Continent-wide phylogenomic framework reveals introgression as a driver of intra-specific diversity and enriched molecular pathways in caribou

Rebecca S. Taylor[1], Micheline Manseau[1], Sonesinh Keobouasone[1], Gabriela Mastromonaco[2], Kirsten Solmundson[3], Allicia Kelly[4], Nicholas C. Larter[5], Mary Gamberg[6], Helen Schwantje[7], Caeley Thacker[8], Jean Polfus[9], Leon Andrew[10], Dave Hervieux[11], Deborah Simmons[10], Paul J. Wilson[3]

[1]Landscape Science and Technology, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ottawa, Canada

[2]Toronto Zoo, Toronto, Canada

[3]Biology Department, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada

[4]Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Northwest Territories, Fort Smith, Northwest Territories, Canada

[5]Retired, formally Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Northwest Territories, Fort Simpson, Northwest Territories, Canada

[6]Gamberg Consulting, Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada

[7]Retired, formally British Columbia ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource Operations, and Rural Development, Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada

[8]British Columbia ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource Operations, and Rural Development, Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada

[9]Canadian Wildlife Service - Pacific Region, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Kelowna, British

Columbia, Canada

[10]Ɂehdzo Got'ı̨nę̨Gots'ę́Nákedı (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board), Tulít'a, Northwest Territories,

Canada

[11]Department of Environment and Parks, Government of Alberta, Grande Prairie, Alberta, Canada

Author for correspondence:

Rebecca S. Taylor

e-mail: rebecca.taylor@ec.gc.ca

Intra-specific diversification in the northern hemisphere is a recent phenomenon, particularly for

vertebrates, due to climatic oscillations during the Quaternary. Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) are a

recently diversified, keystone species in North America with a continental-wide distribution and a large

amount of phenotypic variation. We assess patterns of intra-specific genetic variation and adaptive

divergence, which are of critical interest to the fields of evolutionary biology and conservation. We

characterized the relationship among caribou ecotypes and rapidly evolving genes among intra-specific

lineages using phylogenomic analyses and a newly assembled chromosome-scale reference genome and

66 high-coverage genomes. Nine phylogenomic lineages showed different levels of introgression, with

some lineages highly introgressed. Despite this, dN/dS ratios of all genes in the caribou genome

(>30,000) identified 700-800 genes with significant signatures of positive selection in each lineage. These

genes function in diverse pathways ranging from immune responses to circulatory systems, with the

most enriched molecular pathways found in lineages with high levels of introgression. Glacial cycles and

repeated introgression events between caribou lineages likely inflated both neutral and adaptive genetic

variation: findings that are particularly timely given the importance of intra-specific diversity and

adaptive variation in wild species for resilience to global change.

1. Background

Dramatic climate oscillations during the Quaternary strongly affected the diversification of vertebrate

species in the northern hemisphere leading to younger intra-specific lineages than in the south [1].

Unstable environments and contraction of populations into refugia during this time led to a loss of

genetic diversity in some species [1,2]. However, repeated cycles of secondary contact after periods of

isolation can create an excess of genetic diversity [3-5], and so the impacts of the glacial cycles on intra-

specific diversity is complex and likely impacted by the life-history of the species [5]. Further, although

many studies have investigated the impacts of these range shifts and refugia on neutral genetic

structure and diversity [e.g. 2, 6-8], little is known about the impact of climate cycles on the generation

of adaptive genetic variation [9]. Given how crucial intra-specific diversity is for ecosystem function [10-

12], a deeper understanding of the drivers of intra-specific genetic variation and its interplay with

adaptive divergence is essential to understanding how current species respond to environmental

variations [13-15]. Not only is this of critical interest to the fields of evolutionary biology and

conservation [16,17], it is also timely given the current recognition of the importance of intra-specific

diversity for species resilience [18-20].

We aim to address these questions in caribou (*Rangifer tarandus,* also known as reindeer) using

a whole genome phylogenomic framework. Caribou recently diversified in North America during the

glacial cycles of the Quaternary, and are thought to have undergone divergence between ecotypes

starting around 120,000 years ago [21-23]. Caribou are a highly mobile keystone species with a

continental-wide distribution, ranging from the high Arctic to the boreal forests, and spanning from the

east to the west coast of North America [24] (figure 1). Across its range caribou have a large amount of

phenotypic and genetic variation and have been divided into 12 conservation units, known as

Designatable Units (DUs), by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada [24] (figure

1). Caribou DUs face a number of threats including habitat destruction and climate change [25-27], with

eight DUs currently listed as endangered or threatened, two as special concern, and one that is extinct

[24,28-34].

Previous studies have demonstrated that caribou form two major mitochondrial genetic

lineages due to separation in two major refugia during climate cycles - the Beringian-Eurasian (BEL) and

the North American (NAL) lineages [22,35-39] - as well as further genetic sub-structuring due to micro-

refugia [40-42]. Previous work also indicates that since their divergence 120,000 years ago to the

present, caribou experienced potential repeated secondary contact as ice sheets contracted [23,37,42].

As such, caribou represents an interesting species to study the influence of the Quaternary on the

diversification of both their neutral and adaptive genetic variation.

To this end, we assembled a chromosome-scale reference genome using Dovetail Omni-C

technology and used 66 re-sequenced genomes to: 1) assess the levels of intra-specific diversity by

reconstructing whole-genome phylogenomic history of caribou from across the continent for the first

time, 2) measure introgression between reconstructed lineages of this highly mobile species, and 3)

investigate signatures of rapidly evolving genes potentially involved with the diversification of caribou

and their relationship to phylogenetic divergence and introgressive history, as a first step in

understanding continent wide patterns of adaptive diversification. Given previous work on caribou, we

hypothesized we would uncover divergent intra-specific lineages with some discordance from DU

delineations, for example it is known that Boreal caribou are divided between the two major lineages

(NAL and BEL) and that the phenotype likely evolved in parallel [43,44]. We also hypothesized that we

would find a number of rapidly evolving genes, with more unique adaptive genes uncovered in lineages

with lower levels of introgression due to the potentially homogenizing effect of gene flow between

lineages.

2. Materials and Methods

(a) Caribou chromosome scale reference genome assembly and annotation

To ensure high quality, contiguous DNA for chromosome-scale reference genome assembly, fibroblast

cells were taken from caribou at Toronto Zoo and cultured in T-75 flasks. Firstly, we pre-warmed

DMEM1, DMEM3 and trypsin to 37-38 °C, then discarded media and rinsed each T-75 flask with 5 ml of

DMEM1. We discarded the media, and added 3 ml of trypsin to each flask and incubate at 38 °C for 2

min. We checked to see that cells had lifted, and then added 9 ml of DMEM3 to each flask, rinsed the

flask growing surface to retrieve as many cells as possible and transferred the entire volume to a 15 ml

tube, leaving 4 x 15 ml tubes, 2 for each animal. We then centrifuged at 200 x g for 5 min to pellet cells,

discarded supernatant and re-suspend pellet in 0.8 ml of PBS. We combined pellets for each individual

together in a 2 ml tube, centrifuged in microcentrifuge at 200 x g for 5 min, and discarded the

supernatant. The samples were then flash frozen using liquid nitrogen and transferred to a dry shipper

and shipped to Dovetail Genomics as we wanted to improve our previous assembly also sequenced by

Dovetail Genomics [45], by further scaffolding using Omni-C libraries [46,47]. Cells were cultured as

above and shipped to Genewiz (Azenta Life Sciences) for RNA sequencing for the annotation. Full details

of the sequencing, assembly, and annotation as performed by Dovetail Genomics are available in the

electronic supplementary material. We used the stats.sh script in the program BBMap version 38.42 [48]

to calculate the assembly statistics.

(b) Re-sequenced whole genome sequences

Whole genome sequences of 46 individual used in this study have been previously published and are

available on the National Centre for Biotechnology (NCBI) under BioProject Accession numbers

PRJNA634908, PRJNA694662, and PRJNA754521 (electronic supplementary material, table S1;

23,44,50,51]. For this study, we sequenced 20 new genomes (electronic supplementary material, table

S1; figure 1) using the same protocols as before (23,44). Briefly, samples were extracted using a Qiagen

DNAeasy tissue extraction kit following the manufacturer's instructions (Qiagen). Samples were run on a

Qubit fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the High Sensitivity Assay Kit and normalized to

20 ng/µl at a final volume of 50 µl. The DNA was shipped to The Centre for Applied Genomics (TCAG) at

the Hospital for Sick Children (Toronto, Ontario) for library preparation and sequencing. The samples

were sequenced two per lane on an Illumina HiSeq X. The raw reads for the new genomes will be made

available on the NCBI upon acceptance.

All code used to filter and map re-sequenced genomes, as well as for downstream analyses, can

be found on GitHub (https://github.com/BeckySTaylor/Phylogenomic_Analyses). Raw reads for all 66

individuals were cleaned using Trimmomatic version 0.38 [52] using a sliding window of 4 base pairs to

trim once phred score dropped below 15. We aligned all trimmed reads to the new reference genome,

which we first indexed using Bowtie2 version 2.3.0 [53]. We converted the SAM files to BAM files and

sorted them using Samtools version 1.5 [54], and then added read group information using GATK4 [55].

Using GATK4, we removed duplicates and used 'HaplotypeCaller' to call variants and produce a variant

calling format (VCF) file. We used the 'CombineGVCFs' function, followed by 'GenotypeGVCFs' to

produce a VCF file containing all individuals. We did two rounds of filtering on the VCF file using

VCFtools version 0.1.16 [56]. We removed indels, and any site low-quality genotype calls (minGQ) and

low-quality sites (minQ), with scores below 20, as well as any site with a depth of less than five or more

than double the mean depth of all genomes, filtering to remove sites with a depth of more than 55. For

the second round of filtering, we made two VCF files; one made using a more 'stringent' filter to remove

all missing data, and a 'less stringent' filter to removed sites with more than 5% missing data, resulting

in 17,595,673 and 41,321,354 SNPs respectively.

We also downloaded the raw reads for five Fennoscandian Wild Tundra reindeer genomes to

use as outgroups for phylogenomic analyses (ID numbers NMBU 38-42 [from 57], European Nucleotide

Archive accession PRJEB37216). We mapped and filtered the reads as above, as well as producing a VCF

file containing these and the 66 caribou genomes. We filtered the VCF file in VCFtools as above, this

time removing sites with a depth over 48 (double the mean of this data set) and removing sites with

more than 5% missing data, we had 16,119,954 SNPs.

(c) Whole genome phylogenomic reconstruction

For the phylogenomic reconstruction, we used IQtree version 1.6.12 [58]. First, we made a consensus

fasta file for each individual from the VCF file which included the reindeer using the 'consensus'

command in BCFtools. We found that running IQtree on the full genome sequences required too much

computational power, so we split the genome into seven sections of close to 300 million base pairs,

made a phylogeny with each, and then made a consensus tree as follows. Firstly, we used the 'CSplit'

command to split each individual fasta file into one file per scaffold, retaining the files for scaffolds 1-36

(which contains ~99% of the reference genome, see results). We concatenated all caribou individuals

together for each scaffold, and ran each scaffold from 1-36 in Model Finder in IQtree. Using the Bayesian

Information Criterion, Model Finder gave the model TVM+F+I+G4 for all scaffolds apart from 33 where it

selected GTR+F+I+G4. For all scaffolds the scores for these two models were close, and for scaffold 33

the likelihood score for the two models was similar (111,917,190.538 and 111,917,210.388), and so

when concatenating the scaffolds, we used TVM+F+I+G4 for the full phylogenomic run.

To run the phylogenomic analysis, we then concatenated scaffolds together for each individual

into seven fasta files of roughly 300 million base pairs (scaffolds 1-3, 4-7, 8-11, 12-16, 17-21, 22-27, 28-

35), excluding scaffold 36 which is putatively part of the X chromosome based on the presence of known

X chromosome genes on that scaffold [59,60]. We then reformatted each so that the sequence was on

one line using 'awk' and 'grep' commands, and then concatenated all individuals together into one file,

including the reindeer, for each of the seven sections so we had one fasta file with all individuals for

each of the ~300 million base pair regions. We then ran IQtree using 100,000 bootstraps to obtain

branch supports (-bb command) [61] to produce the phylogenies. We then made a consensus phylogeny

from the seven using the IQtree '-con' command.

(d) ADMIXTURE and principal component analysis

We performed an assignment test using ADMIXTURE version 1.3.0 [62]. We used Plink version 1.9 [63]

to convert the VCF file with the 66 caribou and no missing data into a BED file. We then pruned the

dataset to remove sites with a correlation co-efficient of 0.1 or above in sliding windows of 50 SNPs,

leaving 3,916,295 putatively unlinked SNPs, and then ran ADMIXTURE from K1 to 10. We plotted the

outputs in R studio version 1.2.5041 [64,65]. We used the pruned data set to run a PCA also in plink, and

plotted in R studio using GGplot2 [66]. To produce PCAs of subsets of individuals, we used the 'view -S'

function in BCFtools version 1.13 [67], and then ran plink and plotted in R studio as above.

(e) Introgression measurements

We measured introgression using ABBA BABA tests to control for incomplete lineage sorting. We used

Dsuite version 0.5 [68] to run the 'Dtrios' function to calculate D and f4-ratio statistics, grouping our

individuals by the lineages uncovered in our phylogenomic analysis (see results), using the phylogeny as

input using the '-t' command. When groups share branches on a phylogeny, many elevated D and f4-

ratio statistics can occur, however these correlated statistics can be informative to uncover the relative

time of the gene flow events across the phylogeny and to discover whether the gene flow occurred on

internal branches by using the f-branch statistic [68]. We calculated the f-branch statistics using the

output from Dtrios, and then plotted alongside the phylogeny using the 'dtools.py' script included with

DSuite, setting the p-value to 0.05.

As these statistics are unable to measure gene flow between sister groups, we used SplitsTree

[69] to visualize the phylogenetic network as an 'admixture graph', using the seven files SplitsTree

output by IQtree (one for each of the 300 million base pair phylogenomic analyses).

(f) Rapidly evolving genes and gene ontology analysis

We used GWideCodeML [70], a python package to run the codeml function of PAML [71] in a

computationally efficient way using genome-wide data. We used our annotation file to extract all genes

from the genomes of our individuals to use in GWideCodeML. To do this, we made a consensus fasta file

for each individual in the VCF file with our 66 caribou filtering to remove sites with more than 5%

missing data, as described above. We then used the '-x' function in Gffread version 0.12.3 [72] which

pulls out the coding sequence for each gene as indicated in the annotation file and splices them

together (to remove introns), to create one fasta file per individual with all genes. We reformatted the

files so each gene sequence is on one line using 'awk' commands, and then renamed the header line of

each gene to include the ID of each individual (in addition to the gene ID from the annotation) using

'sed' commands. We used the 'CSplit' command to split the files into one file per gene, and then

concatenated the files for each gene – resulting in one file per gene containing the sequence for all 66

individuals.

We first ran the genes using an unrooted version of the tree as required by codeml. We

removed the outgroup reindeer and then used the 'ape' package in R studio to transform the tree into

an unrooted version with a trifurcation at the root, the format needed by codeml. We used the branch

model, which uses a Likelihood Ratio Test (LRT) to test whether the genes have a significantly different

dN/dS ratio on the focal branch, compared to all other branches of the tree. We tested this for each of

the nine major lineages uncovered in our phylogenomic analysis (see results), excluding one individual,

the boreal caribou from Alberta, which is a hybrid between the two major clades as indicated by the PCA

analysis (see results). We then performed a Bonferroni multiple testing correction on the Likelihood

ratio results, adjusting the significance threshold to account for running the model over nine lineages.

We then took those sites where the focal branch was putatively under positive selection (larger dN/dS

ratio), and as some genes can be significant in multiple branches, we also calculated how many genes

were unique to each branch. We then used a chi-squared test in R studio to determine if there were a

significantly different number of positively selected genes across the different lineages.

To assign putative functions to the significant genes (after Bonferroni correction), we used

ShinyGo v0.76.2 [73] and assigned functions based on the GO Biological Process and GO Molecular

Function databases. The enrichment analysis outputs any biological pathways over-represented in the

list of genes with signatures of positive selection, and was performed for the significant rapidly evolving

genes for each of the nine major lineages separately.

3. Results and Discussion

(a) Chromosome scale assembly and re-sequenced genomes

Our new caribou reference genome has a scaffold N50 of 64.42 MB, and an L50 of 14, with 99.5% of the

assembly being on 36 scaffolds. As the chromosome number is 70 for the species (34 autosome pairs

plus the sex chromosomes) [74], this represents a chromosome-scale assembly. We then used RNA-seq

data to perform a high-quality annotation of the genome, which identified the locations of 34,407

protein-coding genes.

(b) Genetic structure, introgression, and high intra-specific diversity

We reconstructed seven phylogenies, each using ~300 million base pairs of sequence from the 66 re-

sequenced genomes, and then made a final consensus phylogeny from the seven (figure 2). The final

phylogeny separated caribou into nine major well-supported lineages, which were not concordant with

DU designations but reconstructing the expected major lineages; the NAL and the larger and more

diverse BEL [39]. The 'NAL' branches off as the most basal group, and contains Eastern Migratory

caribou and Boreal caribou from Ontario and Manitoba. Boreal caribou from Alberta also belong to this

group but as an outside branch (figure 2). The other lineages are from the BEL, the first of which

contains the Boreal caribou from the Northwest Territories, which likely reflects the parallel evolution of

Boreal caribou as we have seen from previous results [43,44]. Surprisingly, our results indicate that the

Pink Mountain and Graham herds of the Northern Mountain caribou are a sister lineage (PMG) to the

Boreal caribou from the Northwest Territories (NWB lineage). We also found that caribou from the

Central Mountain and Southern Mountain groups form a lineage with the Northern Mountain caribou

from Itcha-Ilgachuz of British Columbia (CSM; figure 2). This correlates more closely with the current

population structuring under Schedule 1 of the Species at Risk Act (SARA) which groups the Itcha-

Ilgachuz caribou with animals from Central and Southern Mountain within the nationally significant

population: Woodland Caribou (Southern Mountain population) [75]. The Arctic caribou form a lineage

(ARC) with the mainland Barren-ground caribou from Manitoba and the Northwest Territories forming a

sister lineage (BRG). The Clearwater Fiord (Baffin Island) Barren-ground caribou sit most closely to

Greenland caribou and not alongside the mainland Barren-ground individuals (figure 2), which contrasts

some previous genetic results [76]. The last three lineages consist of most of the Northern Mountain

individuals, and Barren-ground caribou from the Yukon and Alaska (GRA, NM1 and NM2; figure 2). Our

finding that the Northern Mountain caribou form multiple distinct lineages (along with some Barren-

ground caribou individuals) aligns with previous genetic results that also showed sub-structuring of

Northern Mountain caribou [23,77] and that their distribution covers a large area with diverse habitats

[24].

For ADMIXTURE, the K value with the lowest cross-validation error was 1 (0.286), followed

closely by K=2 (0.289). Both the ADMIXTURE and PCA results are largely concordant with the

phylogenomic reconstruction (electronic supplementary material, figureS1 and figure S2). To measure

introgression between the reconstructed lineages, we used D and f4-ratio tests, which control for

incomplete lineage sorting. These statistics gave many significant signatures of introgression between

groups (electronic supplementary material). We then calculated the f-branch statistic, which accounts

for many correlated signatures of introgression using the f4-ratio statistics to show when along the

phylogeny introgression occurred, and whether the gene flow event was into an ancestral group. The f-

branch results indicated that the strongest signature of introgression was from the NAL lineage into the

ancestor of the NWB and PMG lineages (figure 3). We also found some introgression from the NAL into

the PMG group since they split from the NWB group. We also found relatively strong gene flow from the

NAL, NWB, and PMG lineages into the CSM lineage. The same three lineages (NAL, NWB, and PMG) also

show some gene flow going into the BRG lineage, with the NAL lineage having some gene flow into the

ancestor of the BRG and ARC groups. Most lineages showed gene flow into the ancestor of two main

Northern Mountain groups NM1 and NM2, with the NAL, NWB, PMG, and CSM lineages also having

gene flow into the NM2 lineage alone. Both the ARC and BRG lineages show gene flow into the NWB

lineage. Additionally, the GRA lineage, the CSM lineage, and the NM2 lineage show gene flow into the

PMG caribou lineage (figure 3). In contrast, some lineages show only a small amount or even a lack of

gene flow (with the caveat that sister groups cannot be tested for gene flow using ABBA BABA tests). For

example, no lineage shows gene flow into the ARC, GRA, or NM1 caribou lineages, with the ARC showing

some gene flow into NWB and the ancestral group of NM1 and NM2 and GRA showing some gene flow

into PMG (figure 3).

To try to explore potential introgression between sister lineages, we visualized 'admixture

graphs' in SplitsTree. Unsurprisingly these graphs show some phylogenetic uncertainty, putatively due to

gene flow, within lineages (electronic supplementary material, figure S3). We also see potential signals

of introgression between the NWB, PMG, and CSM lineages, which may help to explain the placement of

the PMG individuals next to the NWB lineage in the phylogenetic reconstruction (electronic

supplementary material, figure S3). We also see some potential introgression between the three major

northern mountain lineages (GRA, NM1, and NM2).

Altogether our results, reconstructing continent-wide whole genome phylogenomic history for

the first time, point towards a high level of intra-specific diversity and genetic structuring in caribou,

with some strong signals of introgression between many of the lineages. Our results build on previous

studies showing high genetic diversity in caribou, for example large numbers of mitochondrial

haplotypes [39,43,23] and high diversity in microsatellite loci [78-80]. The reasons behind the high

diversity and number of intra-specific lineages are likely multi-faceted. The large Beringian refugium

harboured high levels of genetic diversity for some, particularly cold adapted, species such as caribou

[81,82], and is reflected in the large diversity of caribou in the BEL vs the NAL lineage (figure 2). Post-

glacial expansion out of refugia can lead to genetic bottlenecks and low diversity further away from the

refugial populations [2]. However, repeated secondary contact and admixture between glacial lineages

can increase genetic diversity [3,5], in a similar mechanism to the 'glacial pulse model' which describes

how lineage fusion during glacial cycles can be a source of intra-specific lineage diversity [83]. Indeed,

well-known determinants of diversification during adaptive radiations include high standing variation,

gene flow, and habitat to diversify into [84], all of which are true for caribou post-glacial recolonizations.

The life history of caribou is also particularly conducive to the formation of high intra-specific

variation. Deer species have a high intrinsic rate of increase and dispersal capabilities [40]. High vagility

means caribou were able to undergo range shifts and quickly recolonize habitat once ice sheets recede,

or use ice-free corridors [40,82,23], facilitating repeated refugial lineage contact potentially increasing

genetic diversity as described above.

(c) Rapidly evolving genes in caribou lineages

The same processes leading to high genetic variation will likely have also increased standing adaptive

variation in caribou. Isolation in refugia may have promoted local adaptation, but the role of Quaternary

glacial cycles on adaptive diversification and its effects on biodiversity are not well known [9]. We used

the branch model approach in the codeml module of PAML [71] to calculate the ratio of synonymous to

non-synonymous mutations (dN/dS ratio) within genes. The program then performs likelihood ratio

tests to elucidate whether the 'focal' branch has a significantly different ratio from the rest of the

phylogenetic tree, and is thus putatively a rapidly evolving gene within that branch when compared to

the phylogeny as a whole. We ran each of the nine major linages from our whole genome phylogeny as

the focal branch (figure 2) to find those rapidly evolving genes significant to each, thus potentially

involved in the adaptive diversification of the lineage.

We found a number of rapidly evolving genes within each lineage (table 1, electronic

supplementary material). However, contrary to our hypothesis where we expected to find more lineage

specific genes in those with lower levels of introgression (as for example in the ARC lineage), we found

similar numbers of statistically significant genes after Bonferroni correction for each both overall (X^2 =

3.058, df = 8, p = 0.931) and for the genes unique to each lineage (X^2 = 8.142, df = 8, p = 0.420; table 1).

This could be due to the relatively short time scale of the diversification (all within ~120,000 years)

limiting the number of genes within each lineage with a high dN/dS ratio. It could also be due to the high

level of overall connectivity (introgression) detected between the lineages limiting the significant genes

resulting from the codeml approach which scans for genes with a strong signature of positive selection

when compared to the rest of the phylogeny (i.e. not detecting genes that are important for all or many

caribou lineages). There was overlap in the genes that pulled out as significant for each lineage (table 1),

which may be indicative of the diversification occurring from a large pool of standing genetic variation,

which is known to be a driver of diversification during adaptive radiations [84].

We used the codeml approach due to our questions relating to the diversification among

caribou lineages, as well as our phylogenomic framework, and have thus characterized some genes

putatively involved in the differential adaptation of the caribou lineages (electronic supplementary

material for full lists of results). We performed gene ontology (GO) analyses to assign functional

categories to the genes under both 'biological process' and 'molecular function', and found a number of

processes represented in the significant genes such as immune processes, stress responses,

carbohydrate binding, amongst many others (electronic supplementary material for all GO terms). We

then performed enrichment analyses for each lineage, also under both 'biological process' and

'molecular function', in order find specific pathways containing multiple genes with signatures of rapid

evolution. We found that caribou lineages had different numbers of enriched pathways, with some

lineages showing a large number under molecular function compared to the others (over twice as many;

table 1). In particular, the CSM, NWB, and PMG lineages all show high numbers of enriched pathways.

These lineages also show some of the highest signatures of introgression, with the CSM lineage showing

high introgression from multiple lineages, as well as into the PMG lineage (figure 3), and with the

admixture graphs showing potential gene flow between the CSM, NWB, and PMG lineages (electronic

supplementary material, figure S3). Similarly, the NM2 lineage also shows a high number of enriched

pathways (table 1), and has signatures of introgression from many other lineages (figure 3) as well as

with the NM1 and GRA lineages (electronic supplementary material, figure S3). Gene flow can facilitate

adaptive diversification, as well as inflating standing genetic variation as a whole [84-86], and may have

been a driver of adaptive diversification in these the caribou lineages.

Our gene ontology results also point towards some other interesting patterns. For example, only

in the NAL lineage are there more enriched pathways under biological processes, and a number of these

pathways (6/15) are all involved in calcineurin signalling (electronic supplementary material). Calcineurin

is required for T cell activation and interleukin expression during immune response in mammals [87],

which might point towards a difference in the pathogens encountered by the NAL lineage, perhaps in

the more southern refugia. Calcineurin signalling is also important in cardiovascular and skeletal muscle

development in vertebrates [88] and so alternatively could be involved in morphological differences.

Another intriguing pattern from the gene ontology enrichment analysis is that the enriched

pathways under biological processes for both the CSM and NM2 lineages are mostly involved in blood

and circulatory systems (5/9 and 3/3 of their enriched pathways, respectively), including five of the

same genes within these pathways for both lineages (electronic supplementary material). The

importance of circulatory pathways could be due to the elevational migrations undertaken by the

Northern, Central, and Southern Mountain caribou within these two lineages [24]. That both lineages

show signatures of rapidly evolving genes in these pathways, with some of the same genes, could be

due to selection on shared standing variation, or potentially due to introgression between these

lineages given the relatively strong signature of introgression we found from the CSM into the NM2

lineage (figure 3).

Under molecular function, the NM2 lineage shows the largest number of enriched pathways

compared to all other lineages (table 1). Many of the pathways are involved in the activity of

carbohydrate, lipid, glucose or other sugars (electronic supplementary material) which may also speak

to the energetic requirement of elevational migrations, or potentially some difference in diet. Fully

understanding the many genes and pathways we have found to have signatures of selection will likely

take further study. Although such bottom-up approaches to find adaptive genetic variation, as we have

used here, can be advantageous in discovering adaptive genes relating to many and/or unknown

phenotypes, it can be difficult to fully elucidate the effect these genes have on fitness in non-model

organisms [89,90]. However, gleaning overall patterns such as we have found and discussed allows

insight into the process of intra-specific adaptive diversification, such as the potential importance of

introgression of glacial lineages in increasing both neutral and adaptive standing variation. This is in

contrast to our hypothesis that gene flow would act as a homogenising force reducing unique adaptive

variation uncovered for introgressed lineages, and shows how introgression can, in fact, be a driving

force behind diversification. Further, the characterization of putatively rapidly evolving genes amongst

intra-specific lineages has rarely been done before and thus provides a benchmark for investigations of

ecotypic adaptive diversification for other species. This is particularly timely given the current

recognition of the importance of understanding, monitoring, and preserving intra-specific diversity

[12,20].

(d) Conservation of caribou intra-specific diversity

With the increasing availability of genomic data, for caribou and other non-model species, our

understanding of adaptation and adaptive genetic variation is increasing [91,92]. Our improvement of

the caribou reference genome into a chromosome-scale assembly with a high-quality annotation will be

an invaluable resource to enable progress and more in-depth analyses of adaptation, as well as other

important analyses for conservation such as demography and inbreeding/runs of homozygosity [93].

Our whole genome phylogenomic reconstruction of caribou across the continent showed nine

major phylogenomic lineages not concordant with current DUs (figure 2) [24], potentially indicating the

need to re-assess the designations. Although we do not include representatives from all of the 11 extant

DUs in the analyses, we have good geographic sampling from eight DUs (figure 1). Further, two of the

three DUs we have not included, Torngats and Atlantic-Gaspesie, have extremely restricted ranges

(figure 1). Based on previous genetic work all three likely fall within the NAL lineage [22,24], although

future work to include these to investigate possible phylogenomic substructure of the NAL lineage

would be beneficial.

Preserving the high genetic diversity of caribou, indicated here by the divergent intra-specific

lineages (figure 2) and the evidence of differential adaptive variation between lineages (table 1), may be

important for the persistence of caribou and their ability to adapt to environmental changes [18,19]. In

particular, maintaining the connectivity between lineages may be important as introgression appears to

have been a driver of genetic variation, and would continue to allow movement of adaptive genes [94].

424   4. Conclusion

We have assembled and annotated a chromosome-scale caribou reference genome as an invaluable

resource for conservation genomic research. Continent-wide phylogenomic reconstruction using 66 re-

sequenced high-coverage genomes recovered nine major lineages, not concordant with DUs but

representing a high level of intra-specific diversity. Quaternary glacial cycles, coupled with caribou

vagility and life history, played a strong role in increasing both neutral and adaptive genetic diversity.

Divergence due to isolation in refugia followed by repeated secondary contact likely drove

diversification with our finding of widespread signals of introgression, particularly in those lineages with

the highest numbers of enriched functional pathways with signatures of rapidly evolving genes.

Introgression thus appears to have been a crucial process in caribou genetic diversification, and

potentially many other species that underwent repeated range shifts during glacial cycles, and therefore

connectivity should be maintained between lineages for future resilience of the species.

Data accessibility. The raw reads from 46 of the re-sequenced genomes are available on the National

Centre for Biotechnology (NCBI) under BioProject Accession numbers PRJNA634908, PRJNA694662, and

PRJNA754521. New genomes for this manuscript will be uploaded upon acceptance. All code used to

filter and map re-sequenced genomes, as well as for downstream analyses, can be found on GitHub

(https://github.com/BeckySTaylor/Phylogenomic_Analyses).The new reference genome and annotation

will also be made available through the NCBI upon acceptance.

Author contributions. R.S.T. helped to conceive the study, did the bioinformatics, and wrote the

manuscript. M.M. helped to conceive the study, provided funding, and edited the manuscript. S.K.

helped with the bioinformatics and edited the manuscript, and G.M. did the laboratory work to produce

the fibroblast cells for the reference genome and annotation. K.S. provided funding and support with

bioinformatics, A.K., N.C.L., M.G., H.S., C.T., J.P., L.A., D.H., and D.S. coordinated or collected samples

and edited the manuscript. P.J.W. helped to conceive the study, provided funding, and edited the

manuscript.

Conflict of interest declaration. We declare no competing interests.

Funding. Funding was provided through an NSERC Collaborative Research & Development (CRD) grant,

NSERC grant RGPIN-2015–04477, The Government of Canada's Genomics Research and Development

Initiative (GRDI), Genome Canada, the Species-at-Risk Stewardship Program (SARSP), WCS Garfield

Weston Fellowship, Manitoba Hydro, Saskatchewan Power and Weyerhaeuser Inc.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank the many field collectors and hunters who supplied samples

for this work, as well as Bridget Redquest and Austin Thompson for technical support in the laboratory.

We are also thankful to the Shared Hierarchical Academic Research Computing Network (SHARCNET:

www.sharcnet.ca), Compute Canada, and Amazon Cloud Computing for high-performance computing

services.

References

1.   Tingley R, Dubey S. 2012. Disparity in the timing of vertebrate diversification events between

the northern and southern hemispheres. *BMC Evol Biol* **12**, 244. (doi:10.1186/1471-2148-12-

244)

2.   Roberts DR, Hamann A. 2015. Glacial refugia and modern genetic diversity of 22 western North

American tree species. *Proc R Soc B* **282**, 20142903. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2903)

3.   Petit RJ, Aguinagalde I, de Beaulieu J-L, Bittkau C, Brewer S, Cheddadi R, Ennos R, Fineschi S,

Grivet D, Lascoux M, et al. 2003. Glacial refugia: hotspots but not melting pots of genetic

diversity. *Science* **300**, 1563–1565. (doi:10.1126/science.1083264)

4.   Provan J, Bennett K. 2008. Phylogeographic insights into cryptic glacial refugia. *Trends Ecol*

Evol **23**, 564–571. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.06.010)

5.   Alcala N, Vuilleumier S. 2014. Turnover and accumulation of genetic diversity across large time-

scale cycles of isolation and connection of populations. *Proc R Soc B* **281**, 20141369.

(doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1369)

6.   Hansen CCR, Hvilsom C, Schmidt NM, Aastrup P, Van Coeverden de Groot PJ, Siegismund HR,

Heller R. 2018. The Muskox Lost a Substantial Part of Its Genetic Diversity on Its Long Road to

Greenland. *Curr Biol* **28**, 4022-4028.e5. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.10.054)

7.   Ony M, Klingeman WE, Zobel J, Trigiano RN, Ginzel M, Nowicki M, Boggess SL, Everhart S,

Hadziabdic D. 2021. Genetic diversity in North American *Cercis Canadensis* reveals an ancient

population bottleneck that originated after the last glacial maximum. *Sci Rep* **11**, 21803. (doi:

10.1038/s41598-021-01020-z)

8.   Salinas P, Morinha F, Literak I, García J, Milá B, Blanco G. 2021. Genetic diversity, differentiation

and historical origin of the isolated population of rooks *Corvus frugilegus* in Iberia. *J Avian*

Biol **52**, jav.02689. (doi:10.1111/jav.02689)

9. Lafontaine G, Napier JD, Petit RJ, Hu FS. 2018. Invoking adaptation to decipher the genetic

legacy of past climate change. *Ecology* **99**, 1530–1546. (doi:10.1002/ecy.2382)

10. Mimura M, Yahara T, Faith DP, Vázquez-Domínguez E, Colautti RI, Araki H, Javadi F, Núñez-

Farfán J, Mori AS, Zhou S, et al. 2017. Understanding and monitoring the consequences of

human impacts on intraspecific variation. *Evol Appl* **10**, 121–139. (doi:10.1111/eva.12436)

11. Des Roches S, Post DM, Turley NE, Bailey JK, Hendry AP, Kinnison MT, Schweitzer JA, Palkovacs

EP. 2018. The ecological importance of intraspecific variation. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2**, 57–64.

(doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0402-5)

12. Hoban S, Archer FI, Bertola LD, Bragg JG, Breed MF, Bruford MW, Coleman MA, Ekblom R, Funk

WC, Grueber CE, Hand BK. 2022. Global genetic diversity status and trends: towards a suite of

Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs) for genetic composition. *Biological Reviews* **97**, 1511-

1538. (doi:10.1111/brv.12852)

13. Yiming L, Siqi W, Chaoyuan C, Jiaqi Z, Supen W, Xianglei H, Xuan L, Xuejiao Y, Xianping L. 2021.

Latitudinal gradients in genetic diversity and natural selection at a highly adaptive gene in

terrestrial mammals. *Ecography* **44**, 206–218. (doi:10.1111/ecog.05082)

14. Des Roches S, Pendleton LH, Shapiro B, Palkovacs EP. 2021. Conserving intraspecific variation for

nature's contributions to people. *Nat Ecol Evol* **5**, 574-82. (doi:10.1038/s41559-021-01403-5)

15. Leigh DM, van Rees CB, Millette KL, Breed MF, Schmidt C, Bertola LD, Hand BK, Hunter ME,

Jensen EL, Kershaw F, et al. 2021. Opportunities and challenges of macrogenetic studies. *Nat

Rev Genet* **22**, 791–807. (doi:10.1038/s41576-021-00394-0)

16. Lexer C, Mangili S, Bossolini E, Forest F, Stölting KN, Pearman PB, Zimmermann NE, Salamin N.

2013. 'Next generation' biogeography: towards understanding the drivers of species

diversification and persistence. *J. Biogeogr* **40**, 1013–1022. (doi:10.1111/jbi.12076)

17. Paz-Vinas I, Loot G, Stevens VM, Blanchet S. 2015. Evolutionary processes driving spatial

patterns of intraspecific genetic diversity in river ecosystems. *Mol Ecol* **24**, 4586-604.

(doi:10.1111/mec.13345)

18. Carvalho SB, Velo-Antón G, Tarroso P, Portela AP, Barata M, Carranza S, Moritz C, Possingham

HP. 2017. Spatial conservation prioritization of biodiversity spanning the evolutionary

continuum. *Nat Ecol Evol* **1**, 0151. (doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0151)

19. Andrello M, D'Aloia C, Dalongeville A, Escalante MA, Guerrero J, Perrier C, Torres-Florez JP,

Xuereb A, Manel S. 2022. Evolving spatial conservation prioritization with intraspecific genetic

data. *Trends Ecol Evol* **37**, 553–564. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2022.03.003)

20. O'Brien D, Laikre L, Hoban S, Bruford MW, Ekblom R, Fischer MC, Hall J, Hvilsom C,

Hollingsworth PM, Kershaw F, Mittan CS. 2022. Bringing together approaches to reporting on

within species genetic diversity. *J Applied Ecol* **59,** 2227-33. (doi:10.1111/1365-2664.14225)

21. Banfield AWF. 1961. *A Revision of the Reindeer and Caribou, Genus Rangifer*. National Museum

of Canada, Bulletin No. 177, Queen's Printer: Ottawa, ON, Canada.

22. Yannic G, Pellissier L., Ortego J. Lecomte N, Couturier S, Cuyler C, Dussault C, Hundertmark KJ,

Irvine RJ, Jenkins DA, et al. 2014. Genetic diversity in caribou linked to past and future climate

change. *Nat Clim Change* **4**, 132–137. (doi:10.1038/nclimate2074)

23. Taylor RS, Manseau M, Klütsch CFC, Polfus JL, Steedman A, Hervieux D, Kelly A, Larter NC,

Gamberg M, Schwantje H, Wilson PJ. 2021. Population dynamics of caribou shaped by glacial

cycles before the last glacial maximum. *Mol Ecol* **30**, 6121–6143. (doi:10.1111/mec.16166)

24. COSEWIC. 2011. Designatable units for caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) in Canada. Committee on the

Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

25. Vors LS, Boyce MS. 2009. Global declines of caribou and reindeer. *Global Change Biol* **15**, 2626–

2633. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01974.x)

26. Festa-Bianchet M, Ray JC, Boutin S, Côté SD, Gunn A. 2011. Conservation of caribou (*Rangifer*

tarandus) in Canada: An uncertain future. *Can J Zool* **89**, 419–434. (doi:10.1139/z11-025)

27. Weckworth BV, Hebblewhite M, Mariani S, Musiani M. 2018. Lines on a map: Conservation

units, meta-population dynamics, and recovery of woodland caribou in Canada. *Ecosphere* **9**,

e02323. (doi:10.1002/ecs2.2323)

28. COSEWIC. 2014a. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou *Rangifer tarandus*,

Newfoundland population, Atlantic-Gaspésie population and Boreal population, in Canada.

Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

29. COSEWIC. 2014b. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou *Rangifer tarandus*,

Northern Mountain population, Central Mountain population and Southern Mountain

population in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

30. COSEWIC. 2015a. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Peary Caribou *Rangifer*

tarandus pearyi in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

31. COSEWIC. 2015b. COSEWIC assessment process, categories and guidelines. Committee on the

Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

32. COSEWIC. 2016. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou *Rangifer tarandus*,

Barren-ground population, in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in

Canada.

33. COSEWIC. 2017a. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou Dolphin and Union

population (*Rangifer tarandus*), in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in

Canada.

34. COSEWIC. 2017b. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou *Rangifer tarandus*,

Eastern Migratory population and Torngat Mountains population, in Canada. Committee on the

Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

35. Flagstad Ø, Røed KH. 2003. Refugial origins of reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus* L.) inferred from

mitochondrial DNA sequences. *Evolution* **57**, 658–670. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-

3820.2003.tb01557.x.)

36. Cronin MA, MacNeil MD, Patton JC. 2005. Variation in mitochondrial DNA and microsatellite

DNA in caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) in North America. *J Mammal* **86**, 495–505.

(doi:10.1644/1545-1542(2005)86[495:VIMDAM]2.0.CO;2)

37. McDevitt AD, Mariani S, Hebblewhite M, Decesare NJ, Morgantini L, Seip D, Weckworth BV,

Musiani M. 2009. Survival in the Rockies of an endangered hybrid swarm from diverged caribou

(*Rangifer tarandus*) lineages. *Mol Ecol* **18**, 665–679. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.04050.x)

38. Klütsch CFC, Manseau M, Wilson PJ. 2012. Phylogeographical analysis of mtDNA data indicates

postglacial expansion from multiple glacial refugia in woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*

caribou). *PLoS ONE* **7**, e52661. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0052661)

39. Weckworth BV, McDevitt A, Musiani M, Hebblewhite M, Mariani S. 2012. Reconstruction of

caribou evolutionary history in Western North America and its implications for conservation.

Mol Ecol **21**, 3610–3624. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05621.x)

40. Latch EK, Heffelfinger JR, Fike JA, Rhodes Jr OE. 2009. Species-wide phylogeography of North

American mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*): cryptic glacial refugia and postglacial

recolonization. *Mol Ecol* **18**, 1730-45. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04153.x)

41. Klütsch CFC, Manseau M, Anderson M, Sinkins P, Wilson PJ. 2017. Evolutionary reconstruction

supports the presence of a Pleistocene Arctic refugium for a large mammal species. *J

Biogeogr* **44**, 2729–2739. (doi:doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13090)

42. Klütsch CFC, Manseau M, Trim V, Polfus J, Wilson PJ. 2016. The eastern migratory caribou : the

role of genetic introgression in ecotype evolution. Roy Soc Open Sci 3, 150469.

(doi:0.1098/rsos.150469)

43. Polfus JL, Manseau M, Klütsch CFC, Simmons D, Wilson PJ. 2017. Ancient diversification in glacial

refugia leads to intraspecific diversity in a Holarctic mammal. *J. Biogeogr.* **44**, 386–396.

(doi:10.1111/jbi.12918)

44. Taylor RS, Manseau M, Horn RL, Keobouasone S, Golding GB, Wilson PJ. 2020. The role of

introgression and ecotypic parallelism in delineating intraspecific conservation units. *Mol Ecol*

29, 2793–2809. (doi:10.1111/mec.15522)

45. Taylor RS, Horn RL, Zhang X, Golding GB, Manseau M, Wilson PJ. 2019. The caribou (*Rangifer*

tarandus) genome. *Genes* **10**, 540. (doi:10.3390/genes10070540)

46. Yamaguchi K, Kadota M, Nishimura O, Ohishi Y, Naito Y, Kuraku S. 2021. Technical

considerations in Hi-C scaffolding and evaluation of chromosome-scale genome assemblies. *Mol*

Ecol **30**, 5923-34. (doi:10.1111/mec.16146)

47. Putnam NH, O'Connell BL, Stites JC, Rice BJ, Blanchette M, Calef R, Troll CJ, Fields A, Hartley PD,

Sugnet CW, et al. 2016. Chromosome-scale shotgun assembly using an in vitro method for long-

range linkage. *Genome Res* **26**, 342–350. (doi:10.1101/gr.193474.115)

48. Bushnell B, Rood J, Singer E. 2017. BBMerge—Accurate paired shotgun read merging via

overlap. *PLoS ONE* **12**, e0185056. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0185056)

49. Li Z, Lin Z, Ba H, Chen L, Yang Y, Wang K, Qiu Q, Wang W, Li G. 2017. Draft genome of the

reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*). *GigaScience* **6**, 1–5. (doi:10.1093/gigascience/gix102)

50. Solmundson K, Bowman J, Wilson P, Taylor RS, Horn RL, Keobouasone S, Manseau M. Genomic

islands of heterozygosity maintained across caribou populations despite inbreeding. Available

from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.29.424772v1

51. Taylor RS, Manseau M, Redquest B, S. Keobouasone, P. Gagné, C. Martineau, Wilson PJ. 2022.

Whole genome sequences from non-invasively collected caribou faecal samples. *Cons Genet*

Resour **14**, 53-68. (doi:10.1007/s12686-021-01235-2)

52. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence

data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170)

53. Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with bowtie 2. *Nature Methods* **9**,

357–359. (doi:10.1038/nmeth.1923)

54. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R, 1000

Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. 2009. The sequence alignment/map format and

samtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 2078–2079. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352)

55. McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, Garimella K, Altshuler D,

Gabriel S, Daly M, DePristo MA. 2010. The genome analysis toolkit: A MapReduce framework for

analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res* **20**, 1297–1303.

(doi:10.1101/gr.107524.110)

56. Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, Hansaker RE, Lunter G, Marth

GT, Sherry ST et al. 2011. The variant call format and VCFtools. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 2156–2158.

(doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr330)

57. Weldenegodguad M, Pokharel K, Ming Y, Honkatukia M, Peippo J, Reilas T, Røed KH, Kantanen J.

2020. Genome sequence and comparative analysis of reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*) in northern

Eurasia. *Sci Rep* **10**, 1-4. (doi:10.1038/s41598-020-65487-y)

58. Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015 IQ-TREE: A fast and effective stochastic

algorithm for estimating maximum likelihood phylogenies. *Mol Biol Evol* **32**, 268-

274. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msu300)

59. Galloway SM, Hanrahan V, Dodds KG, Potts MD, Crawford AM, Hill DF. 1996. A linkage map of

the ovine X chromosome. *Genome Res* **6**, 667–677. (doi:10.1101/gr.6.8.667)

60. Liu R, Low WY, Tearle R, Koren S, Ghurye J, Rhie A, Phillippy AM, Rosen BD, Bickhart DM, Smith

TPL, et al. 2019. New insights into mammalian sex chromosome structure and evolution using

high-quality sequences from bovine X and Y chromosomes. *BMC Genomics* **20**, 1000.

(doi:10.1186/s12864-019-6364-z)

61. Hoang DT, Chernomor O, von Haeseler A., Minh BQ, Vinh LS. 2018 UFBoot2: Improving the

ultrafast bootstrap approximation. *Mol Biol Evol* **35**, 518–522. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msx281)

62. Alexander DH, Novembre J, Lange K. 2009. Fast model-based estimation of ancestry in unrelated

individuals. *Genome Res* **19**, 1655–1664, 2009. (doi:10.1101/gr.094052.109)

63. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MAR, Bender D, Maller J, Sklar P, de Bakker

PIW, Daly MJ, Sham PC. 2007. plink: A tool set for whole-genome association and population-

based linkage analyses. *Am J Human Genet* **81**, 559–575. (doi:10.1086/519795)

64. RStudio Team. 2015. RStudio: Integrated development for R. RStudio Inc. Retrieved from

http://www.rstudio.com/

65. R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for

Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https:// www.R-project.org/

66. Wickham H. 2016. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag: New York, USA.

ISBN 978-3-319-24277-4, https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org.

67. Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T,

McCarthy SA, Davies RM, Li H. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience* **10**,

giab008. (doi:10.1093/gigascience/giab008)

68. Malinsky M, Matschiner M, Svardal H. 2021. dsuite – Fast D statistics and related admixture

evidence from VCF files. *Mol Ecol Resour* **21**, 584–595. (doi:10.1111/1755-0998.13265)

69. Hudson DH, Bryant D. 2006. Application of phylogenetic networks in evolutionary studies. *Mol*

Biol Evol **23**, 254-67. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msj030)

70. Macías LG, Barrio E, Toft C. 2020. GWideCodeML: a python package for testing evolutionary

hypotheses at the genome-wide level. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics* **10**, 4369-72. (doi:

10.1534/g3.120.401874)

71. Yang Z. 2007. PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Mol Biol Evol* **24**, 1586-91.

(doi:10.1093/molbev/msm088)

72. Pertea G, Pertea M. 2020. GFF utilities: GffRead and GffCompare. *F1000Research* **9**.

(doi:10.12688/f1000research.23297.2)

73. Ge SX, Jung D, Yao R. 2020. ShinyGO: a graphical gene-set enrichment tool for animals and

plants. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 2628-9. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz931)

74. Gripenberg U, Nieminen M. 1986. The chromosomes of reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*). *Rangifer* **6**,

109 (doi:10.7557/2.6.1-App.625)

75. Environment Canada. 2014. Recovery Strategy for the Woodland Caribou, Southern Mountain

population (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) in Canada. *Species at Risk Act* Recovery Strategy Series.

Environment Canada, Ottawa. viii + 103 pp.

76. Jenkins DA, Yannic G, Schaefer JA, Conolly J, Lecomte N. 2018. Population structure of caribou in

an ice-bound archipelago. *Divers Distrib* **24**, 1092-108. (doi:10.1111/ddi.12748)

77. Cavedon M, Poissant J, VonHoldt B, Michalak A, Hegel T, Heppenheimer E, Hervieux D, Neufeld

L, Polfus JL, Schwantje H, Steenweg R. 2022. Population structure of threatened caribou in

western Canada inferred from genome-wide SNP data. *Cons Genet* **16**, 1-5.

(doi:10.1007/s10592-022-01475-1)

78. Boulet M, Couturier S, Cote SD, Otto RD, Bernatchez L. 2007. Integrative use of spatial, genetic,

and demographic analyses for investigating genetic connectivity between migratory, montane,

and sedentary caribou herds. *Mol Ecol* **20**, 4223-40. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03476.x)

79. McLoughlin PD, Paetkau D, Duda M, Boutin S. 2004. Genetic diversity and relatedness of boreal

caribou populations in western Canada. *Biol Cons* **118**, 593–598.

(doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2003.10.008)

80. Zittlau K, Coffin J, Farnell R, Kuzyk G, Strobeck C. 1998. Genetic relationships of three Yukon

caribou herds determined by DNA typing. *Rangifer* **12**, 59–62. (doi:10.7557/2.20.5.1625)

81. Galbreath KE, Cook JA, Eddingsaas AA, DeChaine EG. 2011. Diversity and demography in

Beringia: Multilocus tests of paleodistribution models reveal the complex history of Arctic

ground squirrels. *Evolution* **65**, 1879–1896. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01287.x)

82. Dussex N, Alberti F, Heino MT, Olsen R-A, van der Valk T, Ryman N, Laikre L, Ahlgren H, Askeyev

IV, Askeyev OV, et al. 2020. Moose genomes reveal past glacial demography and the origin of

modern lineages. *BMC Genomics* **21**, 854. (doi:10.1186/s12864-020-07208-3)

83. Maier PA, Vandergast AG, Ostoja SM, Aguilar A, Bohonak AJ. 2019. Pleistocene glacial cycles

drove lineage diversification and fusion in the Yosemite toad (*Anaxyrus canorus*). *Evolution* **73**,

2476-96. (doi:10.1111/evo.13868)

84. Berner D, Salzburger W. 2015. The genomics of organismal diversification illuminated by

adaptive radiations. *Trends Genet* **31,** 491–499. (doi:10.1016/j.tig.2015.07.002)

85. Streicher JW, Devitt TJ, Goldberg CS, Malone JH, Blackmon H, Fujita MK. 2014. Diversification

and asymmetrical gene flow across time and space: lineage sorting and hybridization in

polytypic barking frogs. *Mol Ecol* **23**, 3273–3291. (doi:10.1111/mec.12814)

86. Lexer C, Marthaler F, Humbert S, Barbará T, de la Harpe M, Bossolini E, Paris M, Martinelli G,

Versieux LM. 2016. Gene flow and diversification in a species complex of *Alcantarea* inselberg

bromeliads. *Bot J Linn Soc* **181**, 505–520. (doi:10.1111/boj.12372)

87. Park H-S, Lee SC, Cardenas ME, Heitman J. 2019. Calcium-calmodulin-calcineurin signaling: a

globally conserved virulence cascade in eukaryotic microbial pathogens. *Cell Host & Microbe* **26**,

453–462. (doi:10.1016/j.chom.2019.08.004)

88. Schulz RA, Yutzey KE. 2004. Calcineurin signaling and NFAT activation in cardiovascular and

skeletal muscle development. *Dev Biol* **266**, 1–16. (doi:10.1016/j.ydbio.2003.10.008)

89. Ross-Ibarra J, Morrell PL, Gaut BS. 2007. Plant domestication, a unique opportunity to identify

the genetic basis of adaptation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**, 8641–8648.

(doi:10.1073/pnas.0700643104)

90. Barrett RDH, Hoekstra HE. 2011. Molecular spandrels: tests of adaptation at the genetic level.

Nat. Reviews Genet **12**, 767-780. (doi:10.1038/nrg3015)

91. Fuentes-Pardo AP, Ruzzante DE. 2017. Whole-genome sequencing approaches for conservation

biology: Advantages, limitations and practical recommendations. *Mol Ecol* 26, 5369-406. (doi:

10.1111/mec.14264)

92. Shafer ABA, Wolf JBW, Alves PC, Bergström L, Bruford MW, Brännström I, Colling G, Dalén L, De

Meester L, Ekblom R, et al. 2015. Genomics and the challenging translation into conservation

practice. *Trends Ecol Evol* **30**, 78–87. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2014.11.009)

93. Taylor RS, Jensen EL, Coltman DW, Foote AD, Lamichhaney S. 2021. Seeing the whole picture:

what molecular ecology is gaining from whole genomes. *Mol Ecol* 30, 5917-5922.

(doi:10.1111/mec.16282)

94. Hanson JO, Fuller RA, Rhodes JR. 2019. Conventional methods for enhancing connectivity in

conservation planning do not always maintain gene flow. *J Appl Ecol* **56**, 913–922.

(doi:10.1111/1365-2664.13315)

718
719
720
721

732   **Table 1.** The overall number of significant rapidly evolving genes as well as the number of unique genes

733   for each lineage.

Lineage	Number of genes with a significant dN/dS ratio	Number of unique genes with a significant dN/dS ratio	Number of enriched pathways – biological processes	Number of enriched pathways – molecular function
NAL	764	245	15	5
NWB	758	250	1	39
PMG	779	287	10	38
CSM	787	270	9	30
ARC	791	282	0	14
BRG	777	276	0	9
GRA	749	271	1	4
NM1	777	265	3	3
NM2	742	278	3	51

736
737
738

Figure 1. Map of sampling locations used for the re-sequenced whole genome sequences. Background

colours show the Designatable Unit (DU) ranges.

Figure 2. Maximum likelihood phylogenomic reconstruction using the whole genome sequences of the 66 caribou and five reindeer genomes as outgroups. Bootstrap supports are shown on the nodes. Each individual is identified on the tree with their PCID number (electronic supplementary material, table S1) and their Designatable Unit; BG – barren-ground, BO – boreal, CM – central mountain, DU – Dolphin Union, EM – eastern migratory, GL – Greenland, NM – northern mountain, PY – Peary, and SM – southern mountain.

Figure 3. Heatmap showing the f-Branch statistics alongside the phylogeny; NAL – Eastern Migratory and

Boreal from Ontario and Manitoba, NWB – Boreal from the Northwest Territories, PMG – Northern

Mountain Pink Mountain and Graham, CSM – Central and Southern Mountain and Northern Mountain

Itcha-Ilgachuz, ARC – Arctic caribou, BRG – mainland Barren-ground from the Northwest Territories and

Manitoba, GRA – Barren-ground caribou from the Yukon and Alaska and Northern Mountain caribou

from Dawson and Haines Junction in the Yukon, NM1 – Northern Mountain from the Northwest

Territories and Ross River from the Yukon, NM2 – all other Northern Mountain from British Columbia.

The gene flow is from the group indicated in the top phylogeny (X-axis) going into the phylogeny

represented on the Y-axis. Dotted lines indicate where gene flow is going into an ancestral group on the

phylogeny. Greyed out squares indicate tests that could not be made with this statistic, and white

squares indicate where no gene flow was detected.