# Geographic and environmental contributions to genomic divergence in mangrove forests

Michele Fernandes da Silva[1,2], Mariana Vargas Cruz[1,2], João de Deus Vidal Júnior[1,2], Maria Imaculada Zucchi[3], Gustavo Maruyama Mori[4], Anete Pereira de Souza[1,2]

[1]Department of Plant Biology, Institute of Biology, University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, SP, 13083-863, Brazil

[2]Center for Molecular Biology and Genetic Engineering, University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, SP, 13083-875, Brazil

[3]São Paulo Agency for Agribusiness Technology (APTA), Piracicaba, SP, 13400-790, Brazil

[4]Institute of Biosciences, São Paulo State University (Unesp), São Vicente, SP, 11330-900, Brazil

**Corresponding author:** Anete Pereira de Souza

Center for Molecular Biology and Genetic Engineering, University of Campinas (Unicamp).

Avenue Cândido Rondom, 400, Campinas, SP, 13083-875, Brazil.

Telephone number: +55 19 3521 1132

E-mail: anete@unicamp.br

**ABSTRACT**

Assessing the relative importance of geographic and environmental factors to the spatial distribution of genetic variation can provide relevant information about the processes that maintain genetic variation in natural populations. With a globally wide but very restricted habitat distribution, mangrove trees are an interesting model for studies aiming to understand the contributions of these factors. Mangroves occur along the continent-ocean interface of tropical and subtropical latitudes, regions considered inhospitable to many other plant types. Here, we used landscape genomics approaches to investigate the relative contributions of geographic and environmental variables to the genetic variation of two black mangroves, *Avicennia schaueriana* and *A. germinans*, along the South American coast. Using single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), our results revealed an important role of ocean currents in the gene flow of *A. schaueriana* and isolation by environment as the pattern that best explains the genetic differentiation of *A. germinans*. Additionally, for both species, we found significant correlations between genetic variation with evidence of selection and precipitation regimes, tidal variation, solar radiation and temperature patterns. These discoveries expand our knowledge about the evolution of mangrove trees and provide important information to predict future responses of coastal species to the expected global changes for this century.

**KEYWORDS**

Adaptation of mangroves; isolation by distance; isolation by barrier; environmental gradient; molecular ecology; coastal ecology.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental and geographic variations are often determinants of the distribution of allele frequencies in natural populations, facilitating or limiting gene flow across space and influencing the selection of certain genotypes [1-3]. For example, under an isolation-by-distance (IBD) model [4], geographic distance may limit the dispersal, leading to the accumulation of allele frequency divergences by genetic drift [5]. Furthermore, under the isolation-by-barrier (IBB) model, a barrier to gene flow may abruptly reduce or even disrupt connectivity between individuals of a species [6]. In addition to these models, the genetic differentiation can increase in response to environmental differences, regardless of the geographic distance. This pattern, described by the isolation-by-environment (IBE), [7] can be generated by a variety of ecological processes, such as selection against immigrants, leading to the evolution of locally adapted populations [5].

These models, IBD, IBB, and IBE, are not mutually exclusive and often co-occur in nature [8,9]. Determining the factors that control the distribution patterns of genetic variation across space can provide relevant information about the underlying processes that generate and maintain genetic variation in natural populations [7,10]. This knowledge is essential to predict future responses of current populations to environmental changes [11] and can contribute to decision-making processes aiming to minimize future biodiversity loss [12-14].

The field of research that seeks to clarify the roles of these factors in the distribution of the neutral and adaptive genetic variability of a species over space is known as landscape genomics [11,15-17]. Recently, this approach has been increasingly applied to the study of non-model organisms [18]. Nevertheless, landscape genomic studies are mostly limited to animal species, whereas studies on plants, especially tropical trees [19], remain very limited despite their

fundamental role in global biogeochemical cycles [20] and as habitat providers to most terrestrial biodiversity [21].

As sessile organisms, trees respond directly to the environment in which they live [22]. Conversely, they often have high levels of gene flow, which tend to reduce the strength of natural selection [23]. Thus, tree species that often occur across wide latitudinal ranges along environmental gradients, such as mangrove forests [24], represent a promising biological model to investigate and understand the effects of the environment on micro evolutionary processes and populational dynamics.

Mangrove trees occur in a narrow area along the continent-ocean interface [24] of tropical and subtropical latitudes of the world, mainly between 30ºN and 30°S [25]. These species produce floating seeds or fruits, referred to as “propagules” [24], which can disperse over long distances via rivers and ocean surface currents [26].Their geographic distribution is limited by the topography of the intertidal zone [27] and frequently by the occurrence of low temperatures [28] and precipitation patterns [29]. However, environmental variations in their boundaries are associated with different climatic thresholds [30,31] and oceanographic conditions [32].

*Avicennia* L. (Acanthaceae) is one of the most diverse and widely distributed mangrove genera globally [33,34] and is very abundant on the western Atlantic coastline [35]. In this region, *Avicennia* is mainly represented by two of the three New World *Avicennia* species, namely, *Avicennia germinans* and *Avicennia schaueriana* [33,35]. These species present a partly sympatric distribution on the South American coast, where they share a remarkable north-south pattern of genetic divergence as revealed by selectively neutral microsatellites [36] and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) [37,38]. A similar pattern of putatively neutral genetic

diversity was also observed in other coastal species, such as *Rhizophora mangle* [39,40] and the mangrove-associated tree *Hibiscus pernambucensis* [41]. These findings likely indicate a prominent role of dispersal of floating propagules in shaping the overlapping north-south genetic divergence of these trees given the direction of the South Equatorial current (SEC) along the Atlantic coast of South America [42].

In addition to neutral processes that shape the diversity of *Avicennia* species in this region, recent studies have identified various genomic regions possibly associated with adaptive processes relevant to the environmental context of mangroves [37,38]. These variations have been attributed to climatic and oceanographic factors that vary widely along the latitudinal gradient of the species distribution. Although these studies provide insights into the role of the environment in the organization of the adaptive genetic variation in *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*, the relative importance of neutral and nonneutral abiotic factors remains unknown. The present study aimed to investigate the relative contributions of geographic and environmental variables to the organization of the genetic diversity of these two dominant species of the genus *Avicennia* that are found on the Atlantic coast of South America.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1. Biological materials and genotyping of SNP markers

Biological materials were collected and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers were identified within the context of previous studies by Cruz et al. [37] for *A. schaueriana* and Cruz et al. [38] for *A. germinans*. Briefly, seventy-seven *A. schaueriana* individuals were sampled from ten different locations and 48 *A. germinans* individuals were sampled from six

different locations along the Brazilian coast (figure 1 and table 1). Assembly, mapping and SNP locus identification were performed using custom scripts (SNPsaurus), which created a reference catalogue of abundant reads, retaining biallelic loci present in at least 10% of the samples. High-quality sequences were used, allowing a maximum of 65% of missing data and one SNP per sequence and requiring a minimum coverage of 8× and a minor allele frequency ≥ 0.05 using vcftools v.0.1.12b [43]. To reduce the paralogy or low-quality genotype calls, a maximum reading coverage of 56 was used (resulting from the product with the average reading depth and a standard deviation of 1.5 from the average). In total, 6,170 and 2,297 SNP markers were identified for *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*, respectively.

**2.2. Detection of SNP loci with signatures of natural selection**

SNP loci with evidence of natural selection were identified previously by Cruz et al. [37,38]. For *A. schaueriana*, 86 loci showed considerable deviations from neutral expectations of interpopulation divergence. They were detected by two methods to minimize false positives: LOSITAN [44], with a confidence interval of 0.99 and a false-discovery rate (FDR) of 0.1, and pcadapt [45], with an FDR of 0.1. For *A. germinans*, 25 loci showed considerable deviations from neutral expectations of interpopulation divergence. For the latter species, in addition to LOSITAN (a confidence interval of 0.99 and an FDR of 0.05) and pcadapt (an FDR of 0.05), SNP loci associated with ecological variables were detected using Latent Factor Mixed Models (LFMM) implemented in the *LEA* package [46].

**2.3. Estimation of genetic distances**

To analyze the importance of geographic distance and environmental variables in spatial genetic divergence, we evaluated which model—isolation by distance (IBD), isolation by barrier (IBB) or isolation by environment (IBE) — best described the distribution of the genetic diversity of each species based on genome-wide SNP markers. To that end, we estimated the pairwise genetic differentiation (Wright's $F_{ST}$) [47] for the total set of SNP molecular markers and the set of SNP markers with evidence of selection, using the *Hierfstat* [48] package for R v. 3.6.2 [49].

**2.4. Geographic and environmental distances and the oceanographic barrier**

Pairwise geographic distances among populations were measured using the geographic coordinates of the sampling sites (table 1) with the global positioning system (Garmin 76CSx, WGS-84 standard, Garmin International Inc., Olathe, KS, USA). Distances between points were estimated based on the contour of the Brazilian coast; thus, we considered floating propagules-mediated dispersal [50]. To determine the relative significance of the split pattern of the SEC into the Brazil current (BC) and the North Brazil current (NBC) [42] (figure 1) for *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans* propagules, a binary matrix (0 or 1) was constructed based on the presence (1) or absence (0) of the supposed oceanographic barrier between each pair of sampling sites.

To evaluate the overall effect of the environment on the distribution of genetic variation, we obtained a total of 42 environmental variables for each sampling site, with a resolution of 30 arc-seconds (~ 1 km in Ecuador). In our dataset, we included 27 climatic variables derived from the WorldClim temperature and precipitation datasets (version 1.4 and 2.0) [51], 10 oceanographic variables derived the Marspec ocean surface salinity and temperature datasets

[52] and five variables related to tidal variations retrieved from the Environmental Climate Data Sweden (ECDS) platform [53]. To avoid nonindependence between environmental variables, we removed variables that showed a high correlation ($R^2 > 0.8$) (electronic supplementary material, figure S1), as measured by the *removeCollinearity* function of the *virtualspecies* package [54] in R [49]. We extracted the values of the environmental variables for our sample points (electronic supplementary material, table S1 and S2) using the *raster* package [55] in R [49]. All occurrence data have been carefully inspected to detect and correct problems associated with inconsistent records [56]. We transformed this environmental data matrix using a principal component analysis (PCA). We used the most representative scores from the PCA to calculate Euclidean distances between population pairs [57]. The PCA and environmental distance measurements were all performed in R [49].

**2.5. Association tests**

To test which model best explained our genetic data (both neutral and putatively nonneutral), we performed Multiple Matrix Regression with Randomization (MMRR) [9]. We employed this method to estimate the independent effect of each factor (geographic or environmental) on a single response variable, typically genetic distance. The analysis was performed using the *MMRR* function in R with 10,000 permutations. This function calculates the coefficient of determination, the regression coefficients (β), and estimates significance values for all parameters, showing to be accurate to several types of conditions [9]. The following comparisons were performed: (I) geographic distance (km) and environmental distance, (II) geographic distance (km) and pairwise $F_{ST}$, (III) environmental distance and pairwise $F_{ST}$, (IV) geographic distance (km) in conjunction with environmental distance and pairwise $F_{ST}$ and (V)

the presence/absence of the supposed oceanographic barrier and pairwise $F_{ST}$. These comparisons were also performed separately for the set of samples located northerly from the SEC and for the set of samples located southerly from the SEC because of previous genetic structure evidences [36]. Finally, we tested for correlations between the genetic distances based on the SNP marker set with selection evidence for each environmental variable separately.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Genetic, geographic and environmental distances

For the total set of SNP markers, we found $F_{ST}$ values between 0.019 and 0.189 for pairs of *A. schaueriana* populations and between 0.047 and 0.387 for pairs of *A. germinans* populations (figure 2). For the set of markers with evidence of selection, $F_{ST}$ ranged from 0.02 to 0.36 for *A. schaueriana* (electronic supplementary material, table S3) and from 0.03 to 0.88 for *A. germinans* (electronic supplementary material, table S4). The pairwise geographic distances ranged from approximately 5000 km between Bragança (SB) and Laguna (SL) to 77 km between Cananéia (SC) and Pontal do Paraná (SP) for *A. schaueriana* (electronic supplementary material, table S5) and from 2100 km between Ilha de Marajó in Soure (GM) and Tamandaré (GT) to 222 km between Ilha de Marajó in Soure (GM) and Bragança (GB) for *A. germinans* (electronic supplementary material, table S6).

After removing highly correlated environmental variables ($R^2 > 0.8$), 23 variables were retained for analyses of environmental distances (electronic supplementary material, table S7 and S8). The first five and the three most representative axes of the PCA used to calculate the environmental distance between the sampling sites (electronic supplementary material, table S9

and S10) retained 97% and 92% of the variation for *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*, respectively. The first two PCA axis for *A. schaueriana* represented 80% of the variance and was mainly explained by the variations in air temperature and sea surface temperature, the solar radiation and tidal cycles (figure 3A). For *A. germinans*, the first two PCA axis represented almost 80% of the variance and was mainly explained by the air temperature variation, precipitation regimes, vapor pressure deficit and solar radiation (figure 3B).

**3.2. Association tests**

For *A. schaueriana*, considering all SNP loci, we observed that the geographic distances between pairs of sampling sites played the greatest role in the describing genetic distances ($R^2$ = 0.81, $P < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.90$, $P = 0.001$; figure 4A), but environmental distance also contributed significantly to genetic distance ($R^2 = 0.54$, $P < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.73$, $P < 0.01$; Figure 4B). However, there was a strong significant correlation between geographic distance and environmental difference ($R^2 = 0.82$, $P < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.88$, $P = 0.001$; Figure 4C), implying that the farther the geographic distance, the greater the environmental difference. When tests were performed separately for sampling locations north and south from the SEC, we found significant correlations only between genetic and geographic distances ($R^2 = 0.81$, $P < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.89$, $P$ = 0.01) for sampling sites located south of the SEC. Multiple regression combining the effects of geographic and environmental distances on genetic distance provided a slight increase in the fit of the model ($R^2 = 0.86$, $P < 0.05$), however, the effect of geographic ($\beta_{geographic} = 0.13$, $P$ = 0.001) and environmental ($\beta_{environment} = -0.48$, $P = 0.01$) distances was lower than the regressions including only one predictor variable. The variable that best explained the genetic

differentiation observed in *A. schaueriana* was the presence or absence of the oceanographic barrier ($R^2 = 0.92$, $P < 0.01$; $\beta = 0.96$, $P < 0.01$).

For *A. germinans*, geographic ($R^2 = 0.61$, $P < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.78$, $P = 0.05$; figure 4E) and environmental ($R^2 = 0.67$, $P < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.81$, $P = 0.01$; figure 4F) distances played significant roles in the genetic differentiation between sampling sites in the entire SNP dataset. However, when we removed samples from GT, which is the only sampling site south of the SEC, the genetic divergence was not correlated with either the geographic distance ($R^2 = 0.006$, $P = 0.97$; $\beta = 0.07$, $P = 0.88$) or the environmental distance ($R^2 = 0.03$, $P = 0.70$; $\beta = 0.17$, $P = 0.68$). The correlation between geographic and environmental distances was significant ($R^2 = 0.74$, $P < 0.01$; figure 4G), but less pronounced than that observed for *A. schaueriana*, which was probably due to the lower latitudinal amplitude between their sampling sites, and consequently, lower environmental variation compared to the latter species. When both types of distances were included in the model, we obtained significant values only for the environmental distance, which showed twice the effect than the geographical distance ($R^2 = 0.69$, $P = 0.03$; $\beta_{environment} = 0.55$, $P < 0.05$, $\beta_{geographic} = 0.28$, $P = 0.34$). The presence or absence of the oceanographic barrier did not explain the genetic divergence among *A. germinans* sampling locations ($R^2 = 0.91$, $P = 0.15$; $\beta = 0.95$, $P = 0.12$).

We identified a significant environmental contribution to the genetic differentiation based on the putative nonneutral SNPs for both species. This contribution was more pronounced for *A. germinans* ($R^2 = 0.62$, $P < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.78$, $P < 0.05$; figure 4H) than for *A. schaueriana* ($R^2 = 0.51$, $P < 0.01$; $\beta = 0.7$, $P = 0.001$; figure 4D). When we analyzed each environmental variable separately, we found significant correlations of putative nonneutral genetic differentiation among *A. schaueriana* sampling locations with variables that vary along the latitudinal gradient of the

species, such as the annual mean temperature ($R^2$ = 0.45, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.67, $P$ = 0.001), isothermality ($R^2$ = 0.75, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.86, $P$ = 0.001), precipitation seasonality ($R^2$ = 0.56, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.75, $P$ < 0.01), minimum solar radiation ($R^2$ = 0.49, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.70, $P$ = 0.001), the annual average cycle of tidal amplitude ($R^2$ = 0.62, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.79, $P$ < 0.05) and the mean annual of sea surface temperature ($R^2$ = 0.46, $P$ < 0.001; β = 0.68, $P$ = 0.01). For *A. germinans*, the nonneutral variation was related to variations in the annual mean temperature ($R^2$ = 0.81, $P$ = 0.01; β = 0.88, $P$ < 0.05), maximum temperature of warmest month ($R^2$ = 0.80, $P$ < 0.05; β = 0.88, $P$ < 0.05), precipitation of warmest quarter ($R^2$ = 0.91, $P$ < 0.05; β = 0.95, $P$ = 0.05), maximum solar radiation ($R^2$ = 0.96, $P$ = 0.01; β = 0.98, $P$ = 0.01) and in the annual average cycle of tidal amplitude ($R^2$ = 0.12, $P$ < 0.01; β = 0.35, $P$ = 0.01) (table 2).

## 4. DISCUSSION

The study of the geographic and environmental factors shaping neutral and adaptive genetic variation in heterogeneous environments is one of the main approaches used to understand the dynamics and evolutionary potential of natural populations [16,58]. In this study, we analyzed the relative contributions of environmental and geographic distances and the presence of an oceanographic barrier to the genetic differentiation of populations of two dominant mangrove species in the Neotropics. We identified the relative importance of the main environmental variables that generate adaptation in these species, providing relevant information for decision makers when planning future efforts targeting conservation and coastal vegetation recovery in the face of increasing challenges resulting from anthropogenic environmental and climate changes in this century.

Pairwise $F_{ST}$ results revealed a variable degree of genetic divergence for both species, indicating the existence of substantially structured populations, especially when samples to the north and south of the SEC are considered. These results corroborate the genetic structure patterns found in previous studies conducted with neutral molecular markers [36,39-41] and indicate that regardless of the characteristics of these markers with high (microsatellite) [59] or low (SNPs) [60] mutation rates, the evolutionary processes that led to this divergence must be quite intense or ancient.

The geographic distances between sampling sites contributed significantly to the genetic divergence of *A. schaueriana* ($R^2$: 0.81, $P < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.90$, $P = 0.001$) and *A. germinans* ($R^2 = 0.61$, $P < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.78$, $P = 0.05$), suggesting that spatial distance plays a fundamental role in the genetic divergence of these species' populations. This model appears to be common in studies of plants [8] and mangroves [61-64]. Although evidence of water-dispersed over long distances exists for mangrove species [26,36,65,66], our results indicate that the large geographic extension and major oceanic currents of the Brazilian coast physically limit the dispersal of *Avicennia* species. Although these correlations were significant for the total set of sampling locations, they were not significant when considering only the set of *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans* sampling locations north of the SEC. For the five sampling locations of *A. germinans* in this region, which are distributed in a fairly geographically continuous habitat, the model was not explained by the coefficient of determination values ($R^2 = 0.006$, $P = 0.97$). We hypothesized that the genetic differentiation between 0.047 and 0.387 observed among sampling locations may actually result from an IBB effect caused by the SEC acting as a barrier to the dispersal of propagules. However, we did not find a significant correlation between genetic differentiation

and the presence of the SEC, probably because we were not able to sufficiently sample *A. germinans* south of the SEC given that only a single location, GT, was used.

In contrast, we found statistical evidence for the action of the SEC as a barrier to gene flow for *A. schaueriana*. For this species, the IBB is the model that best explains the genetic differentiation between their populations. Our results corroborate Mori et al. [36], who suggested that the neutral genetic divergence observed for *A. schaueriana* may have been shaped by marine currents. Our results also suggest that the bifurcated flow of marine currents along the Atlantic coast of South America may have a key role as drivers of genetic differentiation observed in other species of mangrove or associated with this ecosystem, such as *Rhizophora mangle* [39,40] and *Hibiscus pernambucensis* [41]. Our findings statistically showed that the SEC is an important driver of the genetic structure of mangrove species; however, coastal and ocean currents vary temporally in strength and directionality [50]. For example, the SEC splits into the BC and the NBC, which have different speeds and directions [42] (Fig. 1). The NBC is faster than the BC, favoring the spread of propagules from south to north, as observed in previous studies [36,39]. Additionally, the flow direction of coastal currents may influence the direction of gene flow among populations. Therefore, future investigations of the dynamics of these currents, not as a static barrier but including different levels of resistance to gene flow, may provide more realistic insights into their influence on the distribution of the genetic variation of species dispersed by sea currents.

We also identified an IBE pattern in the structure of the genetic diversity of *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*. For *A. germinans*, the IBE explained the genetic differentiation between their populations better than the neutral processes. Many species under IBE showed this same pattern [8,67-73], indicating that environmental heterogeneity may be the main factor

underlying geographic distance [8,72,74]. Notably, the environmental differences of both species were correlated with geographic distance. We suggest, therefore, future investigations that control the effect of environmental predictors on geographic distance.

Given the significant results for IBE, we also estimated the contribution of each environmental variable to nonneutral SNP genetic variation, allowing us to infer the degree to which individual environmental variables contribute to these results. For *A. schaueriana*, we found significant correlations to variations in the tidal range regimes, air and ocean surface temperatures, water vapor pressure, solar radiation, and precipitation shape the distribution of the genetic variation of this species (Table 2). Our results corroborate those of Cruz et al. [38] who performed a functional annotation of loci showing deviations from neutral expectations based on allele frequency variations and associated these loci with biological processes related to responses to environmental variables such as drought and UV radiation. Conversely, for *A. germinans*, we found that genetic variation with evidence of selection is correlated with variations in atmospheric temperature patterns, precipitation regimes, solar radiation and tidal amplitude cycles (Table 2). The results observed for both species corroborate those of other studies reporting that precipitation and air and sea temperature variables were limiting factors in the distribution of coastal species [30,32,75-78], and, together with Cruz et al. [37,38], provide new evidence of the role of local adaptation in the distribution of the genetic diversity of these species.

Our results are particularly relevant in light of the climate changes that have been occurring in the last decades. With them, further investigations on the responses of these species to future changes in predicted increases in average annual air and ocean temperatures and sea level rise [79] can be directed. These results also have implications for conservation management

and planning decisions. With a better understanding of the role of environmental variables in the modeling of genetic variation in *Avicennia* species on the South American coast, our results contribute to the definition of evolutionarily significant units (ESU) for these species, thus maintaining their evolutionary potential [80]. In addition, from the results referring to the remarkable pattern of genetic divergence of *A. schaueriana*, resulting in part from the action of the current of the marine surface studied here, we suggest the consideration of genetic banks north and south from the SEC as conservation measures and maintenance of biodiversity.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Our results provide novel evidence that the combined action of geographic distance, ocean currents and environmental gradient contributed to the evolution of spatial genetic divergence within two Neotropical *Avicennia* species on the Atlantic coast of South America. Our findings revealed the major role of ocean currents as barriers to the gene flow of *A. schaueriana* and the environmental gradient as the main abiotic factor in the genetic differentiation of *A. germinans*. For both species, we found new evidence of adaptation to climatic and oceanographic variables that are changing rapidly in recent decades. In this context, our results represent a starting point for understanding the role of environmental variables in shaping genetic variation in *Avicennia* species of the South American coast, contributing to the understanding of the evolution of genetic diversity within this genus and providing information that can be relevant to other coastal organisms. Additionally, our findings guide further research on the responses of these species to climate change and contribute to effective conservation plans for mangroves and other species with similar dispersion mechanisms.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We thank Alessandro Alves Pereira and Prianda Rios Laborda for critically reading the manuscript. Also, we are truly thankful for Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for their financial support.

**FUNDING**

This study was financed in part by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel - CAPES Computational Biology Program (88887.177151 / 2018-00, 88882.160095 / 2013-01), the São Paulo Research Foundation - FAPESP (2013/08086-1, 2013/26793-7, 2014/22821-9, 2018 / 18431-1) and Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – CNPq (448286/2014-9, 153973/2018-8, 309661/2014-5).

**DATA, CODE AND MATERIALS**

*A. germinans* SNP genotypes data are available from the Dryad Digital Repository: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.pk0p2nghr. *A. schaueriana* SNP genotypes data are available from the article: doi:10.1038/s41598-019-56469-w (supplementary datasets 1 and 2). The environmental data set and distance matrices have been uploaded as part of the electronic supplementary material.

**COMPETING INTERESTS**

The authors declare no competing interests.

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

A.P.S., G.M.M., M.F.S. and M.V.C. designed the study; M.F.S., M.V.C., G.M.M. and J.D.V. analyzed data; A.P.S., G.M.M. and M.I.Z. contributed material/analysis tools; M.F.S. wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the manuscript and reviewed it.

## REFERENCES


1. Murray KD, Janes JK, Jones A, Bothwell HM, Andrew RL, Borevitz JO. 2019 Landscape drivers of genomic diversity and divergence in woodland Eucalyptus. *Mol. Ecol.* **28**, 5232–5247. (doi:10.1111/mec.15287)
2. Sork VL. 2016 Gene flow and natural selection shape spatial patterns of genes in tree populations: implications for evolutionary processes and applications. *Evol. Appl.* **9**, 291–310. (doi:10.1111/eva.12316)
3. Wang IJ, Glor RE, Losos JB. 2013 Quantifying the roles of ecology and geography in spatial genetic divergence. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 175–182. (doi:10.1111/ele.12025)
4. Wright S. 1943 Isolation by distance. *Genetics* **28**, 114–138.
5. Bradburd GS, Ralph PL, Coop GM. 2013 Disentangling the effects of geographic and ecological isolation on genetic differentiation. *Evolution* **67**, 3258–3273. (doi:10.1111/evo.12193)
6. Barton NH. 1979 Gene flow past a cline. *Heredity* **43**, 333–339. (doi:10.1038/hdy.1979.86)
7. Wang IJ, Bradburd GS. 2014 Isolation by environment. *Mol. Ecol.* **23**, 5649–5662. (doi:10.1111/mec.12938)

8. 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. (doi:10.1111/evo.12258)

9. Wang IJ. 2013 Examining the full effects of landscape heterogeneity on spatial genetic variation: a multiple matrix regression approach for quantifying geographic and ecological isolation. *Evolution* **67**, 3403–3411. (doi:10.1111/evo.12134)

10. Lee CR, Mitchell-Olds T. 2011 Quantifying effects of environmental and geographical factors on patterns of genetic differentiation. *Mol. Ecol.* **20**, 4631–4642. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294x.2011.05310.x)

11. Vincent B, Dionne M, Kent MP, Lien S, Bernatchez L. 2013 Landscape genomics in *Atlantic salmon* (Salmo Salar): searching for gene-environment interactions driving local adaptation. *Evolution* **67**, 3469–3487. (doi:10.1111/evo.12139)

12. Kovach RP, Gharrett AJ, Tallmon DA. 2012 Genetic change for earlier migration timing in a pink salmon population. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* **279**, 3870–3878. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1158)

13. Muñoz NJ, Farrell AP, Heath JW, Neff BD. 2015 Adaptive potential of a Pacific salmon challenged by climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 163–166. (doi:10.1038/nclimate2473)

14. Wee AKS *et al.* 2019 The integration and application of genomic information in Mangrove conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* **33**, 206–209. (doi:10.1111/cobi.13140)

15. Joost S, Bonin A, Bruford MW, Després L, Conord C, Erhardt G, Taberlet P. 2007 A Spatial Analysis Method (SAM) to detect candidate loci for selection: towards a

landscape genomics approach to adaptation. *Mol. Ecol.* **16**, 3955–3969. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294x.2007.03442.x)

16. Schoville SD, Bonin A, François O, Lobreaux S, Melodelima C, Manel S. 2012 Adaptive genetic variation on the landscape: methods and cases. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **43**, 23–43. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110411-160248)

17. Lowry DB. 2010 Landscape evolutionary genomics. *Biol. Lett.* **6**, 502–504. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2009.0969)

18. Storfer A, Patton A, Fraik AK. 2018 Navigating the interface between landscape genetics and landscape genomics. *Front. Genet.* **9**. (doi:10.3389/fgene.2018.00068)

19. Storfer A, Murphy MA, Spear SF, Holderegger R, Waits LP. 2010 Landscape genetics: where are we now? *Mol. Ecol.* **19**, 3496–3514. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294x.2010.04691.x)

20. Jasechko S, Sharp ZD, Gibson JJ, Birks SJ, Yi Y, Fawcett PJ. 2013 Terrestrial water fluxes dominated by transpiration. *Nature* **496**, 347–350. (doi:10.1038/nature11983)

21. Mannion PD, Upchurch P, Benson RBJ, Goswami A. 2014 The latitudinal biodiversity gradient through deep time. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**, 42–50. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2013.09.012)

22. Holderegger R, Buehler D, Gugerli F, Manel S. 2010 Landscape genetics of plants. *Trends Plant Sci.* **15**, 675–683. (doi:10.1016/j.tplants.2010.09.002)

23. Savolainen O, Pyhäjärvi T, Knürr T. 2007 Gene flow and local adaptation in trees. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **38**, 595–619. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.38.091206.095646)

24. Tomlinson PB. 1986 The Botany of Mangroves. New York: Cambridge University Press

25. Giri C, Ochieng E, Tieszen LL, Zhu Z, Singh A, Loveland T, Masek J, Duke N. 2011 Status and distribution of mangrove forests of the world using earth observation satellite data. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **20**, 154–159. (doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00584.x)

26. Van der Stocken T, Wee AKS, De Ryck DJR, Vanschoenwinkel B, Friess DA, Dahdouh-Guebas F, Simard M, Koedam N, Webb EL. 2019 A general framework for propagule dispersal in mangroves. *Biol. Rev.* **94**, 1547–1575. (doi:10.1111/brv.12514)

27. Middleton BA. 2012 *Global change and the function and distribution of wetlands*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

28. Morrisey DJ, Swales A, Dittmann S, Morrison MA, Lovelock CE, Beard CM. 2010 The ecology and management of temperate mangroves. In: Gibson RN, Atkinson RJA, Gordon JDM, editors. *Oceanography and marine biology: an annual review*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall/CRC, pp. 43–160.

29. Spalding M, Blasco F, Field CD. 1997 *World mangrove Atlas*. Okinawa, Japan: The International Society for Mangroves Ecosystems.

30. Cavanaugh KC, Osland MJ, Bardou R, Hinojosa-Arango G, López-Vivas JM, Parker JD, Rovai AS. 2018 Sensitivity of mangrove range limits to climate variability. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **27**, 925–935. (doi:10.1111/geb.12751)

31. Osland MJ *et al.* 2017 Climatic controls on the global distribution, abundance, and species richness of mangrove forests. *Ecol. Monogr.* **87**, 341–359. (doi:10.1002/ecm.1248)

32. Soares MLG, Estrada GCD, Fernandez V, Tognella MMP. 2012 Southern limit of the Western South Atlantic Mangroves: assessment of the potential effects of global warming

from a biogeographical perspective. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **101**, 44–53. (doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2012.02.018)

33. Duke NC. 1991 A systematic revision of the mangrove genus Avicennia (Avicenniaceae) in Australasia. *Aust. Syst. Bot.* **4**, 299. (doi:10.1071/sb9910299)

34. Li X, Duke NC, Yang Y, Huang L, Zhu Y, Zhang Z, Zhou R, Zhong C, Huang Y, Shi S. 2016 Re-evaluation of phylogenetic relationships among species of the Mangrove Genus Avicennia from Indo-West Pacific based on multilocus analyses. *PLoS One* **11**, e0164453. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0164453)

35. Schaeffer-Novelli Y, Cintrón-Molero G, Adaime RR, de Camargo TM, Cintron-Molero G, de Camargo TM. 1990 Variability of Mangrove ecosystems along the Brazilian Coast. *Estuaries* **13**, 204–218. (doi:10.2307/1351590)

36. Mori GM, Zucchi MI, Souza AP. 2015 Multiple-geographic-scale genetic structure of two Mangrove tree species: the roles of mating system, hybridization, limited dispersal and extrinsic factors. *PLoS One* **10**, e0118710. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118710)

37. Cruz MV, Mori GM, Signori-Müller C, da Silva CC, Oh DH, Dassanayake M, Zucchi MI, Oliveira RS, de Souza AP. 2019 Local adaptation of a dominant coastal tree to freshwater availability and solar radiation suggested by genomic and ecophysiological approaches. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 27. (doi:10.1038/s41598-019-56469-w)

38. Cruz MV, Mori GM, Oh DH, Dassanayake M, Zucchi MI, Oliveira RS, Souza AP. 2020 Molecular responses to freshwater limitation in the mangrove tree *Avicennia germinans* (Acanthaceae). *Mol. Ecol.* **29**, 344–362. (doi:10.1111/mec.15330)

39. Francisco PM, Mori GM, Alves FM, Tambarussi EV, de Souza AP. 2018 Population genetic structure, introgression, and hybridization in the genus Rhizophora along the Brazilian coast. *Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 3491–3504. (doi:10.1002/ece3.3900)

40. Pil MW, Boeger MRT, Muschner VC, Pie MR, Ostrensky A, Boeger WA. 2011 Postglacial north-south expansion of populations of *Rhizophora mangle* (Rhizophoraceae) along the Brazilian coast revealed by microsatellite analysis. *Am. J. Bot.* **98**, 1031–1039. (doi:10.3732/ajb.1000392)

41. Takayama K, Tateishi Y, Murata JIN, Kajita T. 2008 Gene flow and population subdivision in a pantropical plant with sea-drifted seeds *Hibiscus tiliaceus* and its allied species: evidence from microsatellite analyses. *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 2730–2742. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294x.2008.03799.x)

42. Lumpkin R, Johnson GC. 2013 Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: mean, variance, El Niño-Southern oscillation response, and seasonal cycle. *J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans* **118**, 2992–3006. (doi:10.1002/jgrc.20210)

43. Danecek P *et al.* 2011 The variant call format and VCF tools. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 2156–2158. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr330)

44. Antao T, Lopes A, Lopes RJ, Beja-Pereira A, Luikart G. 2008 LOSITAN: a workbench to detect molecular adaptation based on a F st -outlier method. *BMC Bioinform.* **9**, 323. (doi:10.1186/1471-2105-9-323)

45. Luu K, Bazin E, Blum MGB. 2017 pcadapt: an R package to perform genome scans for selection based on principal component analysis. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **17**, 67–77. (doi:10.1111/1755-0998.12592)

46. Frichot E, François O. 2015 LEA: an R package for landscape and ecological association studies. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 925–929. (doi:10.1111/2041-210x.12382)

47. Wright S. 1949 The genetical structure of populations. *Ann. Eugen.* **15**, 323–354. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-1809.1949.tb02451.x)

48. Goudet J. 2005 Hierfstat, a package for r to compute and test hierarchical F-statistics. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **5**, 184–186. (doi:10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00828.x)

49. R Core Team. 2019 *A language and environment for statistical computing.* Available from: https://www.r-project.org/.

50. Van der Stocken T, Carroll D, Menemenlis D, Simard M, Koedam N. 2019 Global-scale dispersal and connectivity in mangroves. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 915–922. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1812470116)

51. Fick SE, Hijmans RJ. 2017 World Clim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* **37**, 4302–4315. (doi:10.1002/joc.5086)

52. Sbrocco EJ, Barber PH. 2013 MARSPEC: ocean climate layers for marine spatial ecology. *Ecology* **94**, 979. (doi:10.1890/12-1358.1)

53. Klein T, Langner J, Frankenberg B, Svensson J, Broman B, Bennet C, Langborg T. 2013 ECDS - a Swedish research infrastructure for the open sharing of environment and climate data. *Data Sci. J.* **12**, 1–9. (doi:10.2481/dsj.12-045)

54. Leroy B, Meynard CN, Bellard C, Courchamp F. 2016 Virtualspecies, an R package to generate virtual species distributions. *Ecography* **39**, 599–607. (doi:10.1111/ecog.01388)

55. Hijmans RJ, van Etten J. 2012 *Raster: geographic analysis and modeling with raster data.* R package version 2.0-12.

56. Chapman AD. 2005 Principles and methods of data cleaning – primary species and speciesoccurrence data, version 1.0. Copenhagen: Report for the Global Biodiversity Information Facility.

57. Lira-Noriega A, Manthey JD. 2014 Relationship of genetic diversity and niche centrality: a survey and analysis. *Evolution* **68**, 1082–1093. (doi:10.1111/evo.12343)

58. Li Y, Zhang XX, Mao RL, Yang J, Miao CY, Li Z, Qiu YX. 2017 Ten years of landscape genomics: challenges and opportunities. *Front. Plant Sci.* **8**, 2136. (doi:10.3389/fpls.2017.02136)

59. Vieira MLC, Santini L, Diniz AL, Munhoz CF. 2016 Microsatellite markers: what they mean and why they are so useful. *Genet. Mol. Biol.* **39**, 312–328. (doi:10.1590/1678-4685-gmb-2016-0027)

60. Morin PA, Luikart G, Wayne RK, the SNP Workshop Group. 2004 SNPs in ecology, evolution and conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **19**, 208–216. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.01.009)

61. Cerón-Souza I, Rivera-Ocasio E, Medina E, Jiménez JA, McMillan WO, Bermingham E. 2010 Hybridization and introgression in New World red Mangroves, Rhizophora(Rhizophoraceae). *Am. J. Bot.* **97**, 945–957. (doi:10.3732/ajb.0900172)

62. Kennedy JP, Pil MW, Proffitt CE, Boeger WA, Stanford AM, Devlin DJ. 2016 Postglacial expansion pathways of red mangrove, Rhizophora mangle, in the Caribbean Basin and Florida. *Am. J. Bot.* **103**, 260–276. (doi:10.3732/ajb.1500183)

63. Ochoa-Zavala M, Jaramillo-Correa JP, Piñero D, Nettel-Hernanz A, Núñez-Farfán J. 2019 Contrasting colonization patterns of black mangrove (*Avicennia germinans* (L.) L.) gene pools along the Mexican coasts. *J. Biogeogr.* **46**, 884–898. (doi:10.1111/jbi.13536)

64. Sandoval-Castro E, Dodd RS, Riosmena-Rodríguez R, Enríquez-Paredes LM, Tovilla-Hernández C, López-Vivas JM, Aguilar-May B, Muñiz-Salazar R. 2014 Post-glacial expansion and population genetic divergence of Mangrove Species *Avicennia germinans* (L.) stearn and *Rhizophora mangle* L. along the Mexican Coast. *PLoS One* **9**, e93358. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093358)

65. Nettel A, Dodd RS. 2007 Drifting propagules and receding swamps: genetic footprints of mangrove recolonization and dispersal along tropical coasts. *Evolution* **61**, 958–971. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00070.x)

66. Takayama K, Tamura M, Tateishi Y, Webb EL, Kajita T. 2013 Strong genetic structure over the American continents and transoceanic dispersal in the Mangrove genus Rhizophora (Rhizophoraceae) revealed by broad-scale nuclear and chloroplast DNA analysis. *Am. J. Bot.* **100**, 1191–1201. (doi:10.3732/ajb.1200567)

67. Barker JSF, Frydenberg J, Sarup P, Loeschcke V. 2011 Altitudinal and seasonal variation in microsatellite allele frequencies of *Drosophila buzzatii*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **24**, 430–439. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02180.x)

68. Byars SG, Parsons Y, Hoffmann AA. 2009 Effect of altitude on the genetic structure of an Alpine grass, Poa hiemata. *Ann. Bot.* **103**, 885–899. (doi:10.1093/aob/mcp018)

69. Jiang S, Luo MX, Gao RH, Zhang W, Yang YZ, Li YJ, Liao PC. 2019 Isolation-by-environment as a driver of genetic differentiation among populations of the only broad-leaved evergreen shrub *Ammopiptanthus mongolicus* in Asian temperate deserts. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 12008. (doi:10.1038/s41598-019-48472-y)

70. Manthey JD, Moyle RG. 2015 Isolation by environment in White-breasted Nuthatches (Sitta carolinensis) of the Madrean Archipelago sky islands: a landscape genomics approach. *Mol. Ecol.* **24**, 3628–3638. (doi:10.1111/mec.13258)

71. Mitchell-Olds T, Willis JH, Goldstein DB. 2007 Which evolutionary processes influence natural genetic variation for phenotypic traits? *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **8**, 845–856. (doi:10.1038/nrg2207)

72. Shafer ABA, Wolf JBW. 2013 Widespread evidence for incipient ecological speciation: a meta-analysis of isolation-by-ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**, 940–950. (doi:10.1111/ele.12120)

73. Rodríguez-Zárate CJ, Sandoval-Castillo J, van Sebille E, Keane RG, Rocha-Olivares A, Urteaga J, Beheregaray LB. 2018 Isolation by environment in the highly mobile olive ridley turtle ( Lepidochelys olivacea ) in the eastern Pacific. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**: 20180264. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2018.0264)

74. Beheregaray LB, Cooke GM, Chao NL, Landguth EL. 2015 Ecological speciation in the tropics: insights from comparative genetic studies in Amazonia. *Front. Genet*. **5**:477. (doi:10.3389/fgene.2014.00477)

75. Duke NC, Kovacs JM, Griffiths AD, Preece L, Hill DJE, van Oosterzee P, Mackenzie J, Morning HS, Burrows D. 2017 Large-scale dieback of mangroves in Australia. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* **68**, 1816. (doi:10.1071/mf16322)

76. McKee K, Rogers K, Saintilan N. 2012 Response of salt marsh and Mangrove wetlands to changes in atmospheric $CO_2$, climate, and sea level. In: Middleton BA, editor. *Global change and the function and distribution of wetlands*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, pp. 63–96.

77. Osland MJ, Enwright NM, Day RH, Gabler CA, Stagg CL, Grace JB. 2016 Beyond just sea-level rise: considering macroclimatic drivers within coastal wetland vulnerability assessments to climate change. *Glob. Change Biol.* **22**, 1–11. (doi:10.1111/gcb.13084)

78. Ximenes A, Ponsoni L, Lira C, Koedam N, Dahdouh-Guebas F. 2018 Does sea surface temperature contribute to determining range limits and expansion of Mangroves in Eastern South America (Brazil)? *Remote Sens.* **10**, 1787. (doi:10.3390/rs10111787)

79. IPCC. 2014 Climate change 2014: synthesis report. In: IPCC, editor. *Climate change 2014 - The physical science basis*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–30.

80. Fraser DJ, Bernatchez L. 2001 Adaptive evolutionary conservation: towards a unified concept for defining conservation units. *Mol. Ecol.***10**, 2741–52. (doi: 10.1046/j.0962-1083.2001.01411.x)

## TABLES

**Table 1.** Collection sites for the samples of *Avicennia schaueriana* and *A. germinans* long the South American coast.

| ***A. schaueriana*** | ***A. germinans*** | **Locality (City/State)** | **Latitude** | **Longitude** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **GM** | Soure, Pará | -0.723 | -48.490 |
| | **GB** | Bragança, Pará | -0.904 | -46.687 |
| **SB** | | Bragança, Pará | -0.820 | -46.615 |
| **SA** | **GA** | Alcântara, Maranhão | -2.410 | -44.406 |
| | **GN** | Parnaíba, Piauí | -2.778 | -41.822 |
| **SR** | **GR** | Paracuru, Ceará | -3.413 | -39.056 |
| | **GT** | Tamandaré, Pernambuco | -8.526 | -35.013 |
| **SV** | | Vera Cruz, Bahia | -12.983 | -38.684 |
| **SG** | | Guapimirim, Rio de Janeiro | -22.701 | -43.007 |
| **SU** | | Ubatuba, São Paulo | -23.489 | -45.164 |
| **SC** | | Cananéia, São Paulo | -25.020 | -47.918 |
| **SP** | | Pontal do Paraná, Paraná | -25.575 | -48.352 |
| **SF** | | Florianópolis, Santa Catarina | -27.576 | -48.518 |
| **SL** | | Laguna, Santa Catarina | -28.445 | -48.840 |

Sample populations of *A. schaueriana* e *A. germinans* are indicated by two capital letters corresponding to Figure 1.

**Table 2.** Results of the MMRR between the genetic distances based on the set of nonneutral molecular markers and each environmental variable for *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*.

| Environmental variables | *A. schaueriana* | | | | *A. germinans* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | β | *P* | $R^2$ | *P* | β | *P* | $R^2$ | *P* |
| Annual mean temperature (ºC) | 0.67 | 0.001 | 0.45 | **0.0009** | 0.88 | 0.02 | 0.81 | **0.01** |
| Temperature annual range (ºC) | 0.60 | 0.005 | 0.36 | **0.0004** | 0.02 | 0.91 | 0.04 | 0.63 |
| Isothermality (ºC) | 0.86 | 0.001 | 0.75 | **0.0005** | 0.72 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.09 |
| Min temperature of coldest month (ºC) | 0.69 | 0.001 | 0.49 | **0.002** | 0.86 | 0.08 | 0.75 | 0.07 |
| Max temperature of warmest month (ºC) | 0.05 | 0.63 | 0.003 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 0.02 | 0.80 | **0.03** |
| Mean Temperature of Coldest Quarter (ºC) | 0.72 | 0.001 | 0.53 | **0.002** | 0.90 | 0.08 | 0.82 | 0.07 |
| Precipitation seasonality (mm) | 0.75 | 0.01 | 0.56 | **0.0004** | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.42 | **0.05** |
| Precipitation of warmest quarter (mm) | 0.56 | 0.006 | 0.31 | **0.008** | 0.95 | 0.05 | 0.91 | **0.04** |
| Precipitation of coldest quarter (mm) | 0.62 | 0.01 | 0.39 | **0.01** | -0.09 | 0.88 | 0.008 | 0.88 |
| Mean solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$) | 0.66 | 0.001 | 0.44 | **0.0005** | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.46 | **0.04** |
| Min solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$) | 0.70 | 0.001 | 0.49 | **0.0001** | -0.26 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.36 |
| Max solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$) | 0.48 | 0.005 | 0.23 | **0.006** | 0.98 | 0.01 | 0.96 | **0.01** |
| Wind speed mean (m $s^{-1}$) | 0.19 | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.27 | 0.45 | 0.07 | 0.41 |
| Max vapor pressure deficit (kPa) | 0.46 | 0.02 | 0.22 | **0.01** | 0.45 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.24 |
| Mean annual SSS (psu) | 0.009 | 0.96 | 0.00008 | 0.96 | -0.17 | 0.67 | 0.03 | 0.68 |
| SSS of the saltiest month (psu) | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.01 | 0.48 | -0.31 | 0.22 | 0.09 | 0.23 |
| Annual variance in SSS (psu) | 0.19 | 0.48 | 0.03 | 0.50 | -0.22 | 0.39 | 0.05 | 0.39 |
| Mean annual SST (ºC) | 0.68 | 0.01 | 0.46 | **0.001** | -0.08 | 0.82 | 0.007 | 0.81 |
| SST of the coldest month (ºC) | 0.64 | 0.002 | 0.42 | **0.001** | 0.08 | 0.78 | 0.006 | 0.76 |
| Annual range in SST (ºC) | 0.59 | 0.003 | 0.36 | **0.006** | 0.88 | 0.13 | 0.78 | 0.15 |
| Annual average cycle amplitude (cm) | 0.79 | 0.002 | 0.62 | **0.007** | 0.35 | 0.007 | 0.12 | **0.006** |
| Annual average duration of tidal cycles (h) | -0.32 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.12 | -0.18 | 0.73 | 0.03 | 0.74 |
| Annual number of cycles | -0.29 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.23 | -0.16 | 0.84 | 0.02 | 0.82 |

The results are presented by the overall fit of the model ($R^2$), regression coefficient (β) and significance (*P*). Models with significant values are presented in bold. SST = sea surface temperature. SSS = sea surface salinity

## FIGURE LEGENDS

**Figure 1.** Geographic distribution and characterization of *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans* sampling sites along the South American coast. The blue area represents the geographical distribution of *A. schaueriana* and its sympatric region with *A. germinans* (blue and yellow). Black circles and triangles represent the sampling sites of the plant material used for genomic genotyping of A. *schaueriana* and A. *germinans*, respectively [37,38]. Sampling locations, indicated by two letters, are displayed according to Table 1. Arrows represent the direction of the main ocean currents acting on the Brazilian coast. Arrow widths illustrate the mean current speed [42].

**Figure 2.** Heatmaps describing interpopulation genetic differentiation based on the total set SNP molecular markers estimated by pairwise $F_{ST}$ (Wright) for (A) *A. schaueriana* (black circles) and (B) *A. germinans* (black triangles) collection sites. Sample codes are denoted as in Table 1.

**Figure 3:** Populations location of (A) *A. schaueriana* e (B) *A. germinans* in a bidimensional projection of the principal component analysis used to calculate the environmental distance. The acronyms for sampling locations, indicated by two letters, are the same as those in Table 1. The color gradient represents the contribution of each environmental variable to PC1 and PC2. V1: Annual mean temperature (ºC). V2: Temperature annual range (ºC). V3: Isothermality (ºC).V4: Min temperature of coldest month (ºC). V5: Max temperature of warmest month (ºC). V6: Mean Temperature of Coldest Quarter (ºC).V7: Precipitation seasonality (mm). V8: Precipitation of warmest quarter (mm). V9: Precipitation of coldest quarter (mm). V10: Mean solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$). V11: Min solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$). V12: Max solar radiation (kJ $m^{-2}$ $day^{-1}$).

V13: Wind speed mean (m $s^{-1}$). V14: Max vapor pressure deficit (kPa). V15: Mean annual SSS (psu). V16: SSS of the saltiest month (psu). V17: Annual variance in SSS (psu). V18: Mean annual SST (ºC). V19: SST of the coldest month (ºC). V20: Annual range in SST (ºC). V21: Annual average cycle amplitude (cm). V22: Annual average duration of tidal cycles (h). V23: Annual number of cycles.

**Figure 4.** Plot of linear regressions showing the correlations among genetic, geographic, and environmental distances. The pairwise comparisons were performed between (A,E) geographic and genetic distances, (B,F) environmental and genetic distances, (C,G) geographic and environmental distances and between (D,H) environmental and genetic distances based on the putative nonneutral single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) for *A. schaueriana* and *A. germinans*, respectively. The $R^2$ and *P*-values are included.


North Brazil Current
South Equatorial Current
Brazil Current
GM
GB
SB
GA
SA
GN
GR
SR
GT
SV
SG
SU
SC
SP
SF
SL
N
0
1000
2000
3000 km
10
0
-10
-20
-30
−80
−60
−40


A
SB
SA
SR
SV
SG
SU
SC
SP
SF
SL
FST
0.15
0.10
0.05
0.00
B
GM
GB
GA
GN
GR
GT
FST
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0


A
SL
SF
SV
SG
SB
SA
SR
SU
SC
SP
V22
V13
V16
V12
V15
V17
V3
V10
V20
V2
V9
V11
V6
V19
V18
V21
V1
V4
V7
V5
V14
V8
V23
PC2 (14.6%)
PC1 (65.7%)
contribution of variables
5
4
3
2


B
GM
GB
GA
GT
GN
GR
V16
V9
V17
V14
V21
V22
V4
V8
V12
V20
V19
V18
V1
V6
V5
V3
V13
V10
V7
V15
V2
V23
V11
PC2 (29.4%)
PC1 (49.4%)
contribution of variables
5
4
3
2
1


A. schaueriana
A
R² = 0.81
P < 0.001
Genetic Distance
Geographic Distance
B
R² = 0.54
P < 0.001
Genetic Distance
Environmental Distance
C
R² = 0.82
P < 0.001
Environmental Distance
Geographic Distance
D
R² = 0.51
P < 0.01
Genetic Distance (nonneutral SNPs)
Environmental Distance
A. germinans
E
R² = 0.61
P < 0.05
Genetic Distance
Geographic Distance
F
R² = 0.67
P < 0.05
Genetic Distance
Environmental Distance
C
R² = 0.74
P < 0.01
Environmental Distance
Geographic Distance
H
R² = 0.62
P < 0.05
Genetic Distance (nonneutral SNPs)
Environmental Distance