1

Migration harshness drives habitat choice and local adaptation in anadromous

Arctic Char: evidence from integrating population genomics and acoustic telemetry

Jean-Sébastien Moore[1], Les N. Harris[2], Jérémy Le Luyer[1], Ben J. G. Sutherland[1], Quentin

Rougemont[1], Ross F. Tallman[2], Aaron T. Fisk[3] & Louis Bernatchez[1]

[1] Institut de Biologie Intégrative et des Systèmes (IBIS), Université Laval, Québec,

Québec, Canada

[2] Freshwater Institute, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

[3] Great Lakes Institute of Environmental Research, University of Windsor, Windsor,

Ontario, Canada

Corresponding author: jean-sebastien.moore@bio.ulaval.ca

Running head: Migratory ecology of Arctic Char

Keywords: population genomics, RADseq, genotyping by sequencing, fish migration,

Arctic, fishery management, conservation

Abstract

Migration is a ubiquitous life history trait with profound evolutionary and ecological

consequences. Recent developments in telemetry and genomics, when combined, can

bring significant insights on the migratory ecology of non-model organisms in the wild.

Here, we used this integrative approach to document dispersal, gene flow and local

adaptation in anadromous Arctic Char from six rivers in the Canadian Arctic. Telemetry

data from 124 tracked individuals indicated asymmetric dispersal, with a large proportion

(72%) of fish tagged in three rivers migrating up the shortest river in the fall. Population

genomics data from 6,136 SNP markers revealed weak, albeit significant, population

differentiation (F_{ST} = 0.011) and population assignments confirmed the asymmetric

dispersal revealed by telemetry data. Approximate Bayesian Computation simulations

suggested the presence of asymmetric gene flow but in the opposite direction than that

observed from the telemetry data, suggesting that dispersal does not necessarily lead to

gene flow. These observations suggested that Arctic Char home to their natal river to

spawn, but may overwinter in rivers with the least harsh migratory route to minimize the

costs of migration in non-breeding years. Genome scans and genetic-environment-

associations identified 90 markers putatively associated with local adaptation, 23 of

which were in or near a gene. Of those, at least four were involved in muscle and cardiac

function, further highlighting the potential importance of migratory harshness as a

selective pressure. Our study illustrates the power of integrating genomic and telemetry to

study migrations in non-model organisms in logistically challenging environments such

as the Arctic.

Introduction

Migrations are a common feature of the life history of many animal species (Dingle 2014). Despite their obvious evolutionary and ecological consequences, however, migrations have been a challenging topic of study. Quantifying migratory phenotypes can be difficult because they can occur over vast distances. Furthermore, while some migratory traits are amenable to laboratory studies and more classical quantitative genetic approaches (e.g. Berthold & Querner 1981; Roff & Fairbairn 1991), many migratory traits are impossible to recreate in experimental settings. Recent technological developments in telemetry techniques both on land (Kays *et al.* 2015) and underwater (Hussey *et al*. 2015), now allow observations of animal movement in the wild over broad spatial scales and with unprecedented levels of detail. Parallel to these developments is the exponential increase in the availability of genomic technologies for non-model organisms (Davey *et al.* 2011, Andrews *et al.* 2016). These new genomic tools make genome-wide assessments of genetic variation possible, thus offering novel ways to link genotypes to migratory phenotypes in the wild for non-model organisms (Liedvogel *et al.* 2011; Shafer *et al.* 2016; Franchini *et al.* 2017). The integration of telemetry and genomic datasets, therefore, provides a powerful approach to document the population level consequences of migrations and to better understand the genetic basis of migratory traits (Shafer *et al.* 2016).

One population level consequence of migration is that it can redistribute genetic diversity. Indeed, while homing to reproduction sites is commonly associated with migrations (Dingle 2014), it is rarely perfect, thus leading to dispersal and gene flow. Consequently, the precision of homing and the spatial scale over which migrations take place influence the scale over which gene flow, and thus genetic structure, can be observed (e.g., Castric & Bernatchez 2004). Furthermore, inter-individual differences in migratory behaviour are common and can influence gene flow (e.g., Turgeon *et al.* 2012; Shafer *et al*. 2012; Delmore *et al.* 2015). Therefore, the study of how migratory behaviour, dispersal, and gene flow interact to determine the genetic structure of populations and their capacity to locally adapt can greatly benefit from integrating genomic and telemetry data.

The diversity of migratory life histories in salmonids makes them excellent model

systems for the study of migration ecology (Hendry *et al*. 2004; Quinn 2005). Anadromy,

a trait shared by many salmonid species, refers to a migratory life cycle whereby

individuals are born in freshwater, feed and grow in saltwater, and return to freshwater to

reproduce. In most salmonids, return migrations to freshwater occur exclusively for the

purpose of reproduction, but some species, notably in the genus *Salvelinus*, must also

return to freshwater to overwinter (e.g., Johnson 1980; Moore *et al*. 2013; Bond *et al*.

2015). The Arctic Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*) is a facultative anadromous, iteroparous

salmonid with a circumboreal distribution (Johnson 1980; Klemetsen *et al*. 2003; Reist *et*

al. 2013). Anadromous individuals undergo annual feeding migrations to the ocean and

must return to freshwater in the fall because winter conditions in the Arctic Ocean are not

favorable (Johnson 1980; Klemetsen *et al*. 2003; see Jensen & Rikardsen 2012 for an

exception). The summer feeding and growth period is thus limited by the ice-free period

on the rivers used for migrations, which can be as short as a month at higher latitudes

(Johnson 1980). This restricted feeding period limits energy gains, and results in skipped

reproduction such that in most populations, spawning occurs once every two to four years

(Dutil 1986). The migratory behaviour of anadromous Arctic Char is therefore best

understood as three distinct migrations: (1) spring feeding migrations to the ocean; (2)

fall spawning migrations to freshwater spawning sites; and (3) fall overwintering

migrations to freshwater overwintering sites when the individual is not in breeding

condition (Fig. 1). Given that optimal spawning habitats likely differ from optimal

overwintering habitats, we can predict that individuals might select different habitats in

different years depending on their maturity status. Accordingly, there is evidence that

Arctic Char home to their natal sites to spawn, but often utilize non-natal overwintering

sites in years when they are not in breeding condition (Johnson 1980; Gyselman 1994;

Moore *et al*. 2013; Gilbert *et al*. 2016). Natal homing to reproduction sites, but use of

alternative overwintering sites, may lead to temporary mixing of different stocks in

freshwater, making both population-specific sampling and fisheries management

challenging. The integration of telemetry and genomic datasets is therefore particularly

promising for studying Arctic Char migrations.

Figure 1. The anadromous Arctic Char life cycle highlighting three distinct migrations. (1) Feeding migrations (black arrows): after hatching and rearing in freshwater for several years (grey dotted arrows), individuals smoltify and begin to migrate to saltwater to feed during the summer when the rivers and ocean are free of ice. (2) Spawning migrations (dashed black arrows): individuals in breeding condition (B) return to their natal freshwater habitat to spawn. Because individuals are not in breeding condition every year, spawning migrations occur only once every 2-4 years. The arrow with the asterisk indicates that Arctic Char are iteroparous and can resume feeding migrations the following spring after spawning (3) Overwintering migrations (full grey arrows): in the years when individuals are not in breeding condition (resting (R)), they must still return to freshwater to overwinter to avoid lower temperatures and increased salinity in the marine environment. Because optimal conditions for spawning and overwintering may differ, use of non-natal overwintering sites might be more frequent than use of non-natal spawning sites. We hypothesized that individuals would favor less harsh migrations for overwintering, as indicated by the shorter river. Silhouette of adult fish from PhyloPic.org.demographic

A key variable driving the evolution of migrations and associated traits is migration distance and harshness. Indeed, migration distance greatly influences the costs of migrations, and strategies that minimize these costs will tend to be favored (Roff 2002). An example is the rapid evolution of a new migratory route in the blackcap (*Sylvia atricapilla*), a migratory warbler from continental Europe, in response to changing environmental conditions (Berthold *et al*. 1992). Prior to the 1970s, this bird migrated to Africa to overwinter, but milder conditions and the presence of bird feeders led to an increase in the frequency of individuals overwintering in Britain, thus benefiting from much shorter migrations (Berthold *et al*. 1992). Freshwater migration lengths and

elevation gain (i.e. their 'harshness') are also well known drivers of the bioenergetics

costs of migrations in anadromous fishes, including salmonids (e.g., Bernatchez &

Dodson 1987), and can drive local adaptation of their life history (e.g., Schaffer & Elson

1975), morphological (e.g., Crossin et al. 2004), and physiological traits (e.g., Eliason *et*

al. 2011). The extent to which migration harshness drives habitat choice (particularly

during overwintering migrations) and local adaptation in anadromous Arctic Char,

however, remains largely unknown (but see Gilbert *et al*. 2016).

In order to investigate the possible role of migration harshness in driving habitat

choice and local adaptation, we combined genotyping-by-sequencing (GBS) and acoustic

telemetry data to study the migrations of anadromous Arctic Char from southern Victoria

Island in the Canadian Arctic Archipelago (Fig. 2). The largest commercial fishery for

Arctic Char in Canada has been operating in this region for over five decades (Day &

Harris 2013) and the local Inuit people rely on this resource for economic, subsistence,

and cultural purposes (Kristofferson & Berkes 2005). At least seven rivers in this region

support populations of Arctic Char, five of which are commercially fished. Previous

studies in the region have demonstrated that many of the stocks mix at sea (Dempson &

Kristofferson 1987; Moore *et al.* 2016), and that genetic differentiation estimated from

microsatellite markers is low (Harris *et al*. 2016). Here, we aimed to better understand

patterns of homing and dispersal of Arctic Char in the region. Particularly, we are

interested in how variation in the harshness of freshwater migrations observed among

rivers in the region (Fig. 2; Table 1) influences freshwater habitat choice and local

adaptation. We addressed four empirical objectives related to this question. First, we used

acoustic telemetry data to show that many individuals used different freshwater habitats

in different years, and fish from all tagging locations preferentially used the shortest river

in the Wellington Bay region (Ekalluk River). Second, we used population genomic data

to document population structure and infer the natal origins of migrating individuals, thus

confirming that dispersal to non-natal habitats occur. Third, we used an Approximate

Bayesian Computation (ABC) framework (Csilléry *et al*. 2010) to determine whether the

asymmetric dispersal towards Ekalluk River is associated with asymmetric gene flow.

Finally, we used genome scans to test for evidence of local adaptation among

populations, and we characterized the chromosomes containing these markers and the

proximity of the markers to known genes in a related salmonid genome. This analysis

provided new insights on patterns and consequences of migrations in this ecologically,

economically, and culturally important species.

Materials and Methods

Telemetry data and sampling

Detailed methods for the acoustic telemetry data collection can be found in Moore

et al. (2016). In short, 42 moored Vemco VR2W passive acoustic receivers were

deployed between July 13 and September 8, 2013 (Fig. 2) along the southern shore of

Victoria Island, Nunavut, near the community of Cambridge Bay. Detections were

continually recorded until receivers were last retrieved between July 27 and August 31

2016. There are at least seven watersheds in the region that support runs of anadromous

Arctic Char, and these watersheds are drained by rivers that vary in length and elevation

gain (Fig. 2 & Table 1). We placed a receiver in six of these seven rivers to detect

migrating fish (the Jayko River was excluded from the telemetry study because of the

large distance between this site and the others). A total of 124 Arctic Char were

surgically implanted with Vemco V16 acoustic transmitters at three tagging locations

(Table 1). In all cases, the fish were collected at the river mouth near the ocean, and for

the Ekalluk and Surrey River, tagging occurred during the downstream migration (early

July), whereas tagging at the Halokvik River targeted upstream migrants (mid/late-

August). Because tagging occurred well before spawning, no information is available

about the breeding status of migrating individuals. In the absence of this information, we

refer to the use of non-natal freshwater systems as 'dispersal' throughout the manuscript,

while we use the term 'homing' to refer to the use of natal habitat regardless of the

purpose of the migration. We also refer to all migrations back to freshwater in the fall as

'return migrations' regardless of whether an individual dispersed or homed. A fin biopsy

was taken from each tagged fish for genomic analysis. Additional baseline samples for

genetic analysis were taken from sampling conducted during the upstream migrations to

monitor commercial stocks or were collected from commercial fishery catches (Table 1).

Samples from the Kitiga River (N69.29° W106.24°), which harbors an Arctic Char

population, were also obtained, but DNA extractions for these samples failed.

Figure 2. Map of the study area highlighting the names and lengths of the rivers sampled. The black circles
with a white center represent the locations of the moored acoustic receivers used to track the movements of
Arctic Char surgically implanted with transmitters at the Ekalluk, Surrey and Halokvik rivers.

Library preparation, sequencing, and SNP calling

A salt-extraction protocol adapted from Aljanabi & Martinez (1997) was used to extract

genomic DNA. Sample quality and concentration were checked on 1% agarose gels and a

NanoDrop 2000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific). Concentration of DNA was

normalized to 20 ng/µl (volume used = 10 µl; 200 ng total) based on PicoGreen assays

(Fluoroskan Ascent FL, Thermo Labsystems). Libraries were constructed and sequenced

on the Ion Torrent Proton platform following a protocol modified from Mascher *et al*.

(2013). In short, genomic DNA was digested with two restriction enzymes (*PstI* and

MspI) by incubating at 37°C for two hours followed by enzyme inactivation by

incubation at 65°C for 20 minutes. Sequencing adaptors and a unique individual barcode

were ligated to each sample using a ligation master mix including T4 ligase. The ligation

reaction was completed at 22°C for 2 hours followed by 65°C for 20 minutes to inactivate

the enzymes. Samples were pooled in multiplexes of 48 individuals, insuring that

individuals from each sampling location were sequenced as part of at least 6 different

multiplexes to avoid pool effects. One randomly chosen replicate per sampling location

was also run on a different multiplex to evaluate sequencing errors (Mastreta-Yanes *et al.*
2015). Libraries were size-selected using a BluePippin prep (Sage Science), amplified by
PCR and sequenced on the Ion Torrent Proton P1v2 chip. The obtained reads were first
aligned to the closely related Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) genome (Berthelot
et al. 2014) using GSNAP v2016-06-09 (Wu *et al.* 2016). The detailed methods for SNP
identification, SNP filtering and genotyping using STACKS v.1.40 (Catchen *et al.* 2013)
are presented in online supplementary materials.
219
Genomic data: basic statistics, population structure, and identification of putative
dispersers
Observed (H_O) and expected heterozygosity (H_E), and the inbreeding coefficient (G_{IS})
were estimated using GenoDive v2.0b27 (Meirmans and Van Tienderen 2004). Effective
population size (N_E) was estimated for the baseline samples using the linkage
disequilibrium method in NeEstimator V2.01 (Do *et al.* 2013) with a critical value for
rare alleles of 0.05. Pairwise population differentiation was quantified using F_{ST} (Weir &
Cockerman 1984) and their significance values estimated with 1000 permutations also in
GenoDive. A Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components (DAPC; Jombart *et al.*
2010) in the R package adegenet (Jombart 2008) was used to describe population
structure. First, the 'find.clusters' function was used with the number of clusters K
varying from 1 to 12. PCA scores of individuals were then plotted and the 'compoplot'
function was used to calculate their proportion of membership to the genetic clusters
identified. ADMIXTURE (Alexander *et al.* 2009) was also run varying the number of
clusters K between 1 and 12. Putative dispersers were identified on the basis of cluster
membership probabilities in DAPC and ADMIXTURE. Putative dispersers were defined
as having a >50% probability of membership to a different cluster than the majority
(>50%) of other sampled individuals at that location. These putative dispersers, as well as
individuals that had less than 75% probability of membership to any genetic clusters (i.e.
putatively admixed individuals) were removed from some analyses (when noted) to avoid
biases. Note that both of these thresholds are purposefully low to ensure all putative
dispersers are removed.
242

Population assignments

The software *gsi_sim* (Anderson *et al.* 2008) implemented in the R package *AssigneR*

(Gosselin *et al.* 2016) was used to perform population assignments and test the power of

the genetic baseline. We first simulated the assignment power of the baseline samples

(see Table 1) and evaluated the impact of the number of markers used for assignment on

power. Markers were ranked based on their F_{ST} values computed from a 'training' set of

individuals comprising 50% of the total sample size per population and assignment

success was computed for the remaining 'hold-out' individuals to avoid high-grading bias

(Anderson 2010). The analysis was repeated for ten randomly generated training sets, and

with ten randomly generated subsets of 30 individuals per population to evaluate the

sensitivity of the analyses. We used the package *RandomForestSRC* (Ishwaran &

Kogalur 2015) implemented in *AssigneR* to impute missing data based on allele

frequencies per population using 100 random trees and 10 iterations and compared

assignment success with and without imputations. We repeated these analyses on a

dataset from which we removed the putative dispersers identified with the clustering

analyses (see previous section for details) since their presence could bias assignment

power downward. Next, we treated the acoustically tagged individuals as samples of

unknown origin and assigned them back to the baseline samples using the function

assignment_mixture in *AssigneR*. To avoid biasing the accuracy of the assignment with

the missing data imputation, for each individual we only used the allele frequencies of the

loci for which genotypes were present – the number of markers used for the assignments

in this case therefore varied among individuals (min = 4,633; max = 5,966).

Demographic simulations

To better understand the relative contributions of recent divergence and current gene flow

on observed population structure, and to verify whether the observed patterns of

dispersion translated into realized gene flow, an ABC pipeline using coalescent

simulations was used (Csilléry et al. 2010). Following other approaches (e.g., Illera *et al.*

2014), three demographic models were compared and demographic parameters for the

best model were estimated. The analyses focused on comparing the Ekalluk and Lauchlan

samples and then the Ekalluk and Halokvik samples to limit computational demands.

Furthermore, these comparisons are the most relevant to test our hypotheses as they are

representative of the eastern (Ekalluk) and western (Lauchlan and Halokvik) group of

populations identified as the first level of hierarchical structure (see Results). We tested

three models: (1) a null hypothesis of panmixia; (2) a model of population divergence

with gene flow (i.e. the isolation with migration model, IM); and (3) a model of

population divergence without gene flow (strict isolation, SI). The simplest model of

panmixia was controlled by a single parameter, $\theta = 4N_1\mu$, where N_1 is the effective size

of the panmictic population and μ is the mutation rate per generation. The SI model is

characterized by six demographic parameters, namely $\theta_1=4N_1\mu$, $\theta_2=4N_2\mu$, and $\theta_A=4N_A\mu$,

with N_1 and N_2 the effective population size of the two daughter populations and N_A the

effective size of the ancestral population respectively. All these parameters are scaled by

$\theta_1=4N_{ref}\mu$ where N_{ref} is the effective size of a reference population. The two daughter

populations diverged from the ancestral T_{split} generations ago with $\tau = T_{split}/4N_{ref}$. The IM

model was further characterized by the migration rates $M_1 = 4Nm$ (migration into

population 1 from population 2) and $M_2 = 4Nm$ (migration into population 2 from

population 1) sampled independently and where Nm is the effective migration rate. Large

prior distributions following those commonly applied were used and drawn from uniform

distributions (e.g., Sousa & Hey 2013). Coalescent simulations ($n = 10^6$) were performed

under each model using msnam (Ross-Ibarra *et al*. 2008), which is a modified version of

the widely used ms simulator (Hudson 2002), under the infinite site model of DNA

mutation. The pipeline of Roux *et al*. (2013) was used with modifications to test for

panmixia, and priors were computed with a Python version of priorgen (Ross-Ibarra *et al*.

2008). Details of the summary statistics used, the model selection procedure, analysis of

robustness, parameter estimations and posterior predictive checks can be found in the

online supplementary materials. Values were not transformed into biological units since

the mutation rate (μ) was unknown. Instead coalescent units were kept, and ratios of θ

and M_1/M_2 are interpreted only.

Genome scans and functional annotation of outliers

Genomic studies of local adaptation using different methods to identify outlier loci often

only detect partially overlapping sets of loci (Gagnaire *et al*. 2015). A common practice

to partially circumvent these problems is to combine genome scans with genetic-

environment-association (GEA) methods as a way to more reliably identify the most

likely targets of selection (De Villemereuil *et al.* 2014). Therefore, we identified markers

putatively under selection using two genome scan methods and a GEA method. First,

Bayescan v1.2 (Foll & Gaggiotti 2008) was used to detect outlier loci with elevated F_{ST}

among the baseline populations (Table 1) with 5,000 iterations, and a burn-in length of

100,000. To increase our chances of finding outliers while also limiting type-two errors,

we tested values of 100, 1,000 and 5,000 for the prior odds (Lotherhos & Whitlock 2014).

This analysis was run on the dataset from which putative dispersers were removed to

avoid biases (n = 273 after dispersers removed). Second, we used PCAdapt (Luu *et al*.

2017), which uses PCA to control for population structure without *a priori* population

definition, a particularly useful feature in the current study where we expect significant

admixture among populations. Because of this feature, we ran the analysis on the full

dataset including the putative dispersers, which also increased the analytical power

associated with increased sample size (n = 318). Simulations have also shown that

PCAdapt is less prone to type-2 errors than Bayescan, and to be less affected by the

presence of admixed individuals in the samples (Luu *et al*. 2017). The optimal number of

principal components necessary to describe population structure was determined using

the graphical method described in Luu *et al.* (2017) and varying *K* from 1 to 10. Finally,

we also used latent factor mixed models (LFMM; Frichot *et al*. 2013) implemented in the

R package LEA to test directly for correlations between allele frequencies at specific loci

and migratory difficulty. We also varied K from 1 to 10 to identify the optimal number of

latent factors required to describe population structure. Migration harshness was

measured as 'work' (Crossin *et al*. 2004), that is the product of river length and altitude

gain, standardized to a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. Because the

environmental data had to be assigned to a sampling location, we used the dataset with

the putative dispersers removed for this analysis (n = 273). As recommended by the

authors in both user manuals, for PCAdapt and LFMM, the missing data were imputed as

before using package *RandomForestSRC* (100 random trees and 10 iterations). All three

approaches controlled for false discovery rates (FDR) with an α of 0.05.

Given the absence of a reference genome for Arctic Char, we used the recently

developed high-density linkage map for the closely related Brook Char (*Salvelinus*

fontinalis; Sutherland *et al.* 2016) to determine approximate genomic positions of the

markers using the MapComp method (Sutherland *et al.* 2016). In brief, MapComp aligns

the flanking sequence of GBS markers of two genetic maps (here the Brook Char genetic

map and the anonymous Arctic Char markers) to a reference genome of a closely related

species. Here the Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) genome (Lien *et al.* 2016) was used

because it has longer scaffolds than the current Rainbow Trout assembly and thus

allowing more markers to be paired (see Sutherland *et al.* 2016). Then, markers from

each species that are closest to each other in nucleotide position on the reference genome

within a set distance are paired. The pairing was conducted in 10 iterations, removing

paired anonymous Arctic Char markers each iteration and rerunning the pairing with the

Brook Char genetic map to permit pairing of more than one anonymous marker with a

single genetic map marker, as previously described (Narum *et al.* 2017). Here, the

distance cutoff between the two markers on the reference genome was within 1 Mbp

maximum distance to find approximate locations for the greatest number of markers. All

significant outliers were also used in a BLAST query against the Atlantic Salmon

genome, which has a full annotation available in NCBI (Lien et al. 2016; NCBI Genome

ICSASG_v2 reference Annotation Release 100; GCA_000233375.4). Outlier markers

that were found by more than one method, but did not BLAST unambiguously to the

Atlantic Salmon genome, were also checked against the Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus*

mykiss) genome.

Results

Telemetry data

The receivers located at the mouth of each river allowed the inference of likely

freshwater overwintering/spawning sites of 98 acoustically tagged Arctic Char for up to

three consecutive years (Table S1 in online supplementary materials). The telemetry data

suggested a pattern of asymmetric dispersal. Indeed, many fish from all three tagging

locations were detected one or more years in the Ekalluk River (Fig. 3), the shortest and

least harsh river around Wellington Bay (Fig. 1 and Table 1), and one of the shortest in

the entire area. First, of the 47 fish tagged in both 2013 and 2014 at the Ekalluk River, 44

returned to this river each year (94%). Second, 16 of the 21 fish (76%) tagged at the

Surrey River returned to the Ekalluk River each year they were detected, while only one

fish returned to the Surrey River. We therefore hypothesize that the fish tagged at the

Surrey River were likely Ekalluk River fish that we intercepted moving north and west,

an interpretation consistent with observations that many Ekalluk River fish visit the

Surrey River estuary shortly after their out-migrations to the ocean (Moore *et al*. 2016)

and also consistent with the population genomic data presented below. Of the 30 fish

tagged at the Halokvik River, 28 returned to this river at least once (93%), but six (20%)

returned to the Ekalluk River at least once. Furthermore, of the 12 fish with more than

one year of data that were inferred to have returned to the Halokvik River at least once,

seven (58%) migrated to the Ekalluk River during other years, demonstrating that an

individual might readily utilize different freshwater sites during its lifetime. In summary,

we detected a majority of fish from all three tagging locations (72%) migrating to the

Ekalluk River at least once.

Figure 3. Choice of overwintering/spawning habitat by Arctic Char from three tagging locations inferred from acoustic telemetry data collected over three summers (2013, 2014, and 2015). The proportion of individuals returning to the same location where they were tagged (black) or dispersing to a different location from that where they were tagged (red) are indicated. The thickness of the arrows is roughly proportional to the proportion of individuals observed migrating to this location. The map indicates the approximate locations of Lauchlan (LAU), Halokvik (HAL), Surrey (SUR), and Ekalluk (EKA) rivers (shaded labels indicate no individuals were tagged there that year). The numbers of individuals that were unambiguously assigned to an overwintering location each year (n) are indicated.

Sequencing and SNP calling

After cleaning and demultiplexing, a total of 1.9 billion reads were left with an average of

4.0 million reads per individual (coefficient of variation: 30.3%). The assembly resulted

in a catalog containing 2,963,980 loci and a total of 13,568,653 SNPs (over 1,272,427

polymorphic loci) after the population module of STACKS. Individuals with more than

25% missing genotypes were removed from all analyses (Table 1), and 6,230 high quality

SNPs were retained after filters. In addition, 94 putatively sex-linked markers were

removed (see Fig. S4 & S5 in supplementary materials and Benestan et al. 2017 for

details) leaving a total of 6,136 SNPs used in all subsequent analyses (Table 2). Replicate

individuals (n = 11) sequenced twice had identical genotypes at 92.0-97.1% of the

markers (mean 94.6%), which was comparable to error rates reported in Mastreta-Yanes

et al. (2015).

Genomic data: basic statistics, population structure, and identification of dispersers

Levels of heterozygosity were comparable among populations (H_O: 0.099-0.105; H_E:

0.103-0.107), and although all G_{IS} values were significantly positive, indicating an excess

of homozygotes, the values were all small (0.001-0.037) (Table 1). Effective population

size estimates varied between 335 (Lauchlan River; 95% c.i.: 318-353) and 1081

(Ekalluk River; 95% c.i.: 935-1280). A weir enumeration study conducted in 1979-1983

found the Ekalluk River to be the most abundant population in the region, and the

Lauchlan River the least abundant, but the estimates of census size were much larger than

the N_E estimates reported here (183,203 for Ekalluk River and 10,850 for Lauchlan;

McGowan 1990). Population differentiation among rivers was weak albeit significant,

with an overall F_{ST} of 0.011 (95% c.i. 0.010-0.012; Fig 4a). The F_{ST} value between

Ekalluk and Surrey rivers was substantially lower than the other values (F_{ST} = 0.001;

95% c.i. 0.0006-0.0016), which was in agreement with our telemetry observations that

most fish captured at Surrey migrated to the Ekalluk River in the fall. It is thus likely that

sampling at the Surrey River resulted in the interception of Ekalluk River fish migrating

through the area, and those two sampling locations were combined for subsequent

analyses unless otherwise noted. When the putative dispersers were removed (*see below*),

the overall F_{ST} increased to 0.014 (95% c.i. 0.013-0.015; Fig. 4a). The presence of

population structure between most sampling locations was also supported by the PCA

analysis, although there was some important overlap among some sampling sites (Fig.

4b). The sampling locations that were most separated in the PCA (Jayko and Lauchlan

rivers) were also the most geographically distant sampling locations.

Figure 4. Description of population structure among the Arctic Char sampling sites: (a) heatmap
of pairwise F_{ST} values before (above the diagonal) and after (below the diagonal) putative
dispersers were removed from the samples (see text for details). All values are significantly
different from zero (p <0.05). (b) Results of the principal components analysis showing PC scores
of each individual along the first two principal axes (1.52% and 1.05% of the total variance
explained respectively). Individuals and the 95% confidence ellipses are colour-coded by
sampling location.

The Bayesian Information Criterion in the DPAC analysis best supported the

presence of two genetic clusters (Fig. S6 online supplementary materials) differentiating

the two westernmost populations (Lauchlan and Halokvik) from all others (Fig. 5). Based

on cluster membership, several putative dispersers and admixed individuals could be

identified (Fig. 5). A majority of putative dispersers (38/45; 85.4%) were individuals

belonging to the western genetic cluster, but sampled in the Ekalluk or Surrey River. In

contrast, many fewer dispersers from the eastern group were identified in the western

sampling locations (three in Lauchlan and three in Halokvik; i.e., 13.3% of putative

dispersers). In other words, the DAPC analysis supported the conclusion of asymmetric

dispersal from the western sampling populations towards the shorter and less harsh

Ekalluk River. Unlike the DAPC analysis, the cross-validation errors in the

ADMIXTURE analysis did not support the presence of two genetic groupings (K = 1 had

the lowest cross-validation error). Nonetheless, at *K* = 2, the individual Q-values were

consistent with the results of the DAPC, and all putative dispersers identified with the

DAPC had >50% probability of membership to the alternative genetic cluster in

ADMIXTURE as well. Furthermore, at K=5 the ADMIXTURE results suggested that

genetic differentiation among rivers was present, albeit weak.

Figure 5. Results of two clustering analyses used to identify putative dispersers. The top panel is
a compo-plot generated from a DAPC using two genetic clusters showing the percent cluster
membership of each individual in the analysis. The bottom two panels are the individual Q-values
from the ADMIXTURE analyses with two (middle) and five (bottom) clusters. The putative
dispersers are individuals with Q-values or percent cluster membership greater than 0.5 but
assigned to a cluster different from that of most other individuals sampled at the same sampling
location and are identified with a white arrow or a white dotted rectangle. Note that the order of
individuals varies among panels, but the identity of putative dispersers was the same in the two
analyses.

Population assignments

Overall, the results of the assignment tests using all 6,136 markers revealed that

there was sufficient power to infer the origin of individuals with high accuracy (84.3%-

94.5%). There was limited variation in assignment success when using different subsets

of individuals, indicating that the results are stable (*not shown*). Overall assignment

success was maximized when using 3,000 markers both when the putative dispersers

were retained or removed (Fig. 6a & 6c). We therefore present pairwise assignment

success per population based on 3,000 markers (Fig. 6b & 6d). As expected, when

dispersers were present in the dataset, assignment success was lower overall (84.3%

without imputations; 88.0% with imputations; range: 71-100%; Fig 6b), and many

individuals from Halokvik and Lauchlan River were assigned to Ekalluk and Surrey

River, and vice-versa. As expected, assignment success was improved when the putative

dispersers were removed from the dataset (92.3% without imputations; 94.5% with

imputations; range 81-100%; Fig 6d), and most of the mis-assignments involved fish

caught at Lauchlan River but assigned to Halokvik River, or fish caught at Jayko River

assigned to Ekalluk and Surrey River.

After confirming that there was sufficient assignment power, we used genomic

data to assign tagged individuals to their most likely river of origin (Table S1 online

supplementary materials). In this case, we used all the markers to simplify the treatment

of missing data (*see Methods*) and because assignment success based on all markers was

not substantially lower than that based on a subset of 3,000 markers (Fig. 6a & 6c).

Eleven of the 57 fish (19%) tagged at the Ekalluk River in 2013 and 2014 were assigned

to the Halokvik River and two to the Lauchlan River. Only two of the 11 putative

Halokvik-origin fish were detected overwintering/spawning in the Halokvik River at least

once, and all others were detected only in the Ekalluk system one or more years. In

contrast, all but one (29/30) of the fish tagged at the Halokvik River were assigned to the

Halokvik River itself. Six of those 29 individuals were detected overwintering/spawning

in both Ekalluk and Halokvik River in different years. Notably, all but one fish (32/33)

detected at least one year at Halokvik River were assigned to the Halokvik River. Finally,

fish tagged at Surrey River were assigned to all possible rivers (except Freshwater

Creek), but a majority (19/31) were assigned to the grouped Ekalluk-Surrey sample. In

short, population assignments also support the prevalence of asymmetric dispersal

towards the Ekalluk River.

Figure 6. Results of assignment tests with all individuals (a & b) or with putative dispersers removed (c & d). The two left panels (a & c) show how assignment success per sampling location varied according to the number of markers used for the assignment, and on whether missing data were imputed using Random Forest (RF) or not. The two right panels (b & d) show results of the assignments with all markers with missing data imputed. The green circles on the diagonal display successful assignments, and the red circles display mis-assignments (i.e., the sample was assigned to a different river from that where it was sampled). Circle size is proportional to the number of individuals in each category.

Demographic simulations

The model selection procedure unambiguously indicated that the isolation with migrations (IM) model was the best with P(IM) ~ 1, while both the panmixia and the strict isolation models had posterior probabilities close to zero (Table S4 in online supplementary materials). This inference was highly significant with a robustness of 1 (Fig. S8 in online supplementary materials). Estimates of demographic parameters

produced confidence intervals of various widths, and differed most from the posterior in

the Ekalluk-Halokvik comparison than in the Ekalluk-Lauchlan comparison. These

estimates were mostly informative with regards to estimates of effective populations size,

divergence times (except in the Ekalluk-Lauchlan comparisons), and intensity of

migration rates, pointing especially to highly asymmetric gene flow (Fig. S9 & S10 in

online supplementary materials). This asymmetric gene flow, however, was in the

opposite direction of the asymmetric dispersal inferred from both the telemetry and the

genetic data. Indeed, gene flow was higher from Ekalluk to Lauchlan, with a ratio of

$M_2/M_1 = 3.08$, and from Ekalluk to Halokvik, with a ratio of $M_2/M_1 = 4.06$ (Table 3).

Ratios of effective population size (θ_1/θ_A) tended to indicate an expansion of the Ekalluk

population relative to the ancestral population in both comparisons (ratios of 9.68 and

3.45). Posterior distributions also indicated an expansion of the Halokvik population

($\theta_2/\theta_A = 2.58$), but the Lauchlan population size was inferred to be smaller than the

ancestral population size ($\theta_2/\theta_A = 0.082$), although this should be interpreted cautiously

since the estimate of the ancestral population size was not highly accurate. Posterior

predictive checks in the Ekalluk-Lauchlan indicated that we were able to accurately

reproduce the summary statistics. In the Ekalluk-Halokvik comparison, however, three

statistics were significantly different from the observed data, namely the averaged

number of shared polymorphic sites and the averaged and standard deviations of the net

divergence (Da). In summary, the ABC approach provided robust estimates of

demographic parameters, and suggested that the asymmetric dispersal towards Ekalluk

River observed with both the telemetry and genomic data did not translate into

pronounced gene flow in that direction.

Genome scans and functional annotation of outliers

The three different methods of outlier detection identified a total of 90 markers putatively

under selection. The Bayescan analysis identified 30 outlier loci when the prior odds

were set at 100 (Fig. S11 online supplementary materials), 10 loci with prior odds of

1000, and 5 loci with prior odds of 5000, all with an FDR of 0.05. The PCAdapt analysis

was run assuming two genetic clusters after graphical evaluation of the eigenvalues

according to Luu et al. (2017). Consistent with the DAPC results, the first two PC axes

explained most variation and only those were retained to account for population structure

(Fig. S12 online supplementary materials). Six outliers were identified with FDR = 0.05

(Fig S13 online supplementary materials). Of those six, four were also identified by the

Bayescan run with prior odds of 100 and two with the run at prior odds of 5000. For the

LFMM analysis, cross-entropy was also minimal at K = 2 (Fig. S14 online supplementary

materials), and two latent factors were thus retained to control for population structure.

With an FDR = 0.05, 58 markers were identified as outliers by the LFMM analysis, none

of which overlapped with the markers identified by Bayescan or PCAdapt.

A total of 2070 of the 6136 markers were positioned onto the Brook Char linkage

map and appeared distributed throughout the genome on many chromosomes (Fig. 7). Of

the 90 unique markers identified combining the three outlier detection analyses, 34

provided unambiguous BLAST results against the Atlantic Salmon genome (see Table S5

for full list of successful BLAST results). Of those, 23 were found to be in a gene, while

nine were found within 100kb of a gene. Only one of the four outliers that were

significant in both the PCAdapt and the Bayescan had unambiguous BLAST results, but

three of them were located on the same 914Kb scaffold (*scaffold_363*) on the Rainbow

Trout genome. The marker with a successful BLAST result was within the gene

FAM179B, which codes for a protein required for the normal structure and function of

primary cilia, an organelle usually associated with the reception of extracellular

mechanical and chemical stimuli (Das *et al*. 2015). Several outlier-linked genes were

involved in muscle or cardiac muscle function and development (*Myocyte-specific*

enhancer factor 2C, *nebulette*, *glycogen phosphorylase muscle form*) or in

gluconeogenesis (*fructose-1,6-bisphosphatase 1-like*). Several other outlier-associated

genes have possible functions linked to axon guidance or neuronal development (*neural*

cell adhesion molecule 2, *neural cadherin-like isoform X1*; *Arf-GAP with GTPase*; *ANK*

repeat and PH domain-containing protein 2; *NEDD8-conjugating enzyme Ubc12*; *CD9*

antigen-like isoform X2). Finally, two outliers were found within immune-response genes

(*Interferon regulatory factor 4*; *Ig heavy chain V region-like*).

Figure 7. Manhattan plots showing the position of each marker that was successfully mapped to the closely related Brook Char genetic map (grey shading and number on the x-axis show linkage groups) and the test statistics from the two genome scan analyses (top: Bayescan and middle: PCAdapt) and the genetic environment association (bottom: LFMM). On the y-axes are the –log10 transformed values of the test statistics (q-values for Bayescan and PCAdapt and adjusted p-values for LFMM). The dashed lines represent the 0.05 significance threshold (used throughout) and the dotted line a 0.01 threshold (for reference only).

Discussion

Concurrent developments in both genomic and telemetry technologies offer new and powerful ways to study the migratory ecology of animals behaving in their natural environments (Schaffer *et al*. 2016). The present study illustrates how this integrative approach can be especially fruitful for animals displaying complex migratory behaviours and inhabiting logistically challenging regions. Here telemetry data suggested the presence of asymmetric dispersal between high Arctic populations of anadromous Arctic Char, and population genomic data confirmed the river of origin of putative dispersers. Dispersal was predominantly from western sampling locations towards the Ekalluk River, the shortest and least harsh river in the Wellington Bay area. Demographic simulations

using an ABC approach also revealed an asymmetry in gene flow, but in the opposite

direction, indicating that the observed asymmetric dispersal does not necessarily lead to

gene flow. Instead, the ABC simulations suggested that Ekalluk River, the most abundant

Arctic char population in the region (McGowan 1990), was a major source of gene flow

to surrounding areas. Together, our observations suggested that Arctic Char home to their

natal river to spawn, but may overwinter in rivers with the least harsh migratory route,

thus potentially minimizing the costs of migrations in non-breeding years. Another

finding facilitated by the integration of telemetry and genomic data was the possible

identification of local adaptation in migratory traits as indicated by the identification of

many outlier markers linked to genes demonstrated to have a role in muscle or cardiac

function. Related physiological traits have been demonstrated to evolve in response to

migration harshness in other anadromous salmonids (Eliason et al. 2011), thus suggesting

that this environmental factor could also drive local adaptation in Arctic Char.

Asymmetric dispersal: overwintering habitat choice minimizes cost of migrations

Unlike most other anadromous salmonids, which return to freshwater exclusively

to reproduce (Fleming 1998; Quinn 2005), Arctic Char and other *Salvelinus* species also

return yearly to freshwater to overwinter (Armstrong 1974; Johnson 1980). Given that

optimal habitats for reproduction and for overwintering likely differ, we might expect

individuals to migrate to separate locations depending on the purpose of the migration

(Dingle 2014). Precise homing to reproduction sites is the norm in salmonids, and it has

been suggested that local adaptation to nesting and rearing environments is an important

driver of philopatry (Hendry *et al*. 2004). Requirements to home, however, might be

relaxed when an individual is returning to freshwater to overwinter instead of to

reproduce (i.e., when there are no genetic or evolutionary consequences). Accordingly,

there is evidence that Arctic Char (and the closely related Dolly Varden; *Salvelinus*

malma) home to their natal habitats to spawn, but can use non-natal habitats to overwinter

(Armstrong 1974; Gyselman 1994; Moore *et al*. 2013; Gilbert *et al*. 2016). Here, we

documented the use of alternative freshwater habitats by the same individuals in

consecutive years using acoustic telemetry data. In addition, we used population genomic

data to infer the natal origins of individuals, and confirmed that the asymmetric dispersal

observed with the telemetry data was indeed due to fish of western origin (i.e., from

Halokvik and Lauchlan) dispersing to the Ekalluk River. This was the case with the

Ekalluk and Surrey baseline samples, which clustering analyses suggested contained a

large proportion of western-origin fish. In addition, population assignment of the tagged

fish showed that all but one fish detected at least once overwintering/spawning in

Halokvik River were from Halokvik River, while many of the fish migrating to the

Ekalluk River were from Halokvik River. The inference of asymmetric dispersal,

therefore, is strengthened by the combination of independent and complementary sources

of evidence from telemetry and genomic data.

The population genomic data could also be used to infer whether the observed

dispersal resulted in high levels of gene flow. While dispersal was highly asymmetric

towards Ekalluk River, the ABC modeling suggested that it did not necessarily translate

into realized gene flow. Indeed, the best supported ABC model was the isolation with

migration model with asymmetric gene flow, but the direction of the asymmetry was

opposite to that observed with direct dispersal. This asymmetry in gene flow, instead, was

from the most abundant population (Ekalluk) towards the least abundant populations

(Halokvik and Lauchlan), as suggested by our N_E estimates (both from LDNE and ABC)

and from field measures of abundance (McGowan 1990), and may thus simply reflect

differences in effective gene flow. In short, while the reasons for this asymmetric gene

flow remain unclear, it was clear that the observed asymmetry in dispersal does not

translate into realized gene flow and suggests that dispersers from the Halokvik and

Lauchlan rivers do not regularly reproduce in the Ekalluk River system.

Taken together, the observations of asymmetric dispersal with both genomic and

telemetry data, but the lack of realized gene flow in the same direction, are consistent

with the hypothesis that individuals in breeding condition home to spawn but may select

overwintering habitats that minimize the costs of migrations in the years when they are

not in breeding condition. Indeed the Ekalluk River is one of the most easily accessible

rivers in the region (measured as work; Table 1). While other rivers are also easily

accessible (e.g., Freshwater Creek, Jayko River), they are further away from Wellington

Bay, and comparatively fewer fish from the Wellington Bay tagging locations travel there

(Moore *et al*. 2016). Other features of the freshwater habitats may also explain the

observed habitat choice. For example, the Ekalluk River drains the largest lake on

Victoria Island, Ferguson Lake, which could offer more abundant or better overwintering

habitats, perhaps resulting in lower overwintering mortalityNonetheless, other studies of

Arctic Char have also found spawning habitat accessibility to be a major constraint to

migrations (Gyselman 1994; Gilbert *et al.* 2016), and the easier migrations afforded by

the short Ekalluk River constitutes a very plausible explanation for the observed patterns

of dispersal.

This hypothesis, however, assumes the ability of Arctic Char to assess which river

provides the most readily accessible overwintering habitat. One possibility is that

individuals explore a variety of freshwater habitats during their summer migrations and

assess their accessibility. Observations of back and forth movement during homing in

other salmonids (Quinn 2005), and the regular use of different estuaries by individuals

during the summer documented by our telemetry work (Moore *et al.* 2016) suggest this is

plausible. Another possibility is that the decision of where to overwinter relies in part on

collective navigation (i.e., increased ability to navigate through social interactions), a

possibility that has been discussed in relation to salmon homing (Berdahl *et al*. 2014).

Given that the Ekalluk River has the most abundant population of Arctic Char in the

region (McGowan 1990; Day & Harris 2013), it is also possible that collective navigation

biases dispersal towards the river with the greater number of individuals. Continued

collection of telemetry data will allow future tests of some of these hypotheses.

In summary, the integration of telemetry and genomic data allowed nuanced

insights into the complex migratory behaviour of anadromous Arctic Char. Notably, it

allowed circumventing logistical challenges posed by the sampling of baseline samples.

In most salmonids, sampling in the freshwater is used to ensure the origin of sampled fish

for baseline collections, but here the use of different freshwater habitats by adults within

their lifetime precludes any certainty in inferring origins of sampled adults even if

collected in freshwater. Sampling juveniles prior to their first marine migration (e.g.,

Moore *et al*. 2013) would also be an option, but attempts at collecting juveniles in 2010

and 2015 failed. Given the complex migratory behaviour of Arctic Char and the logistical

challenges associated with sampling, the integration of telemetry and genomic data

provided a powerful tool for understanding the ecology of this species.

Evidence for local adaptation in migratory traits

Anadromous salmonids display tremendous diversity in migratory traits both
among and within species, and their study has contributed to our understanding of
migration ecology (Hendry *et al.* 2004; Dingle 2014). The application of molecular tools
has provided important insights to the study of the genetic basis of migratory traits in
salmonids. For example, O'Malley & Banks (2008) used a candidate gene approach to
link variation in two circadian rhythm genes, *OtsClock1a* and *OtsClock1b*, to variation in
run timing in anadromous Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*). Other studies have
identified SNP markers linked to migration timing in both Chinook salmon (Brieuc *et al.*
2015) and Steelhead Trout (*O. mykiss*; Hess *et al.* 2016). Finally, Hecht *et al.* (2015)
linked variation in RAD markers with 24 environmental correlates using redundancy
analysis in Chinook salmon, finding that freshwater migration distance was the
environmental variable explaining most of the genomic variation. This last result parallels
our own conclusions regarding the importance of migratory harshness, and is also
corroborated by many classic studies demonstrating the importance of migratory
difficulty as a selective factor driving adaptation in morphological, physiological, and
life-history traits (Shaffer & Elson 1975; Bernatchez & Dodson 1987; Crossin *et al.*
2004; Eliason *et al.* 2011).

In the present study, we used genome scans and genetic-environment correlations
with migratory difficulty to identify markers putatively under divergent selection. These
approaches have been used extensively to identify putative targets of selection, but also
have several limitations, which have been amply discussed in the literature (Lotterhos &
Whitlock 2014; Haasl & Payseur 2015; Bernatchez 2016; Hoban *et al.* 2016). For
example, recent demographic history and patterns of isolation by distance have been
shown to lead to high levels of false positives (Lotterhos & Whitlock 2014; Hoban *et al.*
2016). The geographical proximity of the populations under study, however, precludes
important differences in terms of demographic history since the re-colonization of the
area from a single source population in the last 6,500 years (Moore *et al.* 2015). In
addition, Lotterhos & Whitlock (2015) concluded that maximum power in genome scan
studies could be achieved by examining geographically proximate and genetically similar

populations that experience contrasting environments, criteria that our system fulfilled.

Nevertheless, few of the outlier markers identified by the three methods overlapped, a

common finding (de Villemereuil *et al*. 2014; Gagnaire *et al*. 2015). Interestingly, three

of the four markers that overlapped between the PCAdapt and the Bayescan approaches

were co-located on the same 914 Kb scaffold (*scaffold_363*) on the Rainbow Trout

genome (two of the markers failed to provide unambiguous BLAST results on the better

annotated but more distantly related Atlantic Salmon genome). The co-localization of

three outliers with evidence from two separate methods therefore suggests the importance

of this genomic region, and provides some confidence in the success of the method.

In accordance with our *a priori* expectation that migration harshness is a major

selective factor differing among rivers, several of the outlier SNPs were linked to muscle

and cardiac functions and development. One of the outlier SNPs was located within 75Kb

(5' side) of *myocyte enhancer factor 2* (MEF2), a transcription factor acting as an

important regulator of vertebrate skeletal muscle differentiation and heart development

(Potthof & Olson 2007). Supporting the relevance of this protein for migrating salmonids,

cardiac mRNA levels of MEF2 were elevated in Atlantic salmon following 10 weeks of

experimental exercise training (Castro *et al*. 2013). An outlier was also located within the

gene coding for *nebulette*, a cardiac-specific actin-binding protein essential in the

structure of the sarcomere Z-disc (Bonzo *et al*. 2008). Another marker was within the

gene coding for *muscle glycogen phosphorylase* (PYGM), the enzyme responsible for

breaking up glycogen into glucose subunits to power muscle cells (Kitaoka 2014).

Mutations in this gene in humans are linked to McArdle disease, the major symptom of

which is exercise intolerance in the form of premature fatigue, myalgia and muscle

cramps (Kitaoka 2014). Finally, another marker was within the gene coding for *fructose-*

1,6-biphosphatase, which is involved in the conversion of glycerol into glucose (i.e.,

gluconeogenesis; Lamont *et al*. 2006). These results are consistent with the hypothesis

that migration harshness is a major selective force in anadromous Arctic Char, and

provide a basis to formulate hypotheses regarding the functional traits underlying long-

distance migrations.

The annotations of several other genes are also noteworthy in the context of

homing, which in salmonids involves memory, learning, and chemosensing (Quinn

2005). First, the protein coded by the previously mentioned MEF2 gene is also enriched

in neurons, in the cerebellum, the cerebral cortex and the hippocampus, and its

involvement in synaptic plasticity suggests a role in learning and memory (Potthof &

Olson 2007). Second, the only marker from Rainbow Trout *scaffold_363* that could be

localized is within the gene coding for *FAM179B*, a protein required for the structure and

function of the primary cilia, an organelle usually associated with the reception of

extracellular mechanical and chemical stimuli, and which has been linked to chemotaxis

in *C. elegans* (Das et al. 2015). Note, however, that this scaffold contains 36 predicted

ORFs, and other linked genes could easily be the targets of selection instead of

FAM179B. Finally, several other markers were localized in or near genes coding for

proteins that have functions in the nervous system, particularly axon guidance (*neural*

cell adhesion molecule 2, *neural cadherin-like isoform X1*; *Arf-GAP with GTPase*; *ANK*

repeat and PH domain-containing protein 2; *NEDD8-conjugating enzyme Ubc12*; *CD9*

antigen-like isoform X2; see table S4 for details). There is some evidence from Pacific

salmon that homing has both a learned and an innate, genetically determined component

(McIsaac & Quinn 1988). The abundance of putative targets of selection identified here

linked to the development and function of the nervous system is therefore interesting in

that regard, but much additional work would obviously be required to establish causal

links (Barrett & Hoekstra 2011). Further, the low density of markers used in the present

study did not allow an exhaustive assessment of the targets of natural selection

throughout the Arctic Char genome. Nonetheless, the evidence that local adaptation in a

variety of biological functions evolved despite low genetic differentiation and in the short

time since deglaciation appears fairly robust.

Conclusions

Migration harshness has long been identified as a major driver of adaptation in

anadromous salmonids (Shaffer & Elson 1975; Bernatchez & Dodson 1987; Eliason *et al*.

2011; Hecht *et al*. 2015). We here used an integrative approach, linking genome-wide

data with telemetry, to provide evidence that migration harshness drives both

overwintering habitat choice and local adaptation in anadromous Arctic Char. The

genomic data suggested the importance of migratory harshness in driving local adaptation

through the identification of several putative targets of selection linked to muscle and

cardiac functions. Future work in this system will build on these results to describe

physiological differences among populations in relations to migration harshness. These

will be particularly relevant in the context of adaptation to a changing Arctic, where

migratory environments could exert an important selective pressure on populations (e.g.,

Eliason *et al.* 2011). Many of our conclusions would have been difficult, if not impossible

to reach with genomic or telemetry data alone, and our study therefore illustrated the

synergies made possible by combining the two types of data (Shafer *et al.* 2016). Such

integrative approaches will continue to increase our understanding of how migratory

behaviour interacts with gene flow to influence the spatial scale at which local adaptation

can evolve, and will advance the study of the genetic basis of migratory traits of species

behaving in their wild habitats.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for the support of the Ekaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers

Organization and of the residents of Cambridge Bay, who made this work possible.

Koana! We also acknowledge Kitikmeot Food Ltd. for logistical support and their

precious collaboration with the plant sampling program. We thank B. Boyle and G.

Légaré at the IBIS sequencing platform for their help and advice regarding library

preparation and sequencing. A.-L. Ferchaud, L. Benestan, T. Gosselin, S. Bernatchez, A.

Perreault-Payette, & C. Perrier shared scripts and provided advice on data analysis and

interpretation. The telemetry work was supported by the Ocean Tracking Network (OTN)

through a network project grant (NETGP No. 375118-08) from Natural Sciences and

Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) with additional support from the

Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI, Project No. 13011), by the Polar Continental

Shelf Project of Natural Resources Canada (grant #107-15), and by in kind logistical

support from the Arctic Research Foundation. J.-S. Moore was supported by fellowships

from the Fonds Québécois de Recherche sur la Nature et les Technologies and the W.

Garfield Weston Foundation. J. Le Luyer, B. Sutherland and Q. Rougemont were

supported from various grants from the Canada Research Chair in Genomics and

Conservation of Aquatic Resources led by L. Bernatchez.

Author contribution: J.-S.M. and L.N.H. designed this study and conducted the

fieldwork. J-SM performed part of the lab work, most of the analyses, and wrote the

manuscript. J.L. identified the SNPs using the STACKS workflow. B.J.S. mapped the

markers using MapComp and contributed to the functional annotations. Q.R. performed

the ABC analyses. R.F.T., A.T.F., and L.B. provided guidance and supervision at various

stages of the study. All authors contributed significantly to the writing of the article.

References

Alexander, D.H., Novembre, J., and Lange, K. (2009) Fast model-based estimation of
ancestry in unrelated individuals. *Genome Research* **19**, 1655–1664.
Aljanabi, S.M., and Martinez, I. (1997) Universal and rapid salt-extraction of high quality
genomic DNA for PCR-based techniques. *Nucleic Acids Research* **25**, 4692–4693.
Anderson, E.C. (2010) Assessing the power of informative subsets of loci for population
assignment: standard methods are upwardly biased. *Molecular Ecology Resources*
10, 701–710.
Anderson, E.C., Waples, R.S., and Kalinowski, S.T. (2008) An improved method for
predicting the accuracy of genetic stock identification. *Canadian Journal of*
Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, **65**, 1475–1486.
Andrews, K.R., Good, J.M., Miller, M.R., Luikart, G., and Hohenlohe, P.A. (2016)
Harnessing the power of RADseq for ecological and evolutionary genomics.
Nature Reviews Genetics, **17,** 81–92.
Armstrong RH (1974) Migration of anadromous Dolly Varden (Salvelinus malma) in
southeastern Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **31**,
435–444.
Barrett RDH, Hoekstra HE (2011) Molecular spandrels: tests of adaptation at the genetic
level. *Nature reviews: Genetics*, **12**, 767–780.
Benestan, L., J.-S. Moore, B.J. Sutherland, J. LeLuyer, N. Rycroft, J. Attema, L.N.
Harris, R.F. Tallman, C. Rougeux, E. Normandeau, L. Bernatchez. (2016) Sex
matters in Massive Parallel Sequencing: evidence for biases in genetic parameter
estimation and investigation of sex determination systems. bioRxiv
https://doi.org/10.1101/096065
Berdahl A, Westley PAH, Levin SA, Couzin ID, Quinn TP (2014) A collective
navigation hypothesis for homeward migration in anadromous salmonids. *Fish*
and Fisheries, **17**, 525–542.
Bernatchez L, JJ. Dodson (1987) Relationship between bioenergetics and behaviour in
anadromous fish migrations. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
Sciences, **44**, 399-407.
Bernatchez L (2016) On the maintenance of genetic variation and adaptation to
environmental change: considerations from population genomics in fishes.
Journal of Fish Biology, **89**, 2519–2556.
Berthold, P., and Querner, U. (1981) Genetic basis of migratory behavior in European
warblers, **212**, 77–79.

Berthold P, Helbig AJ, Mohr G, Querner U (1992) Rapid microevolution of migratory
behaviour in a wild bird species. *Nature*, **360**, 668–670.
Bond, M.H., Miller, J.A., and Quinn, T.P. (2015) Beyond dichotomous life histories in
partially migrating populations: cessation of anadromy in a long-lived fish.
Ecology, **96**, 1899–1910.
Bonzo JR, Norris AA, Esham M, Moncman CL (2008) The nebulette repeat domain is
necessary for proper maintenance of tropomyosin with the cardiac sarcomere.
Experimental cell research, **314**, 3519–3530.
Brieuc MSO, Ono K, Drinan DP, Naish KA (2015) Integration of Random Forest with
population-based outlier analyses provides insight on the genomic basis and
evolution of run timing in Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*).
Molecular Ecology, **24**, 2729–2746.
Castric, V., and Bernatchez, L. (2004) Individual assignment test reveals differential
restriction to dispersal between two salmonids despite no increase of genetic
differences with distance. *Molecular Ecology,* **13**, 1299–1312.
Castro V, Grisdale-Helland B, Helland SJ *et al.* (2013) Cardiac molecular-acclimation
mechanisms in response to swimming-induced exercise in Atlantic salmon. *PLoS
ONE*, **8**, e55056.
Catchen, J., Hohenlohe, P.A., Bassham, S., Amores, A., and Cresko, W.A. (2013).
Stacks: an analysis tool set for population genomics. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**,
3124–3140.
Crossin, G.T., Hinch, S.G., Farrell, A.P., Higgs, D.A., Lotto, A.G., Oakes, J.D., and
Healey, M.C. (2004) Energetics and morphology of sockeye salmon: effects of
upriver migratory distance and elevation. *Journal of Fish Biology,* **65**, 788–810.
Csilléry, K., Blum, M.G.B., Gaggiotti, O.E., and François, O. (2010) Approximate
Bayesian Computation (ABC) in practice. Trends in Ecology and Evolution **25**,
410–418.
Das A, Dickinson DJ, Wood CC, Goldstein B, Slep KC (2015) Crescerin uses a TOG
domain array to regulate microtubules in the primary cilium. *Molecular biology of
the cell*, **26**, 4248–4264.
Davey, J.W., Hohenlohe, P.A., Etter, P.D., Boone, J.Q., Catchen, J.M., and Blaxter, M.L.
(2011) Genome-wide genetic marker discovery and genotyping using next-
generation sequencing. *Nature Reviews Genetics,* **12**, 499–510.
Day, A.C. and Harris, L.N. (2013) Information to support an updated stock status of
commercially harvested Arctic Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*) in the Cambridge Bay
region of Nunavut, 1960−2009. DFO Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat
Research Document 2013/068. v + 30 p.
Delmore, K.E., Hübner, S., Kane, N.C., Schuster, R., Andrew, R.L., Câmara, F., Guigó,
R., and Irwin, D.E. (2015) Genomic analysis of a migratory divide reveals
candidate genes for migration and implicates selective sweeps in generating
islands of differentiation. *Molecular Ecology,* **24**, 1873–1888.
Dempson, J.B., and Kristofferson, A.H. (1987) Spatial and temporal aspects of the ocean
migration of anadromous Arctic Char. *In* Common Strategies of Anadromous and
Catadromous Fishes, American Fisheries Society Symposium. *Edited by* M.J.
Dadswell, R.J. Klauda, C.M. Moffitt, R.L. Saunders, R.A. Rulifson, and J.E.
Cooper. pp. 340–357.

de Villemereuil P, Frichot E, Bazin E, François O, Gaggiotti OE (2014) Genome scan
888   methods against more complex models: when and how much should we trust
889   them? *Molecular Ecology*, **23**, 2006–2019.
890   Dingle, H. (2014) Migration: the biology of life on the move. 2nd edition. Oxford
891   University Press, Oxford UK. 306 pp.
892   Do, C., Waples, R.S., Peel, D., Macbeth, G.M., Tillett, B.J., and Ovenden, J.R. (2014)
893   NeEstimator v2: re-implementation of software for the estimation of
894   contemporary effective population size (Ne) from genetic data. *Molecular*
895   *Ecology Resources,* **14**, 209–214.
896   Dutil, J.-D. (1986) Energetic constraints and spawning interval in the anadromous Arctic
897   Charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*). *Copeia*, **4**, 945–955.
898   Eliason, E.J., Clark, T.D., Hague, M.J., Hanson, L.M., Gallagher, Z.S., Jeffries, K.M.,
899   Gale, M.K., Patterson, D.A., Hinch, S.G., and Farrell, A.P. (2011) Differences in
900   thermal tolerance among sockeye salmon populations. *Science,* **332**, 109–112.
901   Fleming IA (1998) Pattern and variability in the breeding system of Atlantic salmon
902   (Salmo salar), with comparisons to other salmonids. *Canadian Journal of*
903   *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **55(Suppl. 1)**, 59–76.
904   Foll, M., and Gaggiotti, O. (2008) A Genome-Scan Method to Identify Selected Loci
905   Appropriate for Both Dominant and Codominant Markers: A Bayesian
906   Perspective. *Genetics,* **180**, 977–993.
907   Franchini P, Irisarri I, Fudickar A *et al.* (2017) Animal tracking meets migration
908   genomics: transcriptomic analysis of a partially migratory bird species. *Molecular*
909   *Ecology*, DOI: 10.1111/mec.14108
910   Frichot, E., Schoville, S.D., Bouchard, G., and François, O. (2013) Testing for
911   associations between loci and environmental gradients using latent factor mixed
912   models. *Molecular Biology and Evolution,* **30**, 1687–1699.
913   Gagnaire P-A, Broquet T, Aurelle D *et al.* (2015) Using neutral, selected, and hitchhiker
914   loci to assess connectivity of marine populations in the genomic era. *Evolutionary*
915   *Applications*, **8**, 769–786.
916   Gilbert, M., Donadt, C.R., Swanson, H.K., and Tierney, K.B. (2016) Low Annual
917   Fidelity and Early Upstream Migration of Anadromous Arctic Char in a Variable
918   Environment. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society,* **145**, 931–942.
919   Gosselin, T, Anderson, E. C., Bradbury, I. (2016). assigner: Assignment Analysis with
920   GBS/RAD Data using R. Rpackage version 0.4.1.
921   https://github.com/thierrygosselin/assigner. doi : 10.5281/zenodo.51453
922   Gross MR, Coleman RM, McDowall RM (1988) Aquatic productivity and the evolution
923   of diadromous fish migration. *Science*, **239**, 1291–1293.
924   Haasl RJ, Payseur BA (2016) Fifteen years of genomewide scans for selection: trends,
925   lessons and unaddressed genetic sources of complication. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**,
926   5–23.
927   Harris, L.N., Moore, J.S., Bajno, R., and Tallman, R.F. (2016) Genetic Stock Structure of
928   Anadromous Arctic Char in Canada's Central Arctic: Potential Implications for
929   the Management of Canada's Largest Arctic Char Commercial Fishery. *North*
930   *American Journal of Fisheries Management*, **36**, 1473–1488.

Hecht BC, Matala AP, Hess JE, Narum SR (2015) Environmental adaptation in Chinook
salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) throughout their North American range.
Molecular Ecology, **24**: 5573–5595.
Hendry A, Castric V, Kinnison M, Quinn T (2004) The evolution of philopatry and
dispersal: Homing Versus Straying in Salmonids. In: *Evolution illuminated:*
salmon and their relatives (eds Hendry A, Stearns S), pp. 53–91. Oxford
University Press, New York, USA.
Hess JE, Zendt JS, Matala AR, Narum SR (2016) Genetic basis of adult migration timing
in anadromous steelhead discovered through multivariate association testing.
Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, **283**, 20153064.
Hoban S, Kelley JL, Lotterhos KE *et al.* (2016) Finding the Genomic Basis of Local
Adaptation: Pitfalls, Practical Solutions, and Future Directions. *The American*
Naturalist, **188**, 379–397.
Hudson, R.R. (2002) Generating samples under a Wright–Fisher neutral model of genetic
variation. *Bioinformatics,* **18**, 337–338.
Hussey, N.E., Kessel, S.T., Aarestrup, K., Cooke, S.J., Cowley, P.D., Fisk, A.T.,
Harcourt, R.G., Holland, K.N., Iverson, S.J., Kocik, J.F., Mills Flemming, J.E.,
and Whoriskey, F.G. (2015) Aquatic animal telemetry: A panoramic window into
the underwater world. *Science*, **348**, 1255642–1255642.
Illera JC, Palmero AM, Laiolo P *et al.* (2014) Genetic, morphological, and acoustic
evidence reveals lack of diversification in the colonization process in an island
bird. *Evolution*, **68**, 2259–2274.
Ishwaran H. and Kogalur U.B. (2015). Random Forests for Survival, Regression and
Classification (RF-SRC), R package version 1.6.1.
Jensen, J., and Rikardsen, A.H. (2012) Archival tags reveal that Arctic Charr Salvelinus
alpinus and brown trout Salmo trutta can use estuarine and marine waters during
winter. *Journal of Fish Biology*, **81**, 735–749.
Johnson, L. (1980) The Arctic Charr. *In* Charrs: salmonid fishes of the genus Salvelinus.
Edited by E.K. Balon. Dr. W. Junk bv Publishers, The Hague. pp. 15–98.
Jombart, T. (2008) adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic
markers. *Bioinformatics*, **24**, 1403–1405.
Jombart, T., Devillard, S., and Balloux, F. (2010) Discriminant analysis of principal
components: a new method for the analysis of genetically structured populations.
BMC Genetics, **11**, 94.
Kays, R., Crofoot, M.C., Jetz, W., and Wikelski, M. (2015) Terrestrial animal tracking as
an eye on life and planet. *Science* **348**, aaa2478.
Kitaoka Y (2014) McArdle disease and exercise physiology. *Biology*, **3**, 157–166.
Klemetsen, A., Amundsen, P.A., Dempson, J.B., Jonsson, B., Jonsson, N., O'Connell,
M.F., and Mortensen, E. (2003) Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* L., brown trout
Salmo trutta L. and Arctic Charr *Salvelinus alpinus* L.: a review of aspects of their
life histories. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish,* **12**, 1–59.
Kristofferson AH, Berkes F (2015) Adaptive co-management of Arctic char in Nunavut
territory. In: *Breaking ice renewable resource and ocean management in*
Canada's North (eds Berkes F, Huebert R, Fast H, Manseau M, Diduck A), pp.
249–268. University of Calgary Press, Calgary.

Lamont BJ, Visinoni S, Fam BC *et al.* (2006) Expression of human fructose-1,6-
bisphosphatase in the liver of transgenic mice results in increased glycerol
gluconeogenesis. *Endocrinology*, **147**, 2764–2772.
Liedvogel, M., Akesson, S., and Bensch, S. (2011) The genetics of migration on the
move. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **26**, 561–569.
Lien, S., Koop, B.F., Sandve, S.R., Miller, J.R., Kent, M.P., Nome, T., Hvidsten, T.R.,
Leong, J.S., Minkley, D.R., Zimin, A., Grammes, F., Grove, H., Gjuvsland, A.,
Walenz, B., Hermansen, R.A., Schalburg, von, K., Rondeau, E.B., Di Genova, A.,
Samy, J.K.A., Olav Vik, J., Vigeland, M.D., Caler, L., Grimholt, U., Jentoft, S.,
Inge Våge, D., de Jong, P., Moen, T., Baranski, M., Palti, Y., Smith, D.R., Yorke,
J.A., Nederbragt, A.J., Tooming-Klunderud, A., Jakobsen, K.S., Jiang, X., Fan,
D., Hu, Y., Liberles, D.A., Vidal, R., Iturra, P., Jones, S.J.M., Jonassen, I., Maass,
A., Omholt, S.W., and Davidson, W.S. (2016) The Atlantic salmon genome
provides insights into rediploidization. *Nature,* **533**, 200–207.
Lotterhos, K.E., and Whitlock, M.C. (2014) Evaluation of demographic history and
neutral parameterization on the performance of FST outlier tests. *Molecular
Ecology,* **23**, 2178–2192.
Lotterhos KE, Whitlock MC (2015) The relative power of genome scans to detect local
adaptation depends on sampling design and statistical method. *Molecular
Ecology*, **24**, 1031–1046.
Luu, K., Bazin, E., and Blum, M.G.B. (2017) PCAdapt: an R package to perform genome
scans for selection based on principal component analysis. *Molecular Ecology
Resources,* **17**, 67–77.
Mastretta-Yanes A, Arrigo N, Alvarez N *et al.* (2015) Restriction site-associated DNA
sequencing, genotyping error estimation and de novo assembly optimization for
population genetic inference. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, **15**, 28–41.
McGowan DK (1990) Enumeration and Biological Data from the Upstream Migration of
Arctic Charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.), in the Cambridge Bay Area, Northwest
Territories, 1979-1983. Canadian Data Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
811: iv + 27 p.
McIsaac, D. O., and Quinn, T. P. (1988) Evidence for a hereditary component in homing
behavior of chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Can. J. Fish. Aquat.
Sci. **45**: 2201-2205.
Meirmans, P.G., and van Tienderen, P.H. (2004) GENOTYPE and GENODIVE: two
programs for the analysis of genetic diversity of asexual organisms. *Molecular
Ecology Notes,* **4**, 792–794.
Mascher, M., Wu, S., Amand, P.S., Stein, N., and Poland, J. (2013) Application of
genotyping-by-sequencing on semiconductor sequencing platforms: a comparison
of genetic and reference-based marker ordering in barley. *PLoS ONE,* **8**, e76925.
Moore, J.-S., Harris, L.N., Tallman, R.F., and Taylor, E.B. (2013) The interplay between
dispersal and gene flow in anadromous Arctic Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*):
implications for potential for local adaptation. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
Aquatic Sciences*, **70**, 1327–1338.
Moore JS, Bajno R, Reist JD, Taylor EB (2015) Post‐glacial recolonization of the North
American Arctic by Arctic Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*): genetic evidence of multiple

northern refugia and hybridization between glacial lineages. *Journal of*
Biogeography **42**, 2089–2100.
Moore, J.S., Harris, L.N., Kessel, S.T., Bernatchez, L., Tallman, R.F., and Fisk, A.T.
(2016) Preference for near-shore and estuarine habitats in anadromous Arctic
Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*) from the Canadian high Arctic (Victoria Island, NU)
revealed by acoustic telemetry. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
Sciences, **73**, 1434–1445.
Narum SR, Gallardo P, Correa C, Matala A, Hasselman D, Sutherland BJG and
Bernatchez L. (2017) Genomic patterns of diversity and divergence of two
introduced salmonid species in Patagonia, South America. *Evolutionary*
Applications, **10**, 402–416.
O'Malley KG, Banks MA (2008) A latitudinal cline in the Chinook salmon
(*Onchorhynchus tshawytscha*) Clock gene: evidence for selection on PolyQ length
variants. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, **275**, 2813–2821.
Potthoff MJ, Olson EN (2007) MEF2: a central regulator of diverse developmental
programs. *Development*, **134**, 4131–4140.
Quinn, T. (2005) The Behavior and Ecology of Pacific Salmon & Trout. University of
Washington Press.
Reist, J.D., Power, M., and Dempson, J.B. (2013) Arctic Charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*): a
case study of the importance of understanding biodiversity and taxonomic issues
in northern fishes. *Biodiversity,* **14**, 45–56.
Roff DA (2002) *Life History Evolution*. Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, MA, USA.
Roff, D.A., and Fairbairn, D.J. (1991) Wing dimorphisms and the evolution of migratory
polymorphisms among the Insecta. *American Zoologist,* **31**, 243–251.
Ross-Ibarra J, Wright SI, Foxe JP *et al.* (2008) Patterns of polymorphism and
demographic history in natural populations of Arabidopsis lyrata. *PLoS ONE*, **3**,
e2411.
Roux C, Tsagkogeorga G, Bierne N, Galtier N (2013) Crossing the species barrier:
genomic hotspots of introgression between two highly divergent Ciona intestinalis
species. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **30**, 1574–1587.
Schaffer, W.M., and Elson, P.F. (1975) The adaptive significance of variations in life
history among local populations of Atlantic salmon in North America. *Ecology*,
56, 577–590.
Shafer, A., Northrup, J.M., White, K.S., Boyce, M.S., Côté, S.D., and Coltman, D.W.
(2012) Habitat selection predicts genetic relatedness in an alpine ungulate.
Ecology, **103**, 1317–1329.
Shafer, A.B.A., Northrup, J.M., Wikelski, M., Wittemyer, G., and Wolf, J.B.W. (2016)
Forecasting Ecological Genomics: High-Tech Animal Instrumentation Meets
High-Throughput Sequencing. *PLoS Biology,* **14**, e1002350.
Sousa, V., and Hey, J. (2013) Understanding the origin of species with genome-scale
data: modelling gene flow. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **14**, 404–414.
Sutherland B, Gosselin T (2016) Salmonid chromosome evolution as revealed by a novel
method for comparing RADseq linkage maps. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, **12**,
3600-3617.
Turgeon, J., Duchesne, P., Colbeck, G.J., Postma, L.D., and Hammill, M.O. (2012)
Spatiotemporal segregation among summer stocks of beluga (*Delphinapterus*

leucas) despite nuclear gene flow: implication for the endangered belugas in

eastern Hudson Bay (Canada). *Conservation genetics,* **13**, 419–433.

Weir, B.S., and Cockerham, C.C. (1984) Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of

population structure. *Evolution*, **38**, 1358–1370.

Wu TD, Reeder J, Lawrence M, Becker G, Brauer MJ (2016) GMAP and GSNAP for

Genomic Sequence Alignment: Enhancements to Speed, Accuracy, and

Functionality. In: *Statistical Genomics* Methods in Molecular Biology. pp. 283–

334. Springer New York, New York, NY.

1075

1076

Table 1. Sample information, river characteristics, and basic genetic diversity estimates for the six sampling locations used in the present study. Work is the product of river length and elevation gain, standardized to a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. Sample type refers to whether the individuals were collected specifically for DNA analysis ('Baseline') or were individuals that were equipped with an acoustic tag as part of the telemetry study ('Tagged'). N_{tot} is the total number of individuals sampled, $N_{<0.25\,NAs}$ the number of individuals with less than 25% missing data retained for all analyses, H_O the observed heterozygosity, H_S the expected heterozygosity, and G_{IS} is the inbreeding coefficient. All G_{IS} values are significant (<0.001).

Sampling location	Coordinates	River length (km)	Elevation gain (m)	Work (std.)	Sampling year	Sample type	N_{tot} / $N_{<0.25\,NAs}$	H_O	H_S	G_{IS}	N_e (95% CI)
Lauchlan River	N68.94° W108.52°	28.5	64	0.175	2012	Baseline	57/57	0.102	0.105	0.03	335 (318 – 353)
Halokvik River	N69.16° W107.09°	50.4	118	1.948	2013	Baseline	60/59	0.099	0.103	0.037	823 (736 - 934)
Surrey River	N69.45° W106.68°	18	35	-0.338	2013	Tagged	34/30				-
					2014	Tagged	31/31				-
					2013	Baseline	60/59	0.102	0.105	0.023	892 (798 – 1009)
Ekalluk River	N69.41° W106.31°	3.8	15	-0.584	2013	Tagged	30/26				-
					2014	Tagged	31/31				-
					2013	Baseline	60/53	0.104	0.106	0.017	1081 (935 – 1280)
Freshwater Creek	N69.12° W105.00°	3.6	7	-0.598	1992	Baseline	32/32	0.105	0.105	0.001	389 (351 – 436)
Jayko River	N69.72° W103.28°	5.4	3	-0.602	2014	Baseline	60/58	0.104	0.107	0.022	368 (351 – 387)

Table 2. Summary of the filter steps and number of SNPs or genotypes removed at each step. Allelic imbalance corresponds to the ratio of the number of reads for the major and minor allele in heterozygous genotypes. Note that each filter was run independently and that only SNPs/genotypes that passed all filters were retained, therefore the total number of SNPs/genotypes filtered out does not equal the sum of the number of SNPs filtered out at each step.

Filter [value]	Number of SNPs/genotypes filtered out
Depth of coverage [≤ 10000]	3 SNPs removed
Depth of coverage [≥ 5]	6,930,852 genotypes removed
Maximum allelic imbalance [≤4]	5,021 genotypes removed
Genotype likelihood [≥ 6]	5,937,959 genotypes removed
Proportion of individuals with a genotype for the SNP [≥ 70%]	153,788 SNPs removed
MAF global [≥0.01]	236,678 SNPs removed
MAF sampling site [≥0.05]	249,951 SNPs removed
Heterozygosity [≤0.6]	3,558 SNPs removed
Minimum Fis [≥ -0.4]	4,237 SNPs removed
Maximum Fis [≤ 0.4]	31,294 SNPs removed
Number of SNPs per locus [≤ 10]	57,694 SNPs removed
Summary	
Total number of SNPs/loci in unfiltered catalogue	286,584 SNPs/81,919 loci
Total number of SNPs filtered out	276,875 SNPs (96.6%)
Total number of SNPs retained	9,709 SNPs
Only one SNP per locus (1st) retained	6,230 SNPs
Sex-linked SNPs removed	6,136 SNPs

Table 3. Parameter estimates for the isolation with migration (IM) model which was determined to have the highest posterior probability among the three models tested (P(IM)≈ 1) for two independent runs comparing Ekalluk and Halovik rivers (EKA-HAL) and Ekalluk and Lauchlan rivers (EKA-LAU). The parameters are θ_A/θ_{ref} for the ancestral population; θ_1/θ_{ref} and θ_2/θ_{ref} for the two daughter populations (θ_1 = Ekalluk in both cases and θ_2 = Halokvik and Lauchlan depending on the analysis), with θ_{ref}= $4N_{ref}\mu$ where N_{ref} is the effective size of a reference population and μ is the mutation rate per generation, M_1 is the migration rate into population 1 (Ekalluk) from population 2 (Halokvik and Lanchlan) and vice-versa for M_2, and τ = $T_{split}/4N_{ref}$ where T_{split} is the time (in generations) since population 1 and 2 diverged from the ancestral population.

Parameter	Prior	EKA-HAL Median [95%Credible Intervals]	EKA-LAU Median [95%Credible Intervals]
θ_A/θ_{ref}	Uniform[0-20]	1.21 [0.20 − 2.38]	5.75 [1.40 − 12.83]
θ_1/θ_{ref}	Uniform[0-20]	11.71 [7.77 − 18.05]	19.86 [19.65 − 19.96]
θ_2/θ_{ref}	Uniform[0-20]	3.10 [1.91 − 6.05]	0.47 [0.18 − 2.75]
M_1	Uniform[0-40]	7.91 [3.93 − 16.28]	12.31 [6.18 -28.39]
M_2	Uniform[0-40]	32.15 [28.15 − 36.32]	37.59 [32.03 − 39.82]
τ	Uniform[0-30]	3.80 [2.30 − 5.30]	11.24 [5.96 − 25.65]