is unambiguously two separate species for gdi > 0.7, and (c) falls in an ambiguous zone for 0.7 > gdi < 0.2.

Isolation-by-distance. — We tested for isolation-by-distance using the VCF file produced by GATK with the glibd() function in the R package dartR 1.1.11 (Gruber et al. 2018).

Inference of gene flow and divergence times

G-PhoCS v1.3 (Gronau et al. 2011), a Bayesian MSC approach that allows for the estimation of periods of gene flow (*i.e.* "migration bands"), was used to jointly infer divergence times, population sizes, and rates of gene flow between specific lineages. Based on the results of

exploratory models that each contained a single "migration band" between two lineages, we ran a final model with a migration bands allowing gene flow from *mittermeieri* to *lehilahytsara* and from *macarthurii* to *M*. sp. #3. Given the observed mitonuclear discordance between *M*. sp. #3 and *M. macarthurii* (see Results), we investigated gene flow between them in more detail by running G-PhoCS using a dataset with only *M*. sp. #3, *M. macarthurii*, and *M. lehilahytsara* individuals, wherein *M*. sp. #3 was divided into the two populations detected using clustering approaches.

The D-statistic and related formal statistics for admixture use phylogenetic invariants to infer post-divergence gene flow between non-sister populations or taxa. We used the qpDstat tool in admixtools v4.1 (Patterson et al. 2012) to compute four-taxon D-statistics for all possible configurations in which gene flow could be tested between non-sister lineages among the five ingroup lineages. We additionally tested for gene flow between *M. macarthurii* and *M.* sp. #3 by separately treating (1) the two distinct *M.* sp. #3 populations detected by clustering approaches, and (2) *M. macarthurii* individuals with and without "*M.* sp. #3-type" mtDNA (see Results). In all tests, *M. murinus* was used as P4 (outgroup).

Effective Population Size Through Time

Studies have shown that population structure can generate spurious signals of population size change (Beaumont 2004; Chikhi et al. 2010; Heller et al. 2013). For example, sequentially

Markovian coalescent approaches such as MSMC (Schiffels and Durbin 2014) actually estimate the inverse instantaneous coalescence rate, which is only equivalent to an effective size in panmictic models (Mazet et al. 2016; Rodríguez et al. 2018). We therefore inferred and compared population size histories using two methods. We estimated N_e over time with MSMC for two species, using the whole-genome data of M. sp. #3 and M. mittermeieri (Hunnicutt et al. 2020) mapped to the chromosome-level genome assembly of M. murinus (Larsen et al. 2017). These estimates were compared to inferred changes in N_e over time based on θ estimates from G-PhoCS for each predefined extant or ancestral population. Although G-PhoCS was not expressly developed to estimate change in N_e over time, this allowed us to explicitly examine broad demographic trends, even with small population-level sampling.

Mutation Rate and Generation Time

We used empirical estimates of mutation rate and generation time to convert coalescent units from BPP, G-PhoCS and MSMC analyses into absolute times and population sizes. We incorporated uncertainty by drawing from mutation rate and generation time distributions for each sampled generation of the MCMC chains in BPP and G-PhoCS (MSMC parameter estimates were converted using the point estimates). For the mutation rate, we used a gamma distribution based on the mean (1.236 x 10⁻⁸) and variance (0.107 x 10⁻⁸) of seven pedigree-based mutation rate estimates for primates (see Campbell et al. 2019, Table S1). For the generation time, we used a lognormal distribution with a mean of ln(3.5) and standard deviation of ln(1.16) based on

estimates of 4.5 years calculated from survival data (Zohdy et al. 2014; Yoder et al. 2016) from *M. rufus*, and 2.5 years from average parent age based on capture-mark-recapture and parentage data in the wild (Radespiel et al. 2019) for *M. murinus*.

RESULTS

RADseq Data and Whole-Genome Assembly

We used three library generation protocols, two sequencing lengths, and a combination of single and paired-end sequencing, yielding data for all 63 individuals in the study and demonstrating the utility of cross-laboratory RAD sequencing, as previously shown in other taxa (e.g., Gonen et al. 2015). From more than 447 million raw reads (Table S1), over 394 million passed quality filters, with approximately 182 million successfully aligning to the *M.* sp. #3 reference genome. We obtained an average of 120,000 loci per individual with coverage ranging from ~1 to ~22x (Table S1).

We assembled approximately 2.5 Gb of nuclear genome sequence data for *M*. sp. #3 with a contig N50 around 36 Kb (Table S3). While the final assembly was fragmented, as expected for a single Illumina library genome, only 6.4% of mammalian BUSCOs (Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Orthologs, Simão et al. 2015) were found to be missing. The genome sequence and associated gene annotations can be accessed through NCBI (Bioproject PRJNA512515).

Phylogenetic I	Relationsl	hips
----------------	------------	------

R	AxML and SVDquartets recovered well-supported nDNA clades for <i>M. simmonsi</i> , <i>M</i> .
macartl	hurii, and M. sp. #3, the latter two as sister taxa with 100% bootstrap support (Fig. 2;
Fig. S	S2). SNAPP also supported M. sp. #3 as sister taxon to M. macarthurii (referred to as
Clade I) and placed M. lehilahytsara as sister taxon to M. mittermeieri (referred to as Clade II)
(Fig.	S2). However, M. lehilahytsara was not monophyletic in RAxML analyses of nDNA
(Fig.	2C) or mtDNA (Fig. 2A), and a SVD quartets analysis of nDNA placed one M .
lehilahy	ytsara individual from Ambavala as sister to all other M. lehilahytsara and M.
mitterm	neieri, and only weakly supported a monophyletic M. mittermeieri (Fig. S2A).

Although mtDNA analyses placed several individuals from Anjiahely in a well-supported clade with M. sp. #3, individuals from Ambavala (see Fig. 1), Mananara-Nord NP, and Antanambe (Fig. 2A; see lower gray box), nuclear RADseq data placed them unambiguously within the M. macarthurii clade (Fig. 2B, C). This suggests that individuals from Anjiahely are in fact M. macarthurii, but carry two divergent mtDNA lineages, and that true M. sp. #3 are only found between Ambavala and Antanambe (Fig. 1). The cause of this mitonuclear discordance for macarthurii in Anjiahely was investigated further (see the section "Interspecific Gene Flow").

Species Delimitation

Genetic structure. — A PCA with both pairs of sister lineages (Clade 1: M. macarthurii and
M. sp. #3; Clade II: M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara) distinguished the two clades along
PC1, and distinguished <i>M. macarthurii</i> and <i>M.</i> sp. #3 along PC2 (Fig. 3B). When restricting
clustering analyses to Clade I, $K = 2$ was the best-supported number of clusters with both
approaches, distinguishing M . macarthurii and M . sp. #3 (Fig. S5; Fig. S7B). At $K = 3$, M .
sp. #3 was divided into two clusters with individuals from Mananara-Nord NP and Antanambe
separated from Ambavala individuals (Fig. S7B, Fig. S10). A separate PCA analysis for
Clade I also distinguished these two groups along PC2 (Fig. 3C), which we hereafter refer to
as "southern M. sp. #3" (Mananara-Nord NP and Antanambe are south of the Mananara river)
and "northern M. sp. #3" (Ambavala is north of the river, and 24.0 km from Mananara-Nord NP
and 35.2 km from Antanambe; Fig. 1), respectively. When restricting clustering analyses to
Clade II, ADMIXTURE and ngsAdmix suggested optimal values of 1 and 2, respectively; at K=2,
M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara were largely but not entirely separated by both approaches
(Fig. S5, Fig. S7C, Fig. S11). A PCA distinguished M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara
along PC1 but with little separation (Fig. 3D).
SNAPP and BPP. — SNAPP Bayes factors strongly favored splitting Clade I into two

330	993). All putative species assignments were recovered by the guided delimitation analysis with
331	BPP (Fig. S12).
332	Genealogical divergence index (gdi). — For the Clade I sister pair, gdi was 0.727 (95%
333	HPD: 0.718-0.737) from the perspective of <i>M. macarthurii</i> (i.e. above the upper threshold for
334	species delimitation), and 0.500 ($0.488-0.511$) from the perspective of M . sp. #3 (i.e. in the upper
335	ambiguous zone for species delimitation; Fig. 3A). In contrast, gdi values for the Clade II
336	putative species pair were much lower and even below the lower threshold for species
337	delimitation: 0.080 (0.074-0.086) from the perspective of M. lehilahytsara, and 0.193 (0.187-
338	0.201) from the perspective of M . $mittermeieri$ (Fig. 3A).
339	Isolation-by-distance (IBD). — While comparisons within and between lineages appeared
340	to follow a single isolation-by-distance pattern for M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara (Clade
341	II, $r=0.693$, $p=0.002$, Fig. 4B), comparisons within versus between lineages differed strongly
342	for M . $macarthurii$ and M . sp. #3 (Clade I, Fig. 4A). Specifically, genetic distances between M .
343	macarthurii and M. sp. #3 were much larger than within lineages and were also much larger than
344	between M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara, despite similar geographic distances.
345	Interspecific gene flow. — G-PhoCS inferred high levels of gene flow in Clade II, from M.
346	mittermeieri to M. lehilahytsara [population migration rate (2Nm) = 1.59 (95% HPD: 1.50-1.68),
347	migrants per generation: 0.18% (95% HPD: 0.09-0.27%)], and much lower levels of gene flow in

Clade I, from *M*. sp. #3 to *macarthurii* [2Nm = 0.08 (95% HPD: 0.07-0.09), migrants per generation: 0.10% (0.05-0.15%)] (Fig. 5C). G-PhoCS also inferred low levels of gene flow between the two clades, most likely between ancestral populations, but the timing and direction of gene flow could not be determined (Supplementary Results; Fig. S13), and D-statistics testing for gene flow between the clades were not significant (Fig. S14).

We further investigated gene flow between *M*. sp. #3 and *M*. *macarthurii* by taking the strong population structure within *M*. sp. #3 into account. D-statistics suggested that northern *M*. sp. #3 and *M*. *macarthurii* with "*M*. sp. #3-type" mtDNA share a slight excess of derived alleles in relation to southern *M*. sp. #3, significantly deviating from 0, which indicates gene flow (Fig. S15A). Using a G-PhoCS model with separate northern and southern groups for *M*. sp. #3, we found that (1) gene flow with *M*. *macarthurii* took place before and after the onset of divergence between northern and southern *M*. sp. #3, (2) gene flow between extant lineages occurred or occurs only between northern (and not southern) *M*. sp. #3 and *M*. *macarthurii*, and (3) gene flow is asymmetric, predominantly into *M*. *macarthurii* (Fig. S15B).

Divergence Times

We estimated divergence times under the MSC model using BPP and G-PhoCS both with and without interspecific gene flow (Fig. 5; Fig. S17). Results were similar across these approaches, with the exception of divergence times between sister lineages in G-PhoCS models

with versus without gene flow (Fig. 5). Specifically, the divergence time between M . sp. #3
and M. macarthurii (Clade I) without gene flow was estimated at 115 kya (95% HPD range: 52-
190 ka across G-PhoCS and BPP models) (Fig. 5; Fig. S17), but at 193 kya (95% HPD:
89-318 ka) when incorporating gene flow (Fig. 5C-D). In Clade II, this difference in
estimated divergence times was considerably larger: under an isolation model it was estimated to
be 103 kya (95% HPD: 49-171 ka; Fig. 5) and as much as 520 kya (95% HPD: 249-871 ka)
when modeled with gene flow (Fig. 5). Deeper nodes were not as strongly affected:
divergence time between Clades I and II was estimated at 687 kya (95% HPD: 337-1126 ka)
across G-PhoCS and BPP isolation models, and at 796 kya (95% HPD: 360-1311 ka) in a G-
PhoCS model with gene flow (Fig. 5D).

Effective Population Sizes

We found large differences in N_e among lineages, with considerably larger N_e for the lineages in Clade II, M. lehilahytsara (mean estimate and 95% HPD range across the BPP and G-PhoCS models with and without interspecific gene flow: 159 k; 58-265 k) and M. mittermeieri (78 k; 36-140 k), than the lineages in Clade I, M. sp. #3 (24 k; 12-38 k) and M. macarthurii (12 k; 5-19 k) (Fig. 5A-C). Wide HPD intervals for M. mittermeieri and lehilahytsara are due to differences between models with and without gene flow. Using the G-PhoCS model focused on

Clade I, fairly similar effective population sizes were estimated separately for northern (47 k; 17-78 k), southern (23 k; 12-37 k), and ancestral (33 k; 17-53 k) *M.* sp. #3 lineages (Fig. S13).

Using the whole-genome data for one individual of *M*. sp. #3 (from the southern group) and for *M*. *mittermeieri*, a comparison of MSMC analyses and G-PhoCS models with and without gene flow (Fig. 6) showed highly similar and markedly declining estimates of population sizes towards the present for *M*. sp. #3 (Fig. 6A). Estimates for *M*. *mittermeieri* were more variable across analyses but none showed a consistent decline towards the present (Fig. 6B).

DISCUSSION

We used an MSC-based framework for genomic species delimitation and identified rapid and recent diversification of mouse lemurs in a relatively small area in northeastern Madagascar. The same region was previously identified to harbor high levels of lemur microendemism and to be vulnerable to the effects of climate change (Brown and Yoder 2015) and anthropogenic habitat alteration (Schüßler et al. 2020), marking it as a region of conservation concern. Species-level divergence was strongly supported for *M.* sp. #3 and its sister species *M. macarthurii* (Clade I, Fig. 2), but not for the pair of *M. mittermeieri* and *M. lehilahytsara* (Clade II, Fig. 2), overturning our *a priori* expectation that the latter were distinct species (Olave et al., 2014). We inferred that the focal species all diverged from their common ancestors within the past million years and documented two cases of sympatric occurrence, each with one representative from

Clade I and one from Clade II. The combined findings of recent divergence and sympatric overlap suggest that reproductive isolation can evolve rapidly in mouse lemurs.

Support for Separate Sister Species Differs Sharply Between the Two Clades

Evidence for distinguishing *M*. sp. #3 and *M*. *macarthurii* as separate species was strong and consistent across analyses. They were reciprocally monophyletic across all phylogenetic analyses of RADseq data (Fig. 2C; Fig. S2; Fig. S3), separated unambiguously in clustering and PCA analyses (Fig. 2B; Fig. 3BC; Fig. S4; Fig. S6-S10), were strongly supported as separate lineages using SNAPP Bayes factors (Table 1) and BPP (Fig. S12), and passed the heuristic species delimitation criterion of *gdi* (Fig. 3A). A comparison of genetic and geographic distances moreover showed a clear distinction between intra- and interspecific genetic distances (Fig. 4). Finally, gene flow between these two lineages was estimated to have occurred at very low levels (G-PhoCS migration band = 0.08; Fig. 5c).

In contrast, separate species status of *M. lehilahytsara* and *M. mittermeieri* (Clade II) was not supported by comprehensive analysis of the genomic data. These species were paraphyletic in RAxML and SVDquartets analyses (Fig. 2A, C; Fig. S2) and not as clearly separated in clustering and PCA analyses (Fig. 2B; Fig. 3BD; Fig. S5, S7–S9; Fig. S10).

Although the Bayes factor support from SNAPP was strong by standard guidelines (Kass and Raftery 1995), the evidence was much weaker relative to species in Clade I and decreased when

more individuals were included (Table S6). It is unsurprising that Bayes factors will support
splitting lineages with genetic structure (Sukumaran and Knowles 2017; Leaché et al. 2019) even
with low levels of gene flow (Barley et al. 2018). Therefore, standard guidelines for interpreting
Bayes factors may be of limited value for delimiting species, as informed by the lack of
monophyly, high levels of inferred gene flow, and failure of additional delimitation tests
observed here. Guided delimitation also separated M. lehilahytsara and M. mittermeieri (Fig.
S11), but similar criticisms of oversplitting (e.g. Barley et al. 2018) lead us to not interpret MSC
delimitation results as evidence of species status. Most strikingly, reciprocal gdi statistics for
Clade II were <0.2, thus falling in the range suggested to unambiguously indicate a single
species (Jackson et al. 2017; Leaché et al. 2019; Fig. 3A). Finally, comparing genetic and
geographic distances within Clade II showed that a single isolation-by-distance pattern fits both
intra- and interspecific comparisons (Fig. 4). While the range of <i>M. lehilahytsara</i> expands
considerably further south than the populations examined here, our results strongly suggest that
M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara are best considered a single species. Sampling gaps are
expected to cause false positive species delimitations rather than false negatives (Barley et al.
2018; Chambers and Hillis 2020; Mason et al. 2020), thus indicating that additional sampling of
M. lehilahytsara populations farther south should not affect our conclusions regarding genetic
continuity. As such, and given that the original description of M. lehilahytsara precedes that of
M. mittermeieri, we recommend that M. mittermeieri be synonymized as M. lehilahytsara.

Mitonuclear Discordance and Gene Flow

Mitonuclear discordance was observed for a subset of *M. macarthurii* individuals from Anjiahely. These individuals carried mtDNA similar to that of *M.* sp. #3 (see Radespiel et al. 2008) but had nDNA indistinguishable from sympatric *M. macarthurii*. Although genealogical discordance could be due to incomplete lineage sorting (e.g., Heckman et al. 2007; Weisrock et al. 2010), mitochondrial introgression is supported by D-statistics (Fig. S15) and the inferred low levels of gene flow from the northern *M.* sp. #3 population into *M. macarthurii* by G-PhoCS (Fig. S13). Besides a possible case in Sgarlata et al. (2019), mitochondrial introgression has not previously been reported in mouse lemurs. We conclude that, somewhat curiously, the discovery of a divergent mtDNA lineage at Anjiahely (Radespiel et al. 2008) which prompted the current work was apparently the result of mtDNA introgression from an undescribed species into its sister species.

Population Size and Species Delimitation

The comparison of effective population sizes in Clades I and II revealed marked differences, which can affect species delimitation tests such as gdi (Leaché et al., 2019). The gdi is calculated using population sizes and divergence times estimated under models with no gene flow, and since divergence time estimates in these models were highly similar in both clades (Fig. 5), differences in effective population sizes also appear to play a role in the stark difference in gdi. Indeed, gdi aims to quantify the probability that two sequences from the focal

taxon coalesce more recently than the divergence time between the taxa, and larger effective population sizes result in slower sorting of ancestral polymorphisms (Maddison 1997).

Assessing "progress" in speciation by quantifying rates of neutral coalescence, however, implies that the magnitude of genetic drift is a good predictor of species limits. At least when considering reproductive isolation (i.e., biological species), this can be problematic, given that the role of drift in speciation is generally thought to be small (Rice and Hostert 1993; Czekanski-Moir and Rundell 2019; but see Uyeda et al. 2009). Therefore, additional measures of divergence should be taken into account, including those that do not depend on population size, such as rates of gene flow and divergence time itself (Yang and Rannala 2010; Leaché et al. 2019).

Sympatric Occurrence and the Tempo of Speciation in Mouse Lemurs

Sympatric *Microcebus* species were found at two study sites, with a representative of each of the two focal clades in Anjiahely (*M. macarthurii* and *M. mittermeieri*) as well as in Ambavala (*M.* sp. #3 and *M. lehilahytsara*; Fig. 1). These cases of sympatric occurrence, with no evidence for recent admixture, imply that the two clades are reproductively isolated. Though our methods cannot address the mechanisms underlying reproductive isolation, possible barriers include male advertisement calls, which tend to differ strongly among species (Braune et al. 2008), and timing of reproduction, which has previously been found to differ among sympatric mouse lemur species (Schmelting et al. 2000; Evasoa et al. 2018) including the focal species

(Schüßler et al., in revision). Only six other cases of sympatry among mouse lemur species are known, five of which include *M. murinus* as one of the co-occurring species (Radespiel 2016; Sgarlata et al. 2019).

Given that the sympatrically occurring species were estimated to have had a common ancestor as recently as ~700-800 kya (i.e., the divergence time between Clade I and Clade II, see Fig. 5), this suggests rapid evolution of reproductive isolation and a short time to sympatry among mouse lemurs. By comparison, Pigot & Tobias (2015) estimated that after 5 Ma of divergence, only 21–23% of primate species have attained sympatry. In fact, the one sympatric pair within their dataset of 74 sister species pairs younger than 2.5 million years consisted of *Galago gallarum* and *G senegalensis* (Pigot and Tobias 2015), which are also Strepsirrhini. Moreover, Curnoe et al. (2006) compiled data for naturally hybridizing primate species, and found the median estimated divergence time to be 2.9 Ma. More broadly, primate speciation rates do not appear to be lower than those for other mammals or even vertebrates (Curnoe et al. 2006, Upham et al. 2019). It should be noted, however, that the temporal estimates reported in our study are based on MSC analyses using mutation rates estimated from pedigree studies, whereas dates for other primate clades were largely calculated from fossil-calibrated relaxed clock methods.

Complexities of Divergence Time Estimates

There are two noteworthy discrepancies in divergence time estimates highlighted by this study. First, the age estimate between the *M. mittermeieri* and *M. lehilahytsara* lineages increased from approximately 100 kya (Fig. 5b) to more than 500 kya (Fig. 5c) when the MSC model allowed for gene flow. The substantial effect of incorporating or disregarding gene flow on divergence time estimation has been previously noted (Leaché et al. 2014; Tseng et al. 2014) and we here reiterate its significance. Second, the coalescent-based estimates of divergence times presented here differ drastically from estimates based on fossil-calibrated relaxed-clock methods. In the present study, we estimated the mean age of the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of mouse lemurs to be under 1.5 Ma, with the highest upper bound of 95% HPDs across models at 2.40 Ma. This age estimate is in stark contrast to previous fossil-calibrated estimates of 8 - 10 Ma (Yang and Yoder 2003; dos Reis et al. 2018).

Several factors likely contribute to this large difference. First, the MSC estimate uses a *de novo* mutation rate sampled from a distribution based on available pedigree-based mutation rates in primates, including mouse lemurs (Campbell et al., 2019). This rate is nearly two-fold higher than the estimated substitution rate for *M. murinus* (dos Reis et al., 2018). Second, converting coalescent units to absolute time also requires a generation time estimate. We attempted to account for uncertainty in generation time by similarly drawing from a distribution based on empirical parent age estimates (Zohdy et al., 2014; Radespiel et al., 2019) in mouse lemurs. Thus, either overestimation of the mutation rate and/or underestimation of the generation time

would lead to divergence time estimates that are too recent. However, theoretical considerations suggest that instead, mouse lemur divergence time estimates from fossil-calibrated clock models are too old.

When incomplete lineage sorting is common, clock models that assume a single topology underlies all loci can overestimate species divergences compared to MSC estimates that allow gene trees to vary (Stange et al., 2018; Feng et al., 2020). This is likely to apply to mouse lemurs given that high levels of incomplete lineage sorting have been previously documented (Heckman et al., 2007; Weisrock et al., 2010; Hotaling et al., 2016). Moreover, due to the absence of a post-K-Pg terrestrial fossil record for Madagascar, clock-model estimates of divergence times in mouse lemurs have relied on fossil calibrations from the distantly related African sister lineage of lemurs, the Lorisiformes (Seiffert et al., 2003), as well as from anthropoid primates and other mammals. This scenario - estimation of divergence times for younger, internal nodes with calibrations placed on much older nodes - should lead to overestimation of divergence times (Angelis and dos Reis 2015). Therefore, it is likely that divergence times between mouse lemur species have been overestimated by previous studies with fossil-calibrated clock models (e.g. Yang and Yoder 2003; dos Reis et al., 2018), and we suggest that the mutation rate-calibrated MSC divergence times presented here are more accurate.

Our estimates of divergence times imply that the entire mouse lemur radiation originated in the Pleistocene, in turn suggesting that Pleistocene climatic oscillations represent a likely factor leading to geographic isolation and subsequent genetic divergence. Periods of drought during glacial maxima are hypothesized to have caused dramatic contraction of forest habitats (Burney et al. 1997; Gasse and Van Campo 2001; Wilmé et al. 2006; Kiage and Liu 2016) and to isolation of previously connected populations. Notably, the patterns of differentiation observed in this study are consistent with the predictions of Wilmé et al. (2006) wherein Madagascar's river drainage systems created high-elevation retreat-dispersal corridors during periods of climatic oscillation. That is, whereas the lineages in Clade I (highly differentiated and low N_e) appear to occur only in lowland forests, those in the Clade II (poorly differentiated and high N_e) occur at both higher and lower elevations (Schüßler et al., in revision). Moreover, the Mananara river runs between the fairly distinct northern and southern populations of M. sp. #3, further emphasizing the potential of large rivers to act as phylogeographic barriers in lemurs (Martin 1972; Pastorini et al. 2003; Goodman and Ganzhorn 2004; Olivieri et al. 2007).

Population Size Dynamics

A long-term decline in population size was inferred for the lineage leading to M. sp. #3. While changes in inferred N_e may be confounded by changes in population structure – especially for single-population sequential Markovian coalescent (PSMC/MSMC) models that do not explicitly consider population subdivision (Mazet et al. 2016; Chikhi et al. 2018) – we recovered

similar results with both MSMC and G-PhoCS analyses (Fig. 6A). This congruence is especially persuasive given the underlying differences between the G-PhoCS and MSMC models and their input data. Moreover, Markovian coalescent approaches are robust to genome assembly quality (Patton et al. 2019), yielding further confidence in the results. The inferred decline and population subdivision of M. sp. #3 was initiated long before anthropogenic land use, supporting the emerging consensus that human colonization in Madagascar alone does not explain the occurrence of open habitats and isolated forest fragments (Quéméré et al. 2012; Vorontsova et al. 2016; Yoder et al. 2016; Salmona et al. 2017, 2020; Hackel et al. 2018). Conversely, results for the M. mittermeieri lineage do not indicate a declining N_e through time (Fig. 6B). This latter result may well be a simple corollary of the evidence described above, that this lineage is part of a single species complex represented by Clade II and thus occurs at both higher and lower elevations in northeastern Madagascar.

Conclusions

We have shown that substantial mouse lemur diversity exists within a 130-km-wide stretch in northeastern Madagascar, including two instances of sympatric occurrence between representatives of two closely related clades. Within one of these clades, our comprehensive approach that uses a variety of genomic analyses indicates that the undescribed lineage M. sp. #3 represents a distinct species, while the two named species in the other clade, M. mittermeieri and M. lehilahytsara, are better considered a single, widespread species with significant population

structure. Given that the original description of *M. lehilahytsara* precedes that of *M. mittermeieri*, primate taxonomists should synonymize the two as *M. lehilahytsara*.

The divergence times calculated here using pedigree-based mutation rate estimates with the MSC are much younger than those of previous studies that used external fossil-based calibrations with relaxed-clock methods. The younger dates suggest rapid evolution of reproductive isolation in mouse lemurs as well as a Pleistocene origin of the radiation, likely following population isolation due to climatic oscillations. This departure from previous hypotheses of mouse lemur antiquity emphasizes the need for future studies focused on resolving discrepancies in divergence time estimates, both in mouse lemurs and in other recently evolved organismal groups for which such comparisons have yet to be made.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the editors and three anonymous reviewers for their constructive input which
substantially improved our manuscript. The study was conducted under the research permit No.
197/17/MEEF/SG/DGF/DSAP/SCB.Re (DS), 072/15/MEEMF/SG/DGF/DCB.SAP/SCB
(MBB), 137/13/MEF/SG/DGF/DCB.SAP/SCB (DWR), 175/14/MEF/SG/DGF/DCB.SAP/SCB
(A. Miller), kindly issued by the directeur du système des aires protégées, Antananarivo and the
regional authorities (Direction Régional de l'Environnement, de l'Ecologie et de Forêts). We are
endebted to J.H. Ratsimbazafy, N.V. Andriaholinirina, C. Misandeau, B. Le Pors and S.
Rasoloharijaona, for their help with administrative tasks, to A. Miller for sharing samples, and to
G. Besnard for facilitating this study. We thank our field assistants (T. Ralantoharijaona, I.
Sitrakarivo, C. Hanitriniaina and T. Ralantoharijaona), the Wildlife Conservation Society
Madagascar and the ADAFAM (Association Des Amis de la Forêt d'Ambodiriana-Manompana,
C. Misandeau in particular) for their valuable help during sample collection. We warmly thank
the many local guides and cooks for sharing their incomparable expertise and help in the field,
misaotra anareo jiaby.

Funding was granted by the Bauer Foundation and the Zempelin Foundation of the "Deutsches Stiftungszentrum" under grant no. T237/22985/2012/kg and T0214/32083/2018/sm to DS, Duke Lemur Center/SAVA Conservation research funds to MBB, the School of Animal

Biology at The University of Western Australia to AM, the Fundação para a Ciência e a
Tecnologia, Portugal (PTDC/BIA-BEC/100176/2008, PTDC/BIA-BIC/4476/2012, and
SFRH/BD/64875/2009), the Groupement de Recherche International (GDRI) Biodiversité et
développement durable – Madagascar, the Laboratoire d'Excellence (LABEX) TULIP (ANR-10-
LABX-41) and CEBA (ANR-10-LABX-25-01, the Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, Portugal to
LC and JS, the ERA-NET BiodivERsA project: INFRAGECO (Inference, Fragmentation,
Genomics, and Conservation, ANR-16-EBI3-0014 & FCT-Biodiversa/0003/2015) the LIA
BEEG-B (Laboratoire International Associé – Bioinformatics, Ecology, Evolution, Genomics
and Behaviour, CNRS) to LC and JS. Further financial support came from the Institute of
Zoology, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover and UR acknowledges the long-term
support of the late Elke Zimmermann for her research activities on Madagascar. The genomic
data were generated with funds from NSF DEB-1354610 to ADY and DWW and from the EDB
Lab to JS. ADY also gratefully acknowledges support from the John Simon Guggenheim
Memorial Foundation, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, and the Duke Tropical
Conservation Initiative. EELJ would like to acknowledge support from the Ahmanson
Foundation for the data generation. This work was performed in collaboration with the GeT core
facility, Toulouse, France (http://get.genotoul.fr), and was supported by France Génomique
National infrastructure, funded as part of "Investissement d'avenir" program managed by Agence
Nationale pour la Recherche (contract ANR-10-INBS-09). JS, UR & LC also gratefully

- acknowledge support from the Get-Plage sequencing and Genotoul bioinformatics
- 615 (BioinfoGenotoul) platforms Toulouse Midi-Pyrenees. This is DLC publication #1459.

616	References
617	Alexander D.H., Novembre J., Lange K. 2009. Fast model-based estimation of ancestry in unrelated
618	individuals. Genome Res. 19:1655–1664.
619	Angelis K., Dos Reis M. 2015. The impact of ancestral population size and incomplete lineage sorting or
620	Bayesian estimation of species divergence times. Curr. Zool. 61:874–885.
621	Barley A.J., Brown J.M., Thomson R.C. 2018. Impact of model violations on the inference of species
622	boundaries under the multispecies coalescent. Syst. Biol. 67:269–284.
623	Beaumont M.A. 2004. Recent developments in genetic data analysis: what can they tell us about human
624	demographic history? Heredity. 92:365–379.
625	Bickford D., Lohman D.J., Sodhi N.S., Ng P.K.L., Meier R., Winker K., Ingram K.K., Das I. 2007.
626	Cryptic species as a window on diversity and conservation. Trends Ecol. Evol. 22:148–155.
627	Boetzer M., Henkel C.V., Jansen H.J., Butler D., Pirovano W. 2011. Scaffolding pre-assembled contigs
628	using SSPACE. Bioinformatics. 27:578–579.
629	Braune P., Schmidt S., Zimmermann E. 2008. Acoustic divergence in the communication of cryptic
630	species of nocturnal primates (Microcebus ssp.). BMC Biology. 6:19.
631	Brown J.L., Yoder A.D. 2015. Shifting ranges and conservation challenges for lemurs in the face of
632	climate change. Ecology and Evolution. 5:1131–1142.
633	Bryant D., Bouckaert R., Felsenstein J., Rosenberg N.A., RoyChoudhury A. 2012. Inferring species trees
634	directly from biallelic genetic markers: bypassing gene trees in a full coalescent analysis. Mol.
635	Biol. Evol. 29:1917–1932.

636	Burney D., James H., Grady F., Rafamantanantsoa JG., Ramilisonina, Wright H., Cowart J. 1997.
537	Environmental change, extinction and human activity: evidence from caves in NW Madagascar.
538	Journal of Biogeography. 24:755–767.
539	Campbell C.R., Tiley G.P., Poelstra J.W., Hunnicutt K.E., Larsen P.A., Reis M. dos, Yoder A.D. 2019.
540	Pedigree-based measurement of the de novo mutation rate in the gray mouse lemur reveals a high
541	mutation rate, few mutations in CpG sites, and a weak sex bias. bioRxiv.:724880.
542	Carstens B.C., Dewey T.A. 2010. Species delimitation using a combined coalescent and information-
543	theoretic approach: an example from North American <i>Myotis</i> bats. Syst. Biol. 59:400–414.
544	Chambers E.A., Hillis D.M. 2020. The multispecies coalescent over-splits species in the case of
545	geographically widespread taxa. Syst. Biol. 69:184–193.
546	Chifman J., Kubatko L. 2014. Quartet inference from SNP data under the coalescent model.
547	Bioinformatics. 30:3317–3324.
548	Chikhi L., Rodríguez W., Grusea S., Santos P., Boitard S., Mazet O. 2018. The IICR (inverse
549	instantaneous coalescence rate) as a summary of genomic diversity: insights into demographic
550	inference and model choice. Heredity. 120:13–24.
651	Chikhi L., Sousa V.C., Luisi P., Goossens B., Beaumont M.A. 2010. The confounding effects of
552	population structure, genetic diversity and the sampling scheme on the detection and
553	quantification of population size change. Genetics. 186:983–995.
554	Curnoe D., Thorne A., Coate J.A. 2006. Timing and tempo of primate speciation. J. Evol. Biol. 19:59–65.
655	Czekanski-Moir J.E., Rundell R.J. 2019. The ecology of nonecological speciation and nonadaptive
556	radiations. Trends Ecol. Evol. 34:400–415.
657	Dalquen D.A., Zhu T., Yang Z. 2017. Maximum likelihood implementation of an isolation-with-migration
658	model for three species. Syst. Biol. 66:379–398.

659	Dávalos L.M., Russell A.L. 2014. Sex-biased dispersal produces high error rates in mitochondrial
660	distance-based and tree-based species delimitation. J. Mammal. 95:781–791.
661	DePristo M.A., Banks E., Poplin R., Garimella K.V., Maguire J.R., Hartl C., Philippakis A.A., del Angel
662	G., Rivas M.A., Hanna M., McKenna A., Fennell T.J., Kernytsky A.M., Sivachenko A.Y.,
663	Cibulskis K., Gabriel S.B., Altshuler D., Daly M.J. 2011. A framework for variation discovery
664	and genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data. Nature Genetics. 43:491–498.
665	Dincă V., Lee K.M., Vila R., Mutanen M. 2019. The conundrum of species delimitation: a genomic
666	perspective on a mitogenetically super-variable butterfly. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.
667	286:20191311.
668	dos Reis M., Gunnell G.F., Barba-Montoya J., Wilkins A., Yang Z., Yoder A.D. 2018. Using
669	phylogenomic data to explore the effects of relaxed clocks and calibration strategies on
670	divergence time estimation: primates as a test case. Syst. Biol. 67:594–615.
671	Edwards D.L., Knowles L.L. 2014. Species detection and individual assignment in species delimitation:
672	can integrative data increase efficacy? Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 281:20132765.
673	Estrada A., Garber P.A., Rylands A.B., Roos C., Fernandez-Duque E., Fiore A.D., Nekaris K.AI.,
674	Nijman V., Heymann E.W., Lambert J.E., Rovero F., Barelli C., Setchell J.M., Gillespie T.R.,
675	Mittermeier R.A., Arregoitia L.V., Guinea M. de, Gouveia S., Dobrovolski R., Shanee S., Shanee
676	N., Boyle S.A., Fuentes A., MacKinnon K.C., Amato K.R., Meyer A.L.S., Wich S., Sussman
677	R.W., Pan R., Kone I., Li B. 2017. Impending extinction crisis of the world's primates: Why
678	primates matter. Science Advances. 3:e1600946.
679	Evasoa M., Radespiel U., Hasiniaina A.F., Rasoloharijaona S., Randrianambinina B., Rakotondravony R.,
680	Zimmermann E. 2018. Variation in reproduction of the smallest-bodied primate radiation, the
681	mouse lemurs (Microcebus spp.): A synopsis. Am. J. Primatol. 80:e22874.

682	Feng B., Merilä J., Matschiner M., Momigliano P. 2020. Estimating uncertainty in divergence times
683	among three-spined stickleback clades using the multispecies coalescent. Mol. Phylogenet Evol.
684	142:106646
685	Fumagalli M., Vieira F.G., Linderoth T., Nielsen R. 2014. ngsTools: methods for population genetics
686	analyses from next-generation sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 30:1486–1487.
687	Gasse F., Van Campo E. 2001. Late Quaternary environmental changes from a pollen and diatom record
688	in the southern tropics (Lake Tritrivakely, Madagascar). Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,
689	Palaeoecology. 167:287–308.
690	Gonen S., Bishop S.C., Houston R.D. 2015. Exploring the utility of cross-laboratory RAD-sequencing
691	datasets for phylogenetic analysis. BMC Research Notes. 8:299.
692	Goodman S.M., Benstead J.P. 2005. Updated estimates of biotic diversity and endemism for Madagascar.
693	Oryx. 39:73–77.
694 695 696	Goodman S.M., Ganzhorn J. 2004. Biogeography of lemurs in the humid forests of Madagascar: The role of elevational distribution and rivers. J. Biogeog. 31:47-55.
697	Gronau I., Hubisz M.J., Gulko B., Danko C.G., Siepel A. 2011. Bayesian inference of ancient human
698	demography from individual genome sequences. Nat. Genet. 43:1031–1034.
699	Gruber B., Unmack P.J., Berry O.F., Georges A. 2018. dartr: An r package to facilitate analysis of SNP
700	data generated from reduced representation genome sequencing. Mol. Ecol. Res. 18:691–699.
701	Grummer J.A., Bryson R.W., Reeder T.W. 2014. Species delimitation using Bayes factors: simulations
702	and application to the Sceloporus scalaris species group (Squamata: Phrynosomatidae). Syst.
703	Biol. 63:119–133.

704	Hackel J., Vorontsova M.S., Nanjarisoa O.P., Hall R.C., Razanatsoa J., Malakasi P., Besnard G. 2018.
705	Grass diversification in Madagascar: In situ radiation of two large C3 shade clades and support
706	for a Miocene to Pliocene origin of C4 grassy biomes. Journal of Biogeography. 45:750–761.
707	Heckman K.L., Mariani C.L., Rasoloarison R., Yoder A.D. 2007. Multiple nuclear loci reveal patterns of
708	incomplete lineage sorting and complex species history within western mouse lemurs
709	(Microcebus). Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 43:353–367.
710	Heller R., Chikhi L., Siegismund H.R. 2013. The confounding effect of population structure on Bayesian
711	skyline plot inferences of demographic history. PLoS ONE. 8:e62992.
712	Hundsdoerfer A.K., Lee K.M., Kitching I.J., Mutanen M. 2019. Genome-wide SNP data reveal an
713	overestimation of species diversity in a group of hawkmoths. Genome Biol. Evol. 11:2136–2150
714	Hunnicutt K.E., Tiley G.P., Williams R.C., Larsen P.A., Blanco M.B., Rasoloarison R.M., Campbell C.R.
715	Zhu K., Weisrock D.W., Matsunami H., Yoder A.D. 2020. Comparative genomic analysis of the
716	pheromone receptor class 1 family (V1R) reveals extreme complexity in mouse lemurs (Genus,
717	Microcebus) and a chromosomal hotspot across mammals. Genome Biol. Evol. 12:3562–3579.
718	Jackson N.D., Carstens B.C., Morales A.E., O'Meara B.C. 2017. Species delimitation with gene flow.
719	Syst. Biol. 66:799–812.
720	Jombart T., Ahmed I. 2011. adegenet 1.3-1: new tools for the analysis of genome-wide SNP data.
721	Bioinformatics. 27:3070–3071.
722	Kappeler P.M., Rasoloarison R.M., Razafimanantsoa L., Walter L., Roos, C. 2005. Morphology,
723	behaviour and molecular evolution of giant mouse lemurs (Mirza spp.) Gray, 1870, with
724	description of a new species. Primate Rep. 71:3–26.
725	Kass R.E., Raftery A.E. 1995. Bayes Factors. J. Am. Stat. Assoc. 90:773–795.

726	Kiage L.M., Liu K. 2016. Late Quaternary paleoenvironmental changes in East Africa: a review of
727	multiproxy evidence from palynology, lake sediments, and associated records. Progress in
728	Physical Geography. 30:633–658.
729	Korneliussen T.S., Albrechtsen A., Nielsen R. 2014. ANGSD: Analysis of Next Generation Sequencing
730	Data. BMC Bioinformatics. 15:356.
731	Larsen P.A., Harris R.A., Liu Y., Murali S.C., Campbell C.R., Brown A.D., Sullivan B.A., Shelton J.,
732	Brown S.J., Raveendran M., et al. 2017. Hybrid de novo genome assembly and centromere
733	characterization of the gray mouse lemur (Microcebus murinus). BMC Biol. 15:110.
734	Leaché A.D., Fujita M.K., Minin V.N., Bouckaert R.R. 2014. Species delimitation using genome-wide
735	SNP data. Syst. Biol. 63:534–542.
736	Leaché A.D., Zhu T., Rannala B., Yang Z. 2019. The spectre of too many species. Syst Biol. 68:168–181.
737	LeCompte E., Crouau-Roy B., Aujard F., Holota H., Murienne J. 2016. Complete mitochondrial genome
738	of the gray mouse lemur, Microcebus murinus (Primates, Cheirogaleidae). Mitochondrial DNA A
739	DNA Mapp. Seq. Anal. 27:3514–3516.
740	Louis E.E., Coles M.S., Andriantompohavana R., Sommer J.A., Engberg S.E., Zaonarivelo J.R., Mayor
741	M.I., Brenneman R.A. 2006. Revision of the mouse lemurs (Microcebus) of eastern Madagascar.
742	Int. J. Primatol. 27:347–389.
743	Louis E.E.Jr., Lei R. 2016. Mitogenomics of the family Cheirogaleidae and relationships to taxonomy and
744	biogeography in Madagascar. In: Lehman S., Radespiel U., Zimmermann E., editors. The Dwarf
745	and Mouse Lemurs of Madagascar: Biology, Behavior and Conservation Biogeography of the
746	Cheirogaleidae. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. p. 54–93.

747	Lozier J.D. 2014. Revisiting comparisons of genetic diversity in stable and declining species: assessing
748	genome-wide polymorphism in North American bumble bees using RAD sequencing. Mol. Ecol.
749	23:788–801.
750	Luo A., Ling C., Ho S.Y.W., Zhu CD. 2018. Comparison of methods for molecular species delimitation
751	across a range of speciation scenarios. Syst. Biol. 67:830–846.
752	Maddison W.P. 1997. Gene trees in species trees. Syst. Biol. 46:523–536.
753	Markolf M., Brameier M., Kappeler P.M. 2011. On species delimitation: Yet another lemur species or just
754	genetic variation? BMC Evol. Biol. 11:216.
755 756 757	Martin R.D. 1972. Adaptive radiation and behaviour of Malagasy lemurs. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B 264:295-352.
758	Mason NA, Fletcher NK, Gill BA, Funk WC, Zamudio KR. 2020. Coalescent-based species delimitation
759	is sensitive to geographic sampling and isolation by distance. Systematics and Biodiversity,
760	18:269-280.
761	Mazet O., Rodríguez W., Grusea S., Boitard S., Chikhi L. 2016. On the importance of being structured:
762	instantaneous coalescence rates and human evolutionlessons for ancestral population size
763	inference? Heredity. 116:362–371.
764	Mittermeier R. A., Louis E. E. Jr., Richardson M., Schwitzer C., Langrand O., Rylands A. B., Hawkins F.,
765	Rajaobelina S., Ratsimbazafy J., Rasoloarison R., Roos C., Kappeler P. M., Mackinnon J
766	2010. Lemurs of Madagascar, 3 rd Edition. Conservation International Tropical Field Guide Series,
767	Washington, USA.
768	Myers N., Mittermeier R.A., Mittermeier C.G., da Fonseca G.A.B., Kent J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for
769	conservation priorities. Nature. 403:853–858.

770	Nielsen R., Korneliussen T., Albrechtsen A., Li Y., Wang J. 2012. SNP calling, genotype calling, and
771	sample allele frequency estimation from new-generation sequencing data. PLoS ONE. 7:e37558.
772	O'Leary S.J., Puritz J.B., Willis S.C., Hollenbeck C.M., Portnoy D.S. 2018. These aren't the loci you're
773	looking for: Principles of effective SNP filtering for molecular ecologists. Mol. Ecol. 27:3193-
774	3206.
775	Olave M., Sola E., Knowles L.L 2014. Upstream analyses create problems with DNA-based species
776	delimitation. Syst. Biol. 63:263-271.
777	Olivieri G., Zimmermann E., Randrianambinina B., Rasoloharijaona S., Rakotondravony D., Guschanski
778	K., Radespiel U. 2007. The ever-increasing diversity in mouse lemurs: Three new species in north
779	and northwestern Madagascar. Mol. Phygenet. Evol. 43:309-327.
780	Palkopoulou E., Lipson M., Mallick S., Nielsen S., Rohland N., Baleka S., Karpinski E., Ivancevic A.M.,
781	To TH., Kortschak R.D., Raison J.M., Qu Z., Chin TJ., Alt K.W., Claesson S., Dalén L.,
782	MacPhee R.D.E., Meller H., Roca A.L., Ryder O.A., Heiman D., Young S., Breen M., Williams
783	C., Aken B.L., Ruffier M., Karlsson E., Johnson J., Palma F.D., Alfoldi J., Adelson D.L., Mailund
784	T., Munch K., Lindblad-Toh K., Hofreiter M., Poinar H., Reich D. 2018. A comprehensive
785	genomic history of extinct and living elephants. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 115:E2566–E2574.
786	Pamilo P., Nei M. 1988. Relationships between gene trees and species trees. Mol. Biol. Evol. 5:568–583.
787	Patton A.H., Margres M.J., Stahlke A.R., Hendricks S., Lewallen K., Hamede R.K., Ruiz-Aravena M.,
788	Ryder O., McCallum H.I., Jones M.E., et al. 2019. Contemporary demographic reconstruction
789	methods are robust to genome assembly quality: A case study in Tasmanian Devils. Mol. Biol.
790	Evol. 36:2906-2921.
791	Pastorini J., Thalmann U., Martin R.D. 2003. A molecular approach to comparative phylogeography of

extant Malagasy lemurs. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 100:5879–5884.

792

793	Patterson N., Moorjani P., Luo Y., Mallick S., Rohland N., Zhan Y., Genschoreck T., Webster T., Reich D.
794	2012. Ancient admixture in human history. Genetics. 192:1065–1093.
795	Pedersen CE.T., Albrechtsen A., Etter P.D., Johnson E.A., Orlando L., Chikhi L., Siegismund H.R.,
796	Heller R. 2018. A southern African origin and cryptic structure in the highly mobile plains zebra.
797	Nat. Ecol. Evol. 2:491–498.
798	Pigot A.L., Tobias J.A. 2015. Dispersal and the transition to sympatry in vertebrates. Proc. R. Soc. Lond.
799	B Biol. Sci. 282:20141929.
800	de Queiroz K. 2007. Species concepts and species delimitation. Syst. Biol. 56:879–886.
801	Quéméré E., Amelot X., Pierson J., Crouau-Roy B., Chikhi L. 2012. Genetic data suggest a natural
802	prehuman origin of open habitats in northern Madagascar and question the deforestation narrative
803	in this region. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 109:13028–13033.
804	R Core Development Team. 2013. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
805	Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
806	Radespiel U. 2016. Can behavioral ecology help to understand the divergent geographic range sizes of
807	mouse lemurs? In: Lehman S., Radespiel U., Zimmermann E., editors. The Dwarf and Mouse
808	Lemurs of Madagascar: Biology, Behavior and Conservation Biogeography of the
809	Cheirogaleidae. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. p. 498–519.
810	Radespiel U., Lutermann H., Schmelting B., Zimmermann E. 2019. An empirical estimate of the
811	generation time of mouse lemurs. Am. J. Primatol. 81:e23062.
812	Radespiel U., Olivieri G., Rasolofoson D.W., Rakotondratsimba G., Rakotonirainy O., Rasoloharijaona S.,
813	Randrianambinina B., Ratsimbazafy J.H., Ratelolahy F., Randriamboavonjy T., Rasolofoharivelo
814	T., Craul M., Rakotozafy L., Randrianarison R.M. 2008. Exceptional diversity of mouse lemurs

815	(Microcebus spp.) in the Makira region with the description of one new species. Am. J. Primatol.
816	70:1033–1046.
817	Rannala B., Yang Z. 2003. Bayes estimation of species divergence times and ancestral population sizes
818	using DNA sequences from multiple loci. Genetics. 164:1645–1656.
819	Rannala B., Yang Z. 2013. Improved reversible jump algorithms for Bayesian species delimitation.
820	Genetics. 194:245–253.
821	Rice W.R., Hostert E.E. 1993. Laboratory experiments on speciation: what have we learned in 40 years?
822	Evolution. 47:1637–1653.
823	Rodríguez W., Mazet O., Grusea S., Arredondo A., Corujo J.M., Boitard S., Chikhi L. 2018. The IICR and
824	the non-stationary structured coalescent: towards demographic inference with arbitrary changes in
825	population structure. Heredity. 121:663–678.
826	Salmona J., Heller R., Quéméré E., Chikhi L. 2017. Climate change and human colonization triggered
827	habitat loss and fragmentation in Madagascar. Mol. Ecol. 26:5203-5222.
828	Salmona J., Olofsson J.K., Hong-Wa C., Razanatsoa J., Rakotonasolo F., Ralimanana H.,
829	Randriamboavonjy T., Suescun U., Vorontsova M.S., Besnard G. 2020. Late Miocene origin and
830	recent population collapse of the Malagasy savanna olive tree (Noronhia lowryi). Biol. J. Linn.
831	Soc. 129:227–243.
832	Schmelting B., Ehresmann P., Lutermann H., Randrianambinina B., Zimmermann, E. 2000. Reproduction
833	of two sympatric mouse lemur species (Microcebus murinus and M. ravelobensis) in northwest
834	Madagascar: first results of a long term study. In: Lourenço W.R., Goodman S.M. editors.
835	Diversité et Endémisme à Madagascar. Paris: Société de Biogéographie. p. 165-175.
836	Schiffels S., Durbin R. 2014. Inferring human population size and separation history from multiple
837	genome sequences. Nature Genetics 46:919-925.

838	Schüßler D., Mantilla-Contreras J., Stadtmann R., Ratsimbazafy J.H., Radespiel U. 2020. Identification of
839	crucial stepping stone habitats for biodiversity conservation in northeastern Madagascar using
840	remote sensing and comparative predictive modeling. Biodivers. Conserv.
841	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-020-01965-z.
842	Seiffert E.R., Simons E.L., Attia Y. 2003. Fossil evidence for an ancient divergence of lorises and galagos.
843	Nature 422:421-424.
844	Sgarlata G.M., Salmona J., Pors B.L., Rasolondraibe E., Jan F., Ralantoharijaona T., Rakotonanahary A.,
845	Randriamaroson J., Marques A.J., Aleixo-Pais I., Zoeten T. de, Ousseni D.S.A., Knoop S.B.,
846	Teixeira H., Gabillaud V., Miller A., Ibouroi M.T., Rasoloharijaona S., Zaonarivelo J.R.,
847	Andriaholinirina N.V., Chikhi L. 2019. Genetic and morphological diversity of mouse lemurs
848	(Microcebus spp.) in northern Madagascar: The discovery of a putative new species? Am. J.
849	Primatol. 81:e23070.
850	Simão F.A., Waterhouse R.M., Ioannidis P., Kriventseva E.V., Zdobnov E.M. 2015. BUSCO: assessing
851	genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. Bioinformatics.
852	31:3210–3212.
853	Skotte L., Korneliussen T.S., Albrechtsen A. 2013. Estimating individual admixture proportions from next
854	generation sequencing data. Genetics. 195:693–702.
855	Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large
856	phylogenies. Bioinformatics. 30:1312–1313.
857	Stange M, Sánchez-Villagra MR, Salzburger W, Matschiner M. 2018. Bayesian divergence-time
858	estimation with genome-wide single-nucleotide polymorphism data of sea catfishes (Ariidae)
859	supports Miocene closure of the Panamanian Isthmus. Syst Biol. 67:681-699.
860	Sukumaran J., Knowles L.L. 2017. Multispecies coalescent delimits structure, not species. Proc. Natl.
861	Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 114:1607–1612.

862	Tattersall I. 2007. Madagascar's lemurs: Cryptic diversity or taxonomic inflation? Evolutionary
863	Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews. 16:12–23.
864	Tseng SP., Li SH., Hsieh CH., Wang HY., Lin SM. 2014. Influence of gene flow on divergence
865	dating - implications for the speciation history of Takydromus grass lizards. Mol. Ecol. 23:4770-
866	4784.
867	Upham N.S., Esselstyn J.A., Jetz W. 2019. Inferring the mammal tree: Species-level sets of phylogenies
868	for questions in ecology, evolution, and conservation. PLOS Biology 17(12): e3000494.
869	Uyeda J.C., Arnold S.J., Hohenlohe P.A., Mead L.S. 2009. Drift promotes speciation by sexual selection.
870	Evolution. 63:583–594.
871	Vorontsova M.S., Besnard G., Forest F., Malakasi P., Moat J., Clayton W.D., Ficinski P., Savva G.M.,
872	Nanjarisoa O.P., Razanatsoa J., Randriatsara F.O., Kimeu J.M., Luke W.R.Q., Kayombo C.,
873	Linder H.P. 2016. Madagascar's grasses and grasslands: anthropogenic or natural? Proc. R. Soc.
874	Lond. B Biol. Sci. 283:20152262.
875	Warmuth V.M., Ellegren H. 2019. Genotype-free estimation of allele frequencies reduces bias and
876	improves demographic inference from RADSeq data. Mol. Ecol. Res. 19:586–596.
877	Weisrock D.W., Rasoloarison R.M., Fiorentino I., Ralison J.M., Goodman S.M., Kappeler P.M., Yoder
878	A.D. 2010. Delimiting species without nuclear monophyly in Madagascar's mouse lemurs. PLoS
879	ONE. 5:e9883.
880	Wen D., Nakhleh L., Kubatko L. 2018. Coestimating reticulate phylogenies and gene trees from
881	multilocus sequence data. Syst. Biol. 67:439–457.
882	Wilmé L., Goodman S.M., Ganzhorn J.U. 2006. Biogeographic evolution of Madagascar's microendemic
883	biota Science 312:1063–1065

884	Yang Z., Rannala B. 2010. Bayesian species delimitation using multilocus sequence data. Proc. Natl.
885	Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 107:9264–9269.
886	Yang Z., Yoder A.D. 2003. Comparison of likelihood and Bayesian methods for estimating divergence
887	times using multiple gene Loci and calibration points, with application to a radiation of cute-
888	looking mouse lemur species. Syst. Biol. 52:705–716.
889	Yoder A.D., Campbell C.R., Blanco M.B., Reis M. dos, Ganzhorn J.U., Goodman S.M., Hunnicutt K.E.,
890	Larsen P.A., Kappeler P.M., Rasoloarison R.M., Ralison J.M., Swofford D.L., Weisrock D.W.
891	2016. Geogenetic patterns in mouse lemurs (genus Microcebus) reveal the ghosts of
892	Madagascar's forests past. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 113:8049-8056.
893	Zimin A.V., Marçais G., Puiu D., Roberts M., Salzberg S.L., Yorke J.A. 2013. The MaSuRCA genome
894	assembler. Bioinformatics. 29:2669–2677.
895	Zimmermann E., Radespiel U. 2014. Species concepts, diversity, and evolution in primates: Lessons to be
896	learned from mouse lemurs. Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews. 23:11–14.
897	Zohdy S., Gerber B.D., Tecot S., Blanco M.B., Winchester J.M., Wright P.C., Jernvall J. 2014. Teeth, sex
898	and testosterone: aging in the world's smallest primate. PLoS ONE. 9:e109528.
899	