The relative contribution of natural landscapes and human-mediated

factors on the connectivity of a noxious invasive weed

Diego F. Alvarado-Serrano, Megan Van Etten, Shu-Mei Chang, Regina S. Baucom

ABSTRACT

Examining how the landscape may influence gene flow is at the

forefront of understanding population differentiation and adaptation. Such

understanding is crucial in light of ongoing environmental changes and the

elevated risk of ecosystems alteration. In particular, knowledge of how humans

may influence the structure of populations is imperative to allow for informed

decisions in management and conservation as well as to gain a better

understanding of anthropogenic impacts on the interplay between gene flow,

genetic drift and selection. Here we use genome-wide molecular markers to

characterize the population genetic structure and connectivity of *Ipomoea*

purpurea, a noxious invasive weed. We likewise assess the interaction between

natural and human-driven influences on genetic differentiation among

populations. Our analyses find that human population density is an important

predictor of pairwise population differentiation, suggesting that the agricultural

and/or horticultural trade may be involved in maintaining some level of

connectivity across distant agricultural fields. Climatic variation appears as an

additional predictor of genetic connectivity in this species. We discuss the

implications of these results and highlight future research needed to disentangle

the mechanistic processes underlying population connectivity of weeds.

Keywords: human-aided migration, landscape genetics, morning glory,

population structure, weeds

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Elucidating routes and levels of migration between populations of a

species is essential to understand the forces that shape its evolutionary

trajectory (Barrowclough, 1980; Slatkin, 1985). Landscape features—such as

rivers, mountain ranges, crop fields, and urban areas—can impact levels of gene

flow between populations by determining dispersal rates and routes (McRae,

2006; Cushman *et al.*, 2006) as well as influence the likelihood of successful

establishment of immigrants (Wang and Bradburd, 2014; Sexton *et al.*, 2014).

Landscape features can also indirectly condition the effect of gene flow by

influencing local effective population sizes (Wright, 1949; Slatkin, 1985).

Consequently, the landscape, loosely defined as an area with spatially variable

biotic and abiotic factors (Holderegger *et al.*, 2010), influences the levels of

effective gene flow among populations (Clobert *et al.*, 2012). In this way, the

landscape plays a pivotal role in the evolution of species.

In contrast to species that depend almost exclusively on natural dispersal

agents, species in heavily human-dominated ecosystems may exploit human

activities to maintain gene flow among populations and expand their ranges

(Everman and Klawinski, 2013; Fountain *et al.*, 2014). Such species may be

capable of maintaining population connectivity over vast geographic ranges

(Trakhtenbrot *et al.*, 2005) by overcoming landscape features that would

otherwise represent natural barriers. Such species would thus be able to attain

dispersal distances that could be orders of magnitude greater than those

dependent primarily on natural dispersal agents (Mack and Lonsdale, 2001;

Ricciardi, 2007). By facilitating dispersal, humans have the potential to

condition the balance between drift and selection (Slatkin, 1985; Lenormand,

2002), introduce genetic variation to local populations (Kolbe *et al.*, 2004),

prevent local extinction or favor recolonization (Fountain *et al.*, 2014), and alter

the overall genetic constitution of populations (Bataille *et al.*, 2011). Human-

aided migration—intentional or unintentional—is particularly prevalent in

plants (Hodkinson *et al.*, 2007; Auffret and Cousins, 2013), where it has had

major impacts on the distribution of species and stability of communities

(Simberloff, 2013 and references therein). Despite our knowledge of both

human and natural factors influencing dispersal, there remains a gap in our

understanding of the relative influence of each on the distribution of genetic

variation among populations of many (if not most) plant species.

A particularly amenable study system to fill this knowledge gap comes

from agricultural weed populations. Agricultural weeds experience a highly

dynamic landscape characterized by frequent spatial rearrangements and

changes in the physical environment (e.g., expansion of agricultural front,

increased fragmentation, crop rotation, agricultural chemical use) (Menchari *et*

al., 2007; Meehan *et al.*, 2011). At the same time, natural features such as

climate, soil type, and topography likely also play a significant role in

structuring populations (Cimalová and Lososová, 2009; Navas, 2012). Under

these conditions, human-aided migration may be critical for weedy plant

success (Epperson and Clegg, 1986). However, we have limited knowledge of

how or if weedy plant populations are able to maintain connectivity through a

complex landscape matrix. Addressing this limitation would improve our

understanding of the underlying processes governing connectivity of weed

populations and also offer practical tools to deal with the economic problems

that weeds impose (on the order of 33B USD per year in US agriculture alone;

Pimentel *et al.*, 2005).

As a first step into investigating the interplay between natural factors

and human activities on structuring genetic diversity in weed populations, we

estimate the intensity and extent of migration and evaluate how multiple

landscape features influence genetic connectivity of a noxious agricultural

weed, *Ipomoea purpurea*. Specifically, we ask the following questions: 1) what

is the overall population structure of *I. purpurea*, one of the most troublesome

weeds in US agriculture (Webster and Nichols, 2012), and 2) which natural

and/or human-influenced landscape features—soils, elevation, climate,

landcover, crop types, human population density—may act to promote or

constrain genetic connectivity between populations of this weed? Answering

these questions offers a deeper understanding of the multiplicity of population

structure drivers that influence noxious weeds.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study system

Ipomoea purpurea, the common morning glory, is a noxious agricultural

weed (Defelice, 2001; Fang *et al.*, 2013) that has a widespread distribution

across highly heterogeneous landscapes in the Eastern, South- and Mid-western

regions of the United States (Culpepper, 2006; Webster and Nichols, 2012). It is

a self-compatible annual bumblebee-pollinated vine and is found primarily in

agricultural fields and disturbed areas (Tiffin and Rausher, 1999; Baucom and

Mauricio, 2008), as well as cultivated flower gardens and yards (Defelice,

2001). *I. purpurea* is one of the most problematic agricultural weeds of

southeastern agriculture (Webster and Nichols, 2012), and exhibits variable

levels of resistance to the commonly used herbicide glyphosate (Kuester *et al.*,

2015). This species is also a major concern for conservation given its

naturalization in multiple regions throughout the world and its aggressiveness

as an invasive (Chaney and Baucom, 2012; Fang *et al.*, 2013).

Data compilation

To capture the plausible effect of both natural and disturbed landscapes on

structuring genetic diversity in *I. purpurea*, we compiled a diverse set of GIS

data for the continental US from a variety of sources (Table S1). These data

include human activities (human population density, landcover, planted crops,

and roads) as well as natural factors such as elevation, climate (19 variables

summarizing central tendencies and variability patterns in temperature and

precipitation, and soil characteristics), and soil characteristics (8 variables

summarizing the texture, pH, and organic and inorganic content of the top 20cm

of soil). Focusing on both sets of data allowed us to assess the relative influence

of natural and human effects on structuring *I. purpurea*'s populations. We first

processed all these data into landscape layers at a common spatial resolution of

10km^2 and a common spatial extent around the US states with available

samples (Fig. 1). This spatial resolution was chosen to maintain a practical

balance between scale and analytical manageability given available

computational resources. To reduce dimensionality, we opted to perform two

separate Principal Component Analyses (PCAs) on the 19 climatic and 8 soil

layers, respectively. For all subsequent analyses we kept the resulting first two

principal components of each of these analyses, which accounted for over 78%

of the variance in each case, and primarily summarized temperature temporal

gradients and precipitation seasonality, and soils' pH, sandiness, and grain size,

respectively (Table S2).

We compiled data from a panel of 15 previously optimized microsatellite

loci (Molecular Ecology Resources Primer Development Consortium 2013) to

examine the genetic connectivity of populations of *I. purpurea*. These data

(Kuester *et al.*, 2015) encompass a total of 597 individuals from 31 localities

(with a minimum of 8 individuals per locality) (Fig. 1; Table S3), collected in

2012 from farms across the range of *I. purpurea* in the United Sates (Kuester *et*

al., 2015). In addition, to obtain a more comprehensive representation of the

genome of *I. purpurea*, we generated a Next Generation Sequencing (NGS)

dataset from an additional set of individuals (10 individuals each from 6

localities represented in the SSR dataset, plus 2 additional localities in close

geographic proximity to localities in the SSR dataset for a total of 8

populations; Fig. 1).

To generate the NGS dataset, we constructed genome-wide Genotype By

Sequencing (GBS) library. The GBS library was developed using 7ng of

genomic DNA, extracted from leaf or cotyledon tissue, using SNPsaurus'

(Oregon, USA) nextRAD technology. Samples were first fragmented and then

ligated to short adapter and barcode sequences using a partial Nextera reaction

(Illumina; California, USA) before being amplified using Phusion® Hot Start

Flex DNA Polymerase (New England Biolabs; Massachusetts, USA). The 80

dual-barcoded PCR-amplified samples were pooled and the resulting libraries

were purified using AMPure XP beads (Agencourt Bioscience Corporation;

Massachusetts, USA) at 0.7x. The purified library was then size selected to 350-

800 base pairs and sequenced using two runs of an Illumina NextSeq500

sequencer (Genomics Core Facility, University of Oregon).

The resulting sequences were analytically processed using the SNPsaurus

nextRAD pipeline (SNPsaurus, Oregon, USA; Siliceo-Cantero *et al.*, 2016).

Specifically, reads of 16 randomly selected individuals (of the 80 sequenced)

were combined to create a pseudo-reference genome. This was done after

removing loci with read counts above 20,000, which presumably corresponded

to repetitive genomic material, and loci with read counts below 100, which

presumably corresponded to off-target or read errors. The filtered reads were

aligned to each other using BBMap (Bushnell, 2014). All parameters were set

to default values with the exception of minimum alignment identity, which was

set to 0.93 to identify alleles, as this threshold has been found to work well for

non-reference species (SNPsaurus, Oregon, USA). A single read instance was

chosen to represent the locus in the pseudo-reference. This resulted in a total of

263,658 loci. All reads from each of the 80 individuals were then aligned to the

pseudo-reference using BBMap (Bushnell, 2014) and converted to a vcf

genotype table, using Samtools (Li *et al.*, 2009) and bcftools (Li, 2011), after

filtering out nucleotides with a quality score of 10 or worse. The resulting vcf

table was filtered using vcftools (Danecek *et al.*, 2011) for SNPs with a

minimum allele frequency of 0.02, a minimum read depth of 5, and a maximum

15% of missing data. This resulted in 9774 variable regions. Loci with less than

5 high quality base-calls and with more than 20% missing data or an average of

less than 20 high quality base calls were also removed using vcftools (Danecek

et al., 2011). This resulted in a final panel of quality-vetted 8210 Single

Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs) (Fig. S1) that we used in all subsequent

analyses.

Population structure analyses

We first conducted a series of analyses to characterize the overall genetic

structure of *I. purpurea* populations. All analyses were run separately for the

microsatellite (SSR, hereafter) and SNP datasets given their intrinsic differences

and distinct geographic coverage (Fig. 1; Table S3). In addition, we repeated all

population structure analyses using just the subset of 6 localities where SSR and

SNP datasets are both available. Running separate analyses using these two

different markers (referred as SSRc and SNPc, hereafter) allowed us to

determine if the differences between marker types was due to differences in

sample size (SSR = 24 localities; SNP = 8 localities) or geographic coverage

(Fig. 1). Similarly, to determine if the differences uncovered between marker

types were due to SNP sequencing or genotyping error, we repeated all

population genetic analyses after doing a more stringent SNP quality filtering

by removing loci with a genotype quality score below 20, a minimum read

depth of 10, or with more than 15% missing data.

First, to characterize population differentiation we estimated F_{ST} using

GenAlEx v6.5 (Peakall and Smouse, 2012) (because similar global F_{ST} and R_{ST}

estimates were obtained for the SSR dataset, we opted to report F_{ST} values only

to allow direct comparisons with the SNP dataset). We then estimated

contemporary effective population size for each sampled locality in

NeEstimator v2 using the excess heterozygous method (Do *et al.*, 2014). We

performed this latter analysis to assess the possibility that differences in local

population size underlie differences in genetic variability (Weckworth *et al.*,

2013) and/or promote asymmetric effective migration rate (*Nm*).

In addition, to further examine genetic structure we assessed population

admixture and spatial genetic clustering using TESS (Chen *et al.*, 2007). TESS

was run using the admixture algorithm and a BYM model (Durand, Jay, *et al.*,

2009) with 10 runs per K value, and without using geographic weights. The

TESS model, with the lowest DIC was chosen as the optimal model (Durand,

Chen, *et al.*, 2009). K values tested ranged from two to the maximum number

of sampled localities. Additionally, following Wang et al. (2009), we

complemented these analyses with Analyses of Molecular Variance (AMOVA;

Excoffier *et al.*, 1992) run in GenAlEx (Peakall and Smouse, 2012) using 9999

permutation replicates. We ran these AMOVAs either partitioning the variance

into regions based on the spatial genetic clusters previously identified by

TESS—to quantify the fraction of the genetic variance explained by these

clusters, or leaving it ungrouped (i.e., no regions), for comparison.

Additionally, we investigated population connectivity by estimating levels

of recent migration between sampled localities through the identification of

individuals of mixed ancestry using BayesAss (Wilson and Rannala, 2003).

BayesAss is a program that uses individual multilocus genotypes and a Markov

Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm to probabilistically distinguish between

immigrants and long-term native individuals (Wilson and Rannala, 2003). We

ran BayesAss for 6 million generations using default parameter settings, and

discarded the first two million generations as burn-in (Dyer, 2009). For each

marker dataset, we repeated this analysis three times (for a total of 18 million

generations) and combined the results from the three replicates for our final

inference. Then, using a posterior probability cut-off of 0.75 we assign

individuals' ancestry. We chose this cut-off value as a minimum credibility

score to simultaneously maximize sample size and reliability (stringer

thresholds show similar differences between marker sets; results not shown). It

is important to note that because of computational limits we had to randomly

subsample our set of SNPs to 400 SNPs for this analysis. The same subsampled

set was used for the full and reduced (SNPc) analyses.

Landscape genetics analyses

To identify the likely landscape features underlying overall population

structure of *I. purpurea*, we evaluated the association between landscape

features and genetic differentiation based on the full datasets. First, we

estimated conditional genetic distances (Dyer *et al.*, 2010) using GeneticStudio

(Dyer, 2009). Briefly, conditional genetic distances are measures of pairwise

genetic distance derived from population networks, constructed based on the

degree of genetic similarity between sampled localities (Dyer and Nason, 2004).

They reflect genetic similarity between localities that better capture direct gene

flow (i.e., direct migration) as opposed to connectivity driven by step-wise

migration through intervening localities (Dyer, 2015). The complexity of the

associated conditional genetic network was summarized by their vertex

connectivity (White and Harary, 2001), whereas the congruence between

networks derived from different marker sets was measured by their structural

congruence (a measure of wether the number of congruent edges between

networks is greater than expected by chance) (Dyer, 2009).

To assess the association between landscape features and population

differentiation, we first converted each landscape layer (climate, crops,

elevation, landcover, population density, roads, and soils layers; Table S1) into

landscape resistance layers. To do this, each landscape feature in these layers

was assigned a resistance value that reflects the difficulty that each feature

offers to the movement of gametes or individuals. In contrast to previous

studies that typically rely on expert opinion for resistance assignment, we

utilized an unbiased statistical optimization to avoid the sensitivity of results to

subjective resistance assignment (Spear *et al.*, 2010). Specifically, resistance

values were optimized through a genetic algorithm approach (Mitchell, 1996).

Briefly, in this search algorithm a population of individuals with traits encoded

by unique combinations of model parameters (resistance assignment proposals

in our case) is allowed to compete with each other based on the fitness

associated with the traits it carries (Peterman *et al.*, 2014). Specifically, in

Peterman's (2014) implementation of this algorithm, which we followed here,

individuals' fitness is estimated by the relative quality of a MLPE.lmm model

(Maximum Likelihood Population Effects – Linear Mixture Model). This model

evaluates the association between pairwise genetic distance and landscape

cumulative resistance between localities, estimated in Circuitscape (Shah and

McRae, 2008). Individuals with parameter settings (i.e., resistance assignments)

that result in better models, as measured by a Deviance Information Criterion

(DIC) score, are preferentially represented in the following generation.

Offspring modifications introduced by mutations (i.e., small resistance

assignment perturbations) allow for exploration of the parameter space. The

algorithm was stopped once 25 generations have passed without significant

improvement in fitness.

We implemented Peterman's (2014) algorithm in R (package

ResistanceGA; Peterman, 2014) allowing for the independent optimization of

each of our landscape layers. The optimal resistance landscapes identified in

this way were then used to run a final univariate MLPE.lmm model to

characterize the association between landscape features and conditional genetic

distances between localities. Because the roads-associated resistance was not

recovered as significant for either marker dataset, we dropped this layer for all

subsequent analyses. Finally, to identify the simultaneous contribution of

natural and human-driven landscape features to population differentiation in *I.*

purpurea we ran Multiple Regression on Distance Matrices (MRDM; Legendre

et al., 1994). Before running these MRDM models, we standardized all

optimized resistance layers to mean of zero and variance of one (Dyer *et al.*,

2010). These final regressions included geographic distance as a null model

predictor as well as effective population size and were run in R (package

ecodist; Goslee and Urban, 2007) using 10,000 permutations to assess

significance. We accounted for multiple testing by applying a false recovery

rate correction (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995) using the function *p.adjust* in R

(R Core Development Team, 2016).

These landscape genetic analyses, aimed at identifying the relative influence

of natural and human-related landscape features on *I. purpurea*'s connectivity,

show several differences between SSR and SNP datasets (see below).

Nonetheless, we expect that association patterns that are robust between

datasets should accurately reflect the impact of landscape features on gene flow,

independent of possible biases introduced by marker idiosyncrasies. Therefore,

we focus below on the common biological findings between marker types,

while also denoting the most relevant differences.

RESULTS

Population structure

The initial genetic analyses indicated that *I. purpurea* sampled localities

were in no violation of Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (Fig. S1c, d), as evidenced

by the small difference between expected and observed heterozygosity (mean

He = 0.294±0.014 and 0.250±0.001; mean Ho = 0.291±0.009 and 0.260±0.001,

respectively for SSR and SNP datasets). Levels of expected and observed

heterozygosity for the SSR dataset were only slightly greater than those

estimated for the SNP dataset. Likewise, the estimated mean effective

population size per sampled locality was only slightly greater and more variable

for the SSR dataset than for the SNP dataset (13.71 ± 5.59, 9.49 ± 0.13,

respectively), but in neither case was there salient evidence of a plausible

source-sink dynamic, as judged by the similar effective sizes among

populations. Average F_{ST} estimates between datasets were also similar (0.151

and 0.140, respectively for SSR and SNP datasets; Fig. S2).

Interestingly, we found that estimates of recent ancestry differed

between SSR and SNP datasets. The analysis of the SSR dataset indicated that

recent migration among localities seems to be more widespread, with only four

localities being primarily constituted of native individuals (Fig. 2a). Across

localities, on average 73.65% of individuals were inferred to be 1st or 2nd

generation immigrants. In comparison, analysis of the SNP dataset showed that

most populations seem to have a more limited number of recent immigrants,

and that the relatively few inferred immigrants (on average 27.42% of

individuals) did not come exclusively from geographically proximate localities

(Fig. 2d). Accordingly, SSR and SNP pruned conditional genetic networks

(Dyer and Nason, 2004) indicated different underlying patterns of genetic

connectivity (structural congruence = 0.108; Fig. 2b,e). While both were fully

closed, the SSR-based network was more interconnected (vertex connectivity:

5) than the SNP-based network (vertex connectivity: 0). Further, based on the

best TESS models (Fig. S3), widespread admixture was recovered in the SSR

dataset (median individual maximum Q-score = 0.51), whereas minimal

admixture was identified in the SNP dataset (median individual maximum Q-

score = 0.73) (Fig. 2c,f). Finally, grouping individuals according to the

corresponding TESS-identified spatial genetic clusters in AMOVA analyses

only slightly reduced the variance explained solely by geographic location in

both datasets (Table 1).

Similar to our results from the entire datasets, when we subset the SSR

and SNP dataset to the 6 localities in common (SSRc and SNPc datasets), we

found no major differences in genetic estimates between the SSRc and SNPc

datasets (Table S4), and we again identified differences in the underlying

population structure (Fig. S4). Specifically, the SNPc dataset was characterized

by a smaller percentage of recent immigrants (28.25%) than the SSRc dataset

(44.93%) (Fig. S4a,d), and the corresponding genetic networks were also

different from each other (structural congruence = 0.002)—with the SSR-based

network being more connected (vertex connectivity = 2) than the SNPc-based

network (vertex connectivity = 0) (Fig. S4b,e). Finally, as for the full data, a

more admixed genetic composition of individuals was recovered in the SSRc

dataset (median individual maximum Q-score = 0.71) than in the SNPc dataset

(median individual maximum Q-score = 0.85) (Fig. S4c,f). Also, further

confirming the limited spatial structure in this species, using TESS-identified

spatial genetic clusters as regions in AMOVA analyses barely reduced the

variance explained solely by geographic location when compared to a null

model with no regions assigned (Tables S5).

Similarly, when using a more stringently filtered SNP dataset, which

comprised 5811 SNPs, we found that this reduced dataset produced highly

similar results to the original SNP dataset (percentage of recent immigrants =

25.94%, genetic network vertex connectivity = 0, average individual maximum

Q-score = 0.71, and percentage explained by TESS-groupings = 7.31%). Hence,

these results using a more rigorous SNP dataset further support the differences

in population structure inferences between SSR and SNP data.

Landscape genetics

Both the SNP and SSR datasets provide evidence that human-impacted

landscapes play an important role in shaping genetic connectivity in *I.*

purpurea. In both sets of MLPE.lmm models, null (geographic distance),

natural (climate, elevation, and soils), and human-related landscapes (landcover

and human population density) were identified as significant ($p <= 0.05$) or

marginally significant (0.05<p<=0.1) predictors of genetic differentiation

between localities. Interestingly, the variables with the greatest association

coefficient and lowest AICc value in both the SSR and SNP models were

human-related variables (landcover and human population density, respectively;

Table 2). However, when considering all variables together in a multivariate

manner—while accounting for geographic distance—human population density,

local effective population size, and different aspects of climate were the only

variables that remained as significant or marginally significant predictors of

genetic differentiation across both SSR and SNP datasets (Table 2). In contrast,

elevation and soil were identified as significant or marginally significant

predictors only in the SNP dataset. Both multivariate regressions also differed

in the proportion of the variance explained (MRDM R^2 for SSR and SNP

dataset were 0.109 ($F_{1,29}$ = 3.654, p-val. = 0.063) and 0.532 ($F_{1,6}$ = 1.932, p-val.

= 0.113), respectively).

In summary, across datasets, results indicated that human-population-

density resistance was robustly associated with differentiation among *I.*

purpurea's populations, with sparsely to moderately populated areas identified

as more conducive areas for migration and potential corridors available between

all regions (Fig. S5b). In contrast, climatic variables produced potential barriers

to gene flow, with temperature temporal gradients isolating the northernmost

localities from the rest in the SSR dataset, and precipitation seasonality

isolating the eastern and western localities in the SNP dataset (Fig. S5a).

Finally, local effective population size was also a significant predictor in both

datasets, with population size inversely associated with genetic differentiation

(Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Our results reveal that broadly distributed populations of *I. purpurea* are

not genetically isolated from each other. They also suggest the existence of

long-distance and putatively human-mediated migration between localities. At

the scale of our analyses, the regional agricultural matrix does not seem to have

an overarching impact on population connectivity in this species, despite *I.*

purpurea's tight link to agricultural fields. Instead, genetic connectivity in this

species seems to be primarily influenced by climate and human population

density. The effective population size (Ne) also appears to influence population

connectivity in this species, which suggests a plausible additional effect of

genetic drift on the effectiveness of gene flow (Weckworth *et al.*, 2013). Taken

together, these results highlight the significant interplay between human-driven

and natural landscapes in structuring *I. purpurea* populations.

Population connectivity patterns

Despite *I. purpurea*'s expected low natural seed dispersal, due to heavy,

gravity dispersed seeds, and large and patchy distribution, we found evidence of

limited genetic differentiation through the species' range and overall weak

geographic structure. In fact, population differentiation was uneven (pairwise

F_{ST} values ranged from 0.02 to 0.24), and only partially dependent on the

geographic distance between populations. Further, genetic networks for both

datasets were fully closed, suggesting the existence of direct or indirect gene

flow among all sampled populations. In line with this finding, admixed

individuals were present in all sampled localities (although levels of admixture

vary for SSR and SNP datasets), and several instances of recent short- and long-

distance migration were recovered. Nevertheless, the evidence of

interconnectedness we uncovered is likely also influenced by the shared

evolutionary history of populations and, thus, shared ancestral genetic variation

likely confounds our estimates of genetic differentiation (Marko and Hart,

2011). Given the relatively recent invasion of the US by *I. purpurea* and its

inclusion in horticultural trade (Fang *et al.*, 2013), it is possible that historical

connectivity between populations due to human transport maintained gene flow

between populations after its introduction into the US (Mack, 1991).

Alternatively, recurrent colonization from few genetically similar sources might

instead have resulted in partial homogenization of otherwise isolated

populations (Dlugosch and Parker, 2008). To disentangle the relative

contribution of recent gene flow from that of historical patterns of population

connectivity, empirical estimates of inter-population migration (e.g., through

the use of pollen traps) or direct measurements of gene flow (e.g., paternity

analysis) would be needed.

Our estimates of differentiation as well as heterozygosity and allelic

richness differ from other agricultural weedy species. Specifically, our

estimates suggest that *I. purpurea* has lower genetic diversity (as measured by

allelic richness and/or heterozygosity) than primarily outcrossing annual weeds

(e.g., ragweed (Martin *et al.*, 2016) and black-grass (Menchari *et al.*, 2007)),

including many broadly distributed invasives (Dlugosch and Parker, 2008). This

finding is potentially explained by both differences in reproduction system, as

outcrossing plants often show greater genetic diversity than plants with mixed

or primarily selfing reproduction (Hamrick and Godt, 1996), and the recent

population bottlenecks likely experienced by *I. purpurea* (Kuester *et al.*, 2016).

Genetic differentiation found in this study (as measured by F_{ST}), on the other

hand, was relatively low for a broadly distributed gravity-dispersed plant

(Hamrick and Godt, 1996). This contrasts with many broadly distributed weeds,

which show moderate to high F_{ST} values (0.15 - 0.48) likely due to dispersal

limitations over distances above those commonly allowed by natural dispersal

agents (Schmidt *et al.*, 2009; Treier and Müller-Schärer, 2011). This is the case,

for example, of invasive weeds such as weedy *Silene* (Barluenga *et al.*, 2011)

that rely on specialist pollinators or seed dispersers that might not be present in

the invaded range. Considering the natural history of *I. purpurea*—heavy seeds,

bumblebee pollination (Osborne *et al.*, 1999; Schulke and Waser, 2001), and

strong agricultural and horticultural ties (Defelice, 2001), this finding suggests

that human-aided dispersal presumably contributes to maintain connectivity in

this species.

Landscape features influencing population connectivity

Our assessment of the association between population differentiation

and landscape resistance identified several predictors of population

connectivity. Of the landscape features examined, climate and human

population density are the only robust predictors, suggesting a role for both

human activities and climatic barriers in shaping population connectivity in this

species. Specifically, our results suggest that while climatic variables provide

some resistance to migration, scarcely to moderately populated areas (i.e., those

corresponding with rural areas) offer potential corridors between all sampled

regions. The existence of climatic dispersal barriers presumably arises in

response to physiological preferences or local adaptations of the species

(Cimalová and Lososová, 2009); humans seem to oppose these natural

limitations and help *I. purpurea* overcome climatic barriers (e.g., by allowing

dispersal between northern and southern populations that are separated by areas

of high temperature-related resistance to gene flow). Indeed, human-mediated

migration is expected to be particularly prevalent among wild populations of

species with commercial value such as *I. purpurea* (Mack, 1991; Defelice,

2001).

Population connectivity of species in human-dominated environments is

potentially also affected by human-induced changes in population size (Méndez

et al., 2014). Specifically, by influencing population size, anthropogenic

activities condition the effectiveness of migration as it depends on migration

relative rate (*Nm*) (Wright, 1931). Furthermore, population size differences

influence overall dispersal spatial dynamics because the number and direction

of migrants depend on local population sizes (e.g., proportionately greater

number of migrants move from densely to sparsely populated areas than vice

versa; Lenormand, 2002). In line with these expectations, we found that

effective population size is also a significant predictor of population

differentiation in this species. Considering the prevalence of weed management

practices (e.g., tillage, herbicide application) and their effect on weed

population sizes (Kuester *et al.*, 2016), it is likely that these anthropogenic

activities play a significant role in controlling the rate of population

differentiation in weeds. Thus, all evidence suggests a predominant role of

human activities in shaping *I. purpurea*'s current genetic structure.

Relatively few studies have explored how landscape features impact

population connectivity in weeds at large spatial scales, making it hard to

evaluate how distinctive *I. purpurea*'s response to climatic and anthropogenic

factors may be from that of other weeds. Yet, simulations modeling short-

distance dispersal based on spatial distances and landscape configuration have

identified dispersal capabilities and landscape use (including availability of

disturbed habitats and distribution of crop types) to be the most prevalent

determinants of local level connectivity in several weed systems (Woolcock and

Cousens, 2000; Fénart *et al.*, 2007; Will and Tackenberg, 2008). For instance,

using a ~10km^2 aerial photograph to inform a spatial mechanistic model of

Canadian horseweed's interfield dispersal, Dauer et al. (Dauer *et al.*, 2009)

showed that distribution of suitable habitat primarily determined the rate and

extent of this weed's dispersal at this spatial scale. In agreement with these

predictions, empirical data show that local dispersal in mountain pasture weed

is heavily influenced by the spatial distribution of human-dominated landscapes

and the opportunities for interfield contamination (Treier and Müller-Schärer,

2011). Yet, while neither landcover nor crop types distribution were identified

as significant predictors in our multivariate analyses, we cannot rule out the

possibility of high local gene flow at the scale of contiguous agricultural fields

mediated by these landscape features given the scale of our analyses.

Marker-specific inferences

Our results identified interesting differences between marker types in

terms of the inferred population structure of *I. purpurea*. The differences

uncovered between datasets are at first glance unexpected as all loci in a

species' genome evolve under a common evolutionary history (Payseur and

Cutter, 2006). Nevertheless, differences between marker types have been

similarly observed in other studies (Dixon *et al.*, 2011; Martin *et al.*, 2016). For

example, several studies have recovered F_{ST} estimate differences when using

SNP or SSR loci on the same set of samples (Coates *et al.*, 2009; Gärke *et al.*,

2012), presumably due to mutation rates and genomic representation differences

of SSR and SNP loci (Payseur and Cutter, 2006; Coates *et al.*, 2009). Here, the

population structure differences we uncovered may likewise be related to

marker-specific rates of mutation, drift and/or marker-specific biases—such as

greater ascertainment bias on SSR data (Väli *et al.*, 2008; Defaveri *et al.*,

2013)—and not likely caused by the different SSR and SNP dataset sampling.

Because of these intrinsic marker differences, both markers could provide

complementary information (Payseur and Cutter, 2006). While our

identification of robust environmental predictors of genetic differentiation for

SSR and SNP datasets—despite differences in underlying population genetic

patterns—is encouraging, further work is needed to reconcile traditional

landscape genetics studies based on a few highly variable markers with

increasing landscape genomics studies based on thousands of SNPs.

Conclusions

While our results suggest that *I. purpurea* experiences moderate inter-

population connectedness and potential long-distance dispersal, we cannot rule

out the influence of historical relatedness on the observed genetic patterns. To

determine the amount of current-day gene flow that occurs between

populations, direct estimates of gene flow need to be examined. Regardless, the

limited population structure recovered as well as the identification of human

population density as a significant predictor of population differentiation calls

attention to the need for investigating the possible impact of human-mediated

gene flow on the evolutionary path of this species—including its response to

selection and the likelihood of further naturalization. In particular, it remains to

be investigated whether the pattern of maintained connectivity we identify here

could facilitate the success of this weed (e.g., by introducing relevant genetic

variants; Kolbe *et al.*, 2004) or reduce the fitness of local populations (Keller *et*

al., 2000). What seems clear from this study is that human-aided migration

presumably is an important component of gene flow between populations,

which may counter the isolating effects of natural environmental barriers and

genetic drift.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Adam Kuester for seed collecting and for contributing

valuable data for this study. We also thank Ariana Wilson, Eva Fall, and Dan

York for tissue collection. This research was funded by USDA NIFA grants

04180 and 07191to R.S.B.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

DATA ARCHIVING

All data generated is in the process of being archived in Dryad. The

corresponding doi would be made available upon acceptance.

REFERENCES

Auffret AG, Cousins SAO (2013). Humans as long-distance dispersers of rural

plant communities. *PLoS One* **8**: e62763.

Barluenga M, Austerlitz F, Elzinga JA, Teixeira S, Goudet J, Bernasconi G

(2011). Fine-scale spatial genetic structure and gene dispersal in *Silene*

latifolia. *Heredity* **106**: 13–24.

Barrowclough GF (1980). Gene flow, effective population sizes and genetic

variance components in birds. *Evolution* **34**: 789–798.

Bataille A, Cunningham AA, Cruz M, Cedeño V, Goodman SJ (2011).

Adaptation, isolation by distance and human-mediated transport determine

patterns of gene flow among populations of the disease vector *Aedes*

taeniorhynchus in the Galapagos Islands. *Infect Genet Evol* **11**: 1996–

2003.

Baucom, Mauricio R (2008). The evolution of novel herbicide tolerance in a

noxious weed: The geographic mosaic of selection. *Evol Ecol* **22**: 85–101.

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a

practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc B* **57**:

289–300.

Bushnell B (2014). BBMap short read aligner.

http://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap/.

Chaney L, Baucom RS (2012). The evolutionary potential of Baker's weediness

traits in the common morning glory, *Ipomoea purpurea* (Convolvulaceae).

Am J Bot **99**: 1524–1530.

Chen C, Durand E, Forbes F, François O (2007). Bayesian clustering algorithms

ascertaining spatial population structure: A new computer program and a

comparison study. *Mol Ecol Notes* **7**: 747–756.

Cimalová Š, Lososová Z (2009). Arable weed vegetation of the northeastern

part of the Czech Republic: Effects of environmental factors on species

composition. *Plant Ecol* **203**: 45–57.

Clobert J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM, Ducatez S (2012). *Dispersal*

Ecology and Evolution, 1st ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Coates BS, Sumerford D V., Miller NJ, Kim KS, Sappington TW, Siegfried

BD, *et al.* (2009). Comparative performance of single nucleotide

polymorphism and microsatellite markers for population genetic analysis.

J Hered **100**: 556–564.

Culpepper AS (2006). Glyphosate-induced weed shifts. *Weed Technol* **20**: 277–

281.

Cushman SA, McKelvey KS, Hayden J, Schwartz MK (2006). Gene flow in

complex landscapes: testing multiple hypotheses with causal modeling. *Am*

Nat **168**: 486–499.

Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, *et al.*

(2011). The variant call format and VCFtools. *Bioinformatics* **27**: 2156–

2158.

Dauer JT, Luschei EC, Mortensen DA (2009). Effects of landscape composition

on spread of an herbicide-resistant weed. *Landsc Ecol* **24**: 735–747.

Defaveri J, Viitaniemi H, Leder E, Merilä J (2013). Characterizing genic and

nongenic molecular markers: Comparison of microsatellites and SNPs.

Mol Ecol Resour **13**: 377–392.

Defelice MS (2001). Tall morningglory, *Ipomoea purpurea* (L .) roth-flower or

foe? *Weed Technol* **15**: 601–606.

Dixon CJ, Kapralov M V., Filatov DA (2011). Gene flow and species cohesion

following the spread of *Schiedea globosa* (Caryophyllaceae) across the

Hawaiian Islands. *J Evol Biol* **24**: 1–11.

Dlugosch KM, Parker IM (2008). Founding events in species invasions: genetic

variation, adaptive evolution, and the role of multiple introductions. *Mol*

Ecol **17**: 431–449.

Do C, Waples RS, Peel D, Macbeth GM, Tillett BJ, Ovenden JR (2014).

NeEstimator v2: Re-implementation of software for the estimation of

contemporary effective population size (Ne) from genetic data. *Mol Ecol*

Resour **14**: 209–214.

Durand E, Chen C, Francois O (2009). Tess version 2.3 - Reference Manual

August 2009 ∗. : 1–30 [http://membres–imag.fr/Olivier.Francois.

Durand E, Jay F, Gaggiotti OE, François O (2009). Spatial inference of

admixture proportions and secondary contact zones. *Mol Biol Evol* **26**:

1963–1973.

Dyer RJ (2009). GeneticStudio: A suite of programs for spatial analysis of

genetic-marker data. *Mol Ecol Resour* **9**: 110–113.

Dyer RJ (2015). Population graphs and landscape genetics. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol*

Syst **46**: 327–342.

Dyer RJ, Nason JD (2004). Population graphs: The graph theoretic shape of

genetic structure. *Mol Ecol* **13**: 1713–1727.

Dyer RJ, Nason JD, Garrick RC (2010). Landscape modelling of gene flow:

improved power using conditional genetic distance derived from the

topology of population networks. *Mol Ecol* **19**: 3746–3759.

Epperson BK, Clegg MT (1986). Spatial-autocorrelation analysis of flower

color polymorphisms within substructured populations of morning glory

(*Ipomoea purpurea*). *Am Nat* **128**: 840–858.

Everman E, Klawinski P (2013). Human-facilitated jump dispersal of a non-

native frog species on Hawai'i Island. *J Biogeogr* **40**: 1961–1970.

Excoffier L, Smouse PE, Quattro JM (1992). Analysis of molecular variance

inferred from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: Application to

human mitochondrial DNA restriction data. *Genetics* **491**: 479–491.

Fang Z, Gonzales AM, Durbin ML, Meyer KKT, Miller BH, Volz KM, *et al.*

(2013). Tracing the geographic origins of weedy *Ipomoea purpurea* in the

Southeastern United States. *J Hered* **104**: 666–677.

Fénart S, Austerlitz F, Cuguen J, Arnaud JF (2007). Long distance pollen-

mediated gene flow at a landscape level: The weed beet as a case study.

Mol Ecol **16**: 3801–3813.

Fountain T, Duvaux L, Horsburgh G, Reinhardt K, Butlin RK (2014). Human-

facilitated metapopulation dynamics in an emerging pest species, *Cimex*

lectularius. *Mol Ecol* **23**: 1071–1084.

Gärke C, Ytournel F, Bed'Hom B, Gut I, Lathrop M, Weigend S, *et al.* (2012).

Comparison of SNPs and microsatellites for assessing the genetic structure

of chicken populations. *Anim Genet* **43**: 419–428.

Goslee SC, Urban DL (2007). The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based

analysis of ecological data. *J Stat Softw* **22**: 1–19.

Hamrick JL, Godt MJW (1996). Effects of life history traits on genetic diversity

in plant species. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* **351**: 1291–1298.

Hodkinson DJ, Thompson K, Journal T, Dec N (2007). Plant dispersal: The role

of man. *J Appl Ecol* **34**: 1484–1496.

Holderegger R, Buehler D, Gugerli F, Manel S (2010). Landscape genetics of

plants. *Trends Plant Sci* **15**: 675–683.

Keller M, Kollmann J, Edwards PJ (2000). Genetic introgression from distant

provenances reduces fitness in local weed populations. *J Appl Ecol* **37**:

647–659.

Kolbe JJ, Glor RE, Rodríguez Schettino L, Lara AC, Larson A, Losos JB

(2004). Genetic variation increases during biological invasion by a Cuban

lizard. *Nature* **431**: 177–81.

Kuester A, Chang S-M, Baucom RS (2015). The geographic mosaic of

herbicide resistance evolution in the common morning glory, *Ipomoea*

purpurea: Evidence for resistance hotspots and low genetic differentiation

across the landscape. *Evol Appl* **8**: 821–833.

Kuester A, Wilson A, Chang S-M, Baucom RS (2016). A resurrection

experiment finds evidence of both reduced genetic diversity and potential

adaptive evolution in the agricultural weed *Ipomoea purpurea*. *Mol Ecol*

25: 4508–4520.

Legendre P, Lapointe FJ, Casgrain P (1994). Modeling brain evolution from

behavior: A permutational regression approach. *Evolution* **48**: 1487–1499.

Lenormand T (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends Ecol*

Evol **17**: 183–189.

Li H (2011). A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery,

association mapping and population genetical parameter estimation from

sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **27**: 2987–2993.

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, *et al.* (2009). The

Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**:

2078–2079.

Mack RN (1991). The commercial seed trade: An early disperser of weeds in

the United States. *Econ Bot* **45**: 257–273.

Mack RN, Lonsdale WM (2001). Humans as global plant dispersers: Getting

more than we bargained for. *Bioscience* **51**: 95.

Marko PB, Hart MW (2011). The complex analytical landscape of gene flow

inference. *Trends Ecol Evol* **26**: 448–456.

Martin MD, Olsen MT, Samaniego JA, Zimmer EA, Gilbert MTP (2016). The

population genomic basis of geographic differentiation in North American

common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia* L.). *Ecol Evol* **6**: 3760–3771.

McRae B (2006). Isolation by resistance. *Evolution* **60**: 1551–1561.

Meehan TD, Werling BP, Landis DA, Gratton C (2011). Agricultural landscape

simplification and insecticide use in the Midwestern United States. *Proc

Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**: 11500–11505.

Menchari Y, Délye C, Le Corre V (2007). Genetic variation and population

structure in black-grass (*Alopecurus myosuroides* Huds.), a successful,

herbicide-resistant, annual grass weed of winter cereal fields. *Mol Ecol* **16**:

3161–3172.

Méndez M, Vögeli M, Tella JL, Godoy JA (2014). Joint effects of population

size and isolation on genetic erosion in fragmented populations: Finding

fragmentation thresholds for management. *Evol Appl* **7**: 506–518.

Mitchell M (1996). *An introduction to genetic algorithms*. MIT Press:

Cambridge Mass.

Molecular Ecology Resources Primer Development Consortium, Aksoy S,

Almeida-Val VMF, Azevedo VCR, Baucom R, Bazaga P, *et al.* (2013).

Permanent genetic resources added to Molecular Ecology Resources

database 1 October 2012–30 November 2012. *Mol Ecol Resour* **13**: 341–

343.

Navas ML (2012). Trait-based approaches to unravelling the assembly of weed

communities and their impact on agro-ecosystem functioning. *Weed Res*

52: 479–488.

Osborne JL, Clark SJ, Morris RJ, Williams IH, Riley JR, Smith AD, *et al.*

(1999). A landscape-scale study of bumble bee foraging range and

constancy, using harmonic radar. *J Appl Ecol* **36**: 519–533.

Payseur BA, Cutter AD (2006). Integrating patterns of polymorphism at SNPs

and STRs. *Trends Genet* **22**: 424–429.

Peakall R, Smouse PE (2012). GenAlEx 6.5: Genetic analysis in Excel.

Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update.

Bioinformatics **28**: 2537–2539.

Peterman WE (2014). ResistanceGA: An R package for the optimization of

resistance surfaces using genetic algortihms. *bioRxiv*:

https://doi.org/10.1101/007575.

Peterman WE, Connette GM, Semlitsch RD, Eggert LS (2014). Ecological

resistance surfaces predict fine-scale genetic differentiation in a terrestrial

woodland salamander. *Mol Ecol* **23**: 2402–2413.

Pimentel D, Zuniga R, Morrison D (2005). Update on the environmental and

economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States.

Ecol Econ **52**: 273–288.

R Core Development Team (2016). R: a language and environment for

statistical computing, v3.2.4. : [http://www.r-project.org].

Ricciardi A (2007). Are modern biological invasions an unprecedented form of

global change? *Conserv Biol* **21**: 329–336.

Schmidt T, Arens P, Smulders MJM, Billeter R, Liira J, Augenstein I, *et al.*

(2009). Effects of landscape structure on genetic diversity of *Geum*

urbanum L. populations in agricultural landscapes. *Flora Morphol Distrib*

Funct Ecol Plants **204**: 549–559.

Schulke B, Waser NM (2001). Long-distance pollinator flights and pollen

dispersal between populations of *Delphinium nuttallianum*. *Oecologia*

127: 239–245.

Sexton JP, Hangartner SB, Hoffmann AA (2014). Genetic isolation by

environment or distance: Which pattern of gene flow is most common?

Evolution **68**: 1–15.

Shah VB, McRae BH (2008). Circuitscape: A tool for landscape ecology. *Proc*

7th Python Sci Conf: 62–65.

Siliceo-Cantero HH, García A, Reynolds RG, Pacheco G, Lister BC (2016).

Dimorphism and divergence in island and mainland *Anoles*. *Biol J Linn*

Soc **118**: 852–872.

Simberloff D (2013). *Invasive species: what everyone needs to know*. Oxford

University Press: Oxford.

Slatkin M (1985). Gene flow in natural populations. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* **16**:

393–430.

Spear SF, Balkenhol N, Fortin MJ, McRae BH, Scribner K (2010). Use of

resistance surfaces for landscape genetic studies: Considerations for

parameterization and analysis. *Mol Ecol* **19**: 3576–3591.

Tiffin P, Rausher M (1999). Genetic constraints and selection acting on

tolerance to herbivory in the common morning glory *Ipomoea purpurea*.

Am Nat **154**: 700–716.

Trakhtenbrot A, Nathan R, Perry G, Richardson DM (2005). The importance of

long-distance dispersal in biodiversity conservation. *Divers Distrib* **11**:

173–181.

Treier UA, Müller-Schärer H (2011). Differential effects of historical migration,

glaciations and human impact on the genetic structure and diversity of the

mountain pasture weed *Veratrum album* L. *J Biogeogr* **38**: 1776–1791.

Väli Ü, Einarsson A, Waits L, Ellegren H (2008). To what extent do

microsatellite markers reflect genome-wide genetic diversity in natural

populations? *Mol Ecol* **17**: 3808–3817.

Wang IJ, Bradburd GS (2014). Isolation by environment. *Mol Ecol* **23**: 5649–

5662.

Wang IJ, Savage WK, Shaffer HB (2009). Landscape genetics and least-cost

path analysis reveal unexpected dispersal routes in the California tiger

salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*). *Mol Ecol* **18**: 1365–1374.

Webster TM, Nichols RL (2012). Changes in the prevalence of weed species in

the major agronomic crops of the southern United States: 1994/1995 to

2008/2009. *Weed Sci* **60**: 145–157.

Weckworth B V, Musiani M, Decesare NJ, Mcdevitt AD, Hebblewhite M,

Mariani S (2013). Preferred habitat and effective population size drive

landscape genetic patterns in an endangered species. *Proc R Soc B* **280**: 1–

9.

White DR, Harary F (2001). The cohesiveness of blocks in social networks:

node connectivity and conditional density. *Sociol Methodol* **31**: 305–359.

Will H, Tackenberg O (2008). A mechanistic simulation model of seed

dispersal by animals. *J Ecol* **96**: 1011–1022.

Wilson GA, Rannala B (2003). Bayesian inference of recent migration rates

using multilocus genotypes. *Genetics* **163**: 1177–1191.

Woolcock JL, Cousens R (2000). A mathematical analysis of factors affecting

the rate of spread of patches of annual weeds in an arable field. *Weed Sci*

48: 27–34.

Wright S (1931). Evolution in Mendelian populations. *Genetics* **16**: 97–159.

Wright S (1949). The genetical structure of populations. *Ann Eugen* **15**: 323–

820   354.

 TITLES AND LEGENDS OF FIGURES

Table 1. Analysis of Molecular Variance (AMOVA) of SSR and SNP data. The

contribution of spatial clusters (regions), localities, and individuals is

shown. For comparison, results from an AMOVA analysis with no region

category defined are presented in parentheses underneath.

Table 2. Summary of landscape genetics models. Model coefficients are

reported followed by associated p-value (in parenthesis) and, for

MLPE.lmm models, followed by AICc difference and ranking (in square

brackets). Significant coefficients are in bold, marginally significant

coefficients are marked with an asterisk.

Figure 1. Distribution of *Ipomoea purpurea*'s sampled localities. Sample

sizes for both SSR (black bars) and SNP (white bars) datasets are indicated

(locality numbers are given in squares). Elevation is provided as

background.

Figure 2. Inferred population connectivity. The estimated origin of

individuals for each sampled locality (sink) is depicted according to the

locality they were inferred to have originated from (source) (a, d). The

842 color of each cell in these plots depicts the relative proportion of

843 individuals in the sink population that were estimated to be recent

844 immigrants from each locality along the x-axis. Cells on the minor diagonal

845 correspond to the proportion of native individuals. Pruned conditional

846 genetic networks (b, e) and posterior estimates of admixture proportion

847 identified by TESS analysis (c, f) are also displayed. The top row shows

848 SSR-based results, the bottom shows the SNP-based results. Locality

849 numbers follow Fig. 1. Localities shared between SSR and SNP datasets are

850 denoted by colored arrows (for a similar figure based exclusively on

851 these shared localities, see Fig. S4).

852 **TABLE 1.**

Effect	F-statistic	Variance explained		F-value		P-value	
		SSR	SNP	SSR	SNP	SSR	SNP
Regions	F_{RT}	3.94%	8.51%	0.006	0.085	0.001	0.001
Localities	F_{SR}	9.05% (11.06%)	6.10% (13.02%)	0.106	0.067	0.001	0.001
Individuals (among)	F_{ST}	0.67% (38.33%)	24.85% (25.31%)	0.112 (0.111)	0.146 (0.130)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
Individuals (within)	F_{IS}	86.33% (50.61%)	60.54% (61.67%)	0.431 (0.431)	0.291 (0.291)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
Total	F_{IT}	100% (100%)	100% (100%)	0.494 (0.494)	0.395 (0.383)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)

854   **TABLE 2.**

Feature	MLPE.lmm		MRDM	
	SSR	**SNP**	**SSR**	**SNP**
Intrinsic variables				
Geographic distance	0.187* (0.052) +12.303 [8]	0.780* (0.055) +0.396 [4]	0.051 (0.121)	0.255* (0.056)
Population size (Ne)	—	—	**-0.550** (0.001)	-2.650* (0.051)
Natural environment variables				
Climate PC1	**0.243** (0.034) +10.356 [3]	**0.967** (0.045) +0.032 [2]	0.533* (0.064)	1.782 (0.517)
Climate PC2	**0.205** (0.048) +12.030 [7]	0.814* (0.055) +1.560 [7]	-0.029 (0.978)	21.443* (0.075)

Elevation	**0.244**	0.840*	-0.607	-31.789*
	(0.034)	(0.054)	(0.480)	(0.095)
	+10.742	+1.423		
	[4]	[6]		
Soil PC1	**0.208**	**1.044**	0.305	**15.789**
	(0.039)	(0.045)	(0.510)	(0.038)
	+11.378	+0.471		
	[6]	[5]		
Soil PC2	**0.320**	**0.941**	0.187	-6.838
	(0.018)	(0.045)	(0.703)	(0.476)
	+8.139	+ 0.284		
	[2]	[3]		
Human-impact variables				
Crops	-0.226	0.858*	0.154	0.360
	(0.134)	(0.054)	(0.526)	(0.840)
	+14.491	+15.371		
	[9]	[8]		
Landcover	**0.582**	**1.358**	0.340	3.887
	(<0.001)	(0.003)	(0.218)	(0.184)

	–	+39.775		
	[1]	[9]		
Population density	**0.227**	**0.912**	-0.519*	**-3.271**
	(0.034)	(0.045)	(0.095)	(0.037)
	+10.821	–		
	[5]	[1]		

Fig. 1

Fig. 2