Genetic structure of a patchily distributed philopatric migrant: implications for

management and conservation

Anastasios Bounas[1,2*], Dimitris Tsaparis[3], Ron Efrat[4], Gradimir Gradev[5], Marco Gustin[6],

Kresimir Mikulic[7], Airam Rodríguez[8], Maurizio Sarà[9], Georgios Kotoulas[3], Konstantinos

Sotiropoulos[1]

[1]*Molecular Ecology and Conservation Genetics Lab, Department of Biological Applications*
and Technology, University of Ioannina, 45110, Ioannina, Greece.

[2]*Hellenic Ornithological Society – BirdLife Greece, Themistokleous 80, 10681 Athens, Greece.*

[3] *Institute of Marine Biology, Biotechnology and Aquaculture, Hellenic Centre for Marine*
Research, Heraklion, 71500, Greece.

[4] *Mitrani Department of Desert Ecology, The Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research,*
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, IL-8499000, Israel.

[5] *Green Balkans NGO, 1 Skopie Street, 4004, Plovdiv, Bulgaria.*

[6]*LIPU (Lega Italiana Protezione Uccelli) - BirdLife Italia, Conservation Department, Via Udine*
3, I-43100, Parma, Italy.

[7]*Association BIOM – BirdLife Croatia, Preradoviceva 34, 10000, Zagreb, Croatia.*

[8] *Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC), Avda. Américo*
Vespucio s/n, 41092, Seville, Spain.

[9] *Section of Animal Biology, Department STEBICEF, University of Palermo, Via Archirafi 18,*
90123 Palermo, Italy.

*Corresponding author: abounas@cc.uoi.gr, tel: +306973573235

Running Title: Conservation Genetics of the Lesser Kestrel

Significant demographic fluctuations can have major genetic consequences in wild

populations. The Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) has suffered from both population declines

and range fragmentation during the last century. In this study we used multilocus

microsatellite genotypes to assess the genetic population structure of the species, with main

focus on the patchily distributed populations of Central-Eastern (CE) Mediterranean. Our

analysis revealed significant genetic structuring of Lesser Kestrel populations, not only at

cross-continental scale, but also regionally within Central and Eastern Mediterranean. We

detected signs of genetic bottlenecks in some of the peripheral populations coupled with

small effective population sizes. Values of genetic differentiation among the largest

populations were low, albeit significant, whereas the small peripheral CE Mediterranean

populations showed higher levels of differentiation from all other populations. Gene flow

levels were relatively low among the discontinuously distributed populations of the CE

Mediterranean region. We argue that the observed spatial genetic structure can be

attributed at some level to the past demographic decline experienced by the species. Finally,

we discuss how management strategies should focus in the maintenance of current genetic

diversity levels and the recovery of bottlenecked populations through the increase of

population sizes and dispersal rates among peripheral populations.

Keywords: *Falco naumanni* -Genetic Diversity-Lesser Kestrel-Management Units-

Mediterranean-Microsatellites-Migration Rates

INTRODUCTION

Significant demographic fluctuations and isolation, can have major genetic consequences in wild populations. Partially or totally impeded connectivity could eventually lead to increased genetic differentiation as well as to considerable reduction of population size (Fahrig, 2003). Patchily distributed and locally isolated populations are susceptible to the combined influences of genetic drift and inbreeding, which may result in a decrease in genetic diversity and fitness. Decreases in genetic variability compromise a species' ability to adapt to a changing environment (Amos & Balmford, 2001; Frankham, Ballou & Briscoe, 2010). Genetic drift and inbreeding are expected to be stronger in peripheral populations relative to core populations, due to their small population sizes and low immigration rates (Vucetich & Waite, 2003; Hanski & Gaggiotti, 2004;). Therefore, the assessment of genetic structure and the identification of its underlying processes become essential tasks providing valuable information towards the design and implementation of effective conservation strategies. For example, delineation of management units (MUs, Moritz, 1994; Taylor & Dizon, 1999; Palsbøll, Berube & Allendorf, 2007) would be valuable to identify populations or regions in need of localized conservation actions for the short-term management of the species in question.

The Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni,* Fleischer, 1818) is a small migratory falcon breeding from the Mediterranean basin across Middle East and Central Asia to Mongolia and China, and wintering in sub-Saharan Africa (Fig.1; Cramp & Simmons, 1980). The species underwent rapid declines throughout its European range in the early 1960s mainly as a result of agricultural intensification and subsequent habitat degradation and land use changes (Iñigo & Barov, 2010). In Central-Eastern Mediterranean region (hereafter CE Mediterranean) and especially in the Balkan Peninsula, the decline was dramatic, leading to local extinctions and consequently to significant range contraction and fragmentation (Iñigo & Barov, 2010).

Currently, the species shows a patchy distribution and is considered to have a "depleted"

status in the region (BirdLife International, 2017a). The two largest (core) populations are

located in the Apulia-Basilicata area of southern Italy and in Central Greece, still holding

several thousand pairs (BirdLife International, 2004; Gustin *et al.*, 2013). Peripheral

populations of smaller size, consisting of some hundreds of pairs, exist in the Former

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Uzunova & Lisichanets, 2016), in Sicily (Sarà, 2004) and in

the European part of Turkey (Kmetova *et al.*, 2012). In addition, populations with less than

100 breeding pairs (HOS/Birdlife Greece, unpublished data) can be found throughout

continental Greece as well as on some of the Greek islands (Legakis & Maragou, 2009).

Finally, a small geographically isolated population is located in Croatia, at the northernmost

edge of the species European distribution (Mikulic *et al.*, 2013). Conservation actions such as

population reinforcement, construction of artificial nesting sites and maintenance of habitat

quality have led to increases in population sizes in Western Europe and subsequently the

down-listing of the species from Vulnerable to Least Concern (BirdLife International, 2017b).

However, such conservation actions are only recently starting to be implemented in CE

Mediterranean.

Several previous studies have examined the genetic structure of the species and the

underlying processes, at both continental (Wink, Sauer-Gurth & Pepler, 2004; Alcaide *et al.*,

2008a; Alcaide *et al.*, 2008b) and finer spatial scales (Ortego *et al.*, 2008a; Ortego *et al.*,

2008b; Alcaide *et al.*, 2009; Di Maggio *et al.*, 2014). It has been proposed that Asian Lesser

Kestrels are considerably differentiated from European conspecifics, whereas populations

across the Western Palearctic seem to follow an isolation by distance pattern while

maintaining high levels of genetic diversity (Wink *et al.*, 2004; Alcaide *et al.*, 2008b). On a

regional scale though, it seems that the species' philopatry does not lead to fine-scale

genetic structuring (Alcaide *et al.*, 2009); nevertheless, population structure could emerge,

depending on the size and the degree of spatial isolation and the levels of gene flow among

populations (Ortego *et al.*, 2008b). Such restricted gene flow patterns do not necessarily

result from physical barriers hindering dispersal, especially in efficient dispersers such as the

Lesser Kestrel, but can be attributed also to their philopatric behaviour. Indeed, the species

shows high philopatry, with adult birds returning to breed close to their previous breeding

territories (Negro, Hiraldo & Donázar, 1997), however, juveniles disperse more and in

greater distances (Serrano & Tella, 2003; Bounas *et al.*, 2016a).

Herein, we examine the genetic structure of the Lesser Kestrel, 1) across the broader

species range and 2) within the CE Mediterranean. We aim to identify any patterns of

genetic variation and gene flow among populations that could be of crucial importance for

conservation programs to determine the appropriate conservation strategy in the region and

design local scale conservation actions.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

POPULATION SAMPLING AND DNA EXTRACTION

Samples were obtained from 12 breeding sites in CE Mediterranean, where the species

shows a fragmented distribution as well as from Mongolia, Israel and two sites from Spain.

Individuals sampled in Bulgaria originated from Spain and were used for the reinforcement

of the species, thus treated as if they were sampled in Extremadura (ES/BG; Fig. 1). A total of

295 individuals were sampled during four consecutive breeding seasons (2013 - 2016) with

the exception of Spanish samples (SES) that were collected in 2007. Birds were caught by

hand in the nest or using mist nets or spring traps close to the nest. To minimize biases

associated with relatedness only a single fledgling per brood was sampled. Two drops of

blood (≈50μl) were obtained from each individual by leg-pricking and immediately stored in

blood storage cards (NucleoCards®) at room temperature until DNA extraction. DNA was

extracted using the NucleoSpin Tissue kit (Macherey-Nagel) following the manufacturer's

protocol.

Each individual was genotyped at a total of 18 microsatellite loci. Seven loci were originally

isolated from the Peregrine Falcon *Falco peregrinus* (Nesje *et al.*, 2000; Alcaide *et al.*, 2008a),

whereas 11 were developed specifically for the Lesser Kestrel (Ortego *et al.*, 2007; Padilla *et*

al., 2009). Details on loci properties and primers used for their amplification are presented in

Supporting information, Table S1. All loci were amplified in five multiplex reactions using

forward 5'-fluorescent-labelled primers and the KAPA2G Fast Multiplex PCR Kit (Kapa

Biosystems). Each 12.5 μl reaction contained 2pM of each primer and 1x KAPA2G Mix and

was carried out using the following profile: an initial denaturation step of 3 min at 95 °C, 30

cycles of 15 s at 95°C, 30 s at 60 °C, 30 s at 72 °C, with a final extension step of 10 min at 72

°C. PCR products were separated and visualized using an ABI 3730xl capillary sequencer

(Applied Biosystems) and genotypes were scored by eye with STRand v.2.4.59 (Toonen &

Hughes, 2001). Randomization of samples was employed throughout lab processes to avoid

any plate/gel specific errors that might lead in population specific biases (Meirmans, 2015).

In addition, a subset of 50 individuals was re-genotyped to quantify error rates due to allelic

dropout or genotyping errors but no inconsistencies were detected. We used the package

"MsatAllele" (Alberto, 2009) in R 3.2.2 (R Core Team, 2015) to allocate alleles to their

respective size classes. Genotyping errors, due to null alleles and stuttering, were examined

for all loci and sampled populations using MICROCHECKER (Van Oosterhout *et al.*, 2004).

Two loci (Fnd1.2 and Fnd2.1) were omitted from further analyses due to the presence of null

alleles and extensive stuttering respectively, and thus the full analysis was based on the

remaining 16 microsatellite loci.

GENETIC ANALYSES

To evaluate the genetic population structure, the Bayesian clustering software

STRUCTURE 2.3.4 (Pritchard, Stephens & Donnely, 2000) was used to infer the number of

genetically homogeneous clusters present in the dataset. The analysis was conducted both

on the full dataset as well as only on the populations of CE Mediterranean region. For both

analyses we assumed the admixture ancestry model and correlated allele frequencies

(Falush, Stephens & Pritchard, 2003), using sampling location as prior information

(LOCPRIOR model; Hubisz *et al.*, 2009) as it is deemed to be more sensitive at inferring

population structure at lower levels of divergence, which is expected in good dispersers such

as birds. Runs were set with a burn-in period of 2×10^5 iterations followed by 10^6 MCMC

steps with 20 replicates for each K value (1 to 15 for the full dataset and 1 to 12 for CE

Mediterranean). STRUCTURE runs were implemented on a beowulf cluster using

PARASTRUCTURE Perl script (Lagnel, 2015) and STRUCTURE plots were constructed using

DISTRUCT (Rosenberg, 2004). The most likely value of genetic clusters, K, was evaluated

following the ΔK method (Evanno, Regnaut & Goudet, 2005) implemented in STRUCTURE

HARVESTER (Earl & Vonholdt, 2012), as well as by calculating the posterior probability for

each K. We present all cases with high probability that warrant a biological interpretation

(Meirmans, 2015) and are supported by both STRUCTURE runs.

To estimate the directional contemporary gene flow and its relative magnitude among

the breeding populations of CE Mediterranean we used the divMigrate function (Sundqvist

et al., 2016) in the R-package "diveRsity" (Keenan *et al.*, 2013). The method provides a

relative (to within the analysis) migration network graph aiming to visualize the gene flow

patterns among populations, with the resulting metric representing a proportion of the gene

flow among areas, scaled to the largest magnitude estimated. Populations are represented

as nodes and the properties of the lines connecting them are based on the relative strength

of gene flow. Populations that exhibit strong gene exchange between them but weak gene

flow with others tend to cluster closely together, reflecting patterns of genetic structure.

The method is described in detail in Sundqvist et al. (2016). We used N_M (Alcala, Goudet &

Vuilleumier, 2014) as a measure of genetic distance, and tested whether gene flow among

populations was asymmetrical using 10,000 bootstrap iterations.

Sampled populations were pooled according to the STRUCTURE and DivMigrate analyses,

and F_{ST} values between all pairs of populations were calculated with the software Arlequin

3.5.1.3 (Excoffier & Lischer, 2010). F_{ST} values were tested for statistical significance using

10000 permutations. In addition to F_{ST}, we also calculated Jost's D (D_{est}) as an unbiased

estimator of differentiation that performs better than other relatives, in cases of markers

with different number of alleles (Gerlach et al., 2010) as is the case in this study (see

Supporting information, Table S1). Pairwise D values (mean D_{est}) among populations were

calculated with the R-package "DEMEtics" (Gerlach et al., 2010) and statistical significance

was tested using 1,000 bootstrap iterations. For both estimators, p-values were adjusted for

multiple comparisons after the B-H method (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). We used IBDWS

v.3.23 (Jensen, Bohonak & Kelley, 2005) in order to obtain any statistically significant

associations between pairwise genetic ($F_{ST}/[1-F_{ST}]$) and linear geographic (log km) distance

matrices using 30,000 randomizations. The analysis was performed both on the full and the

reduced (i.e. CE Mediterranean) datasets.

To evaluate the genetic variability in each population, standard genetic diversity indices

(A: number of alleles, P: number of private alleles, H_O: observed and H_E: expected

heterozygosity) were calculated using the program GENALEX v.6.5 (Peakall & Smouse, 2012).

Allelic richness (A_R) corrected for different sample sizes and inbreeding coefficient (F_{IS}), were

calculated using FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet, 2002). The same software was used to test for

deviations from Hardy-Weinberg proportions at each locus and sampled population, as well

as for linkage disequilibrium (LD) using 1000 randomizations and adjusting significance for

multiple comparisons. Signs of recent bottlenecks were evaluated using the software

BOTTLENECK (Piry, Luikart & Cornuet, 1999). A test for heterozygosity excess was performed

using the Wilcoxon signed rank test running 1000 iterations and using the two-phase model

(TPM). As the microsatellites we used are either of dinucleotide perfect repeats or of

imperfect repeats, both of which may tend toward the infinite allele model (IAM; Cornuet

and Luikart, 1996), we fixed the proportions of the TPM in favour of the IAM (Cristescu *et al.*,

2010) including 20% of the stepwise mutation model (SMM) and 80% of IAM. We also tested

for a mode-shift distortion using a graphical approach, by plotting the number of alleles in

10 allele frequency classes with 0.1 intervals, according to Luikart *et al.* (1998). In a

population at equilibrium, alleles with frequencies in the first class (<0.1) are expected to be

more numerous than those belonging to the second class, therefore allele frequencies

present a characteristic L-shaped distribution. Plots were examined for mode-shift

distortions that would be consistent with a bottlenecked population (Luikart *et al.*, 1998;

Cristescu *et al.*, 2010). Plots were produced in R 3.2.2 and allele frequency calculations were

performed using the R package "Gstudio" (Dyer, 2014). Finally, the effective population size

(N_e) along with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated using the bias-corrected

version of the method based on linkage disequilibrium (Hill, 1981; Waples, 2006) as

implemented in NeESTIMATOR v.2.01 (Do *et al.*, 2014). N_E estimates were obtained for all

but the core populations (ES, APU, CNG) and Mongolia, as it is very difficult to obtain reliable

estimates for large populations using this method (Waples & Do, 2010).

RESULTS

All microsatellite markers were highly polymorphic across populations and the number of

alleles per locus ranged from four (loci Fnd1.4, Fp86-2, Fp89) to 38 (locus Fnd1.6; Supporting

information, Table S1).

POPULATION STRUCTURE

The Bayesian clustering method implemented in STRUCTURE suggested the presence of

considerable population structuring. When all individuals were modeled, the ΔK-method

suggested two clusters (K = 2) as the most likely population structure (although the posterior

probability was higher for K = 3; Supporting information, Figure S1, Table S2). For K = 2 the

admixture model indicated two gene pools that probably represent a European-Asian (or a

western-eastern) transition, with all European populations showing high membership

coefficients in the 'western' cluster, and the MON and LIM populations belonging to the

'eastern' one (Fig. 2). This eastern gene pool seems to be present in all populations in

Northern and Central Greece (CNG) whereas absent from all other western populations.

Lesser Kestrels from Israel (ISR) were found to be highly admixed, exhibiting a mixed

ancestry from both clusters (Fig. 2). For K = 3, the model adds another gene pool that is

mostly represented by the Trans-Adriatic populations of Croatia (CRO), Apulia (APU) and

Sicily (SIC) whereas Israel (ISR) still seems to be of mixed ancestry. All subpopulations within

Spain (SES, ES/BG) and Central Greece (TRI, LAR, VOL) showed identical admixture

proportions among them, implying no further substructure (Fig. 2).

When individuals from the CE Mediterranean were modeled separately, the ΔK-method

suggested K = 2 as the optimal number of clusters, whereas posterior probability estimates

suggested the presence of four clusters (Supporting information, Figure S2, Table S3). The

populations of Croatia (CRO) and Limnos (LIM) constitute two different genetic clusters, the

one present in Limnos (LIM) extending throughout Greek populations from Northern to

Central Greece (CNG), while two other clusters are present in all other populations in

different proportions (GIA and LES populations of western Greece form a single group). The

maximum value of five clusters further partitions the Sicilian population (SIC) as a separate

group. It is apparent that there is no substructure in the Central and Northern Greek

population, CNG (Fig. 2).

Because of the lack of any structure among the subpopulations of Central Greece (TRI,

LAR, VOL) and Kilkis (KIL), we pooled the individuals from KIL into the central Greek group

(CGR) to estimate the directional relative migration networks using divMigrate. The

migration network (Fig. 3) reflects at some level the genetic structuring revealed by

STRUCTURE analysis, as the core populations of the region (APU, CGR) cluster closely in the

network space showing high gene flow and relatively low differentiation between them. The

GIA and KAL populations also exhibited a relatively high gene flow with the core populations,

with the former (GIA) showing connection with both APU and CGR while the latter (KAL)

presents high gene flow rates only with CGR. Thus KAL was considered to be a part of the

Central-North Greek population in all subsequent analysis. However, in contrast to

STRUCTURE results the sampled populations of western Greece (GIA, LES) showed reduced

gene flow between them and appear to be differentiated. The rest of the groups showed

relatively reduced gene flow towards the core populations. It should be noted that as a

general pattern, all peripheral populations seem to exchange migrants exclusively with the

core populations but not between them, appearing isolated from each other (i.e. a star-

shaped pattern of the migration network; Fig. 3), resembling a mainland-island

metapopulation type (and not a patchy population type). However, there was no evidence

of significantly asymmetric gene flow between any pair of populations.

Pairwise F_{ST} and D_{est} values were highly correlated (Pearson's correlation: $r = 0.95$, $P <$

0.001). All but one of the differentiation values among populations were significant (Table

1). Estimates of both F_{ST} and D_{est} varied between population pairs (F_{ST}: $0.003 - 0.06$; D_{est}:

$0.02 - 0.19$), with all the core populations of Europe (Spain, Apulia, Central Greece) showing

low differentiation among them. On the other hand, Mongolia and Israel seem

differentiated from all others, while the small peripheral CE Mediterranean populations

showed higher levels of differentiation from all other populations. This was particularly

evident for the populations of Croatia and Limnos where the highest values of D_{est} were

recorded when compared to all other populations (Table 1). Mantel tests showed that

genetic distance is not significantly correlated with geographical distance across all sampled

populations ($r = 0.33$, $P = 0.1$, Fig. 4a). Conversely, genetic divergence of CE Mediterranean

populations correlated significantly with the geographical distance among them ($r = 0.57$, $P =$

0.01, Fig. 4b).

GENETIC DIVERSITY

We did not detect any notable differences in the mean allelic richness across populations.

The average H_O was 0.64, H_O and H_E were similar and F_{IS} was low in all cases (Table 2).

Private alleles were present in all sampled populations with the only exception of Croatia

(CRO). Generally, populations did not deviate from Hardy-Weinberg proportions but some

deviations of individual loci were detected: four populations (CRO, LIM, ISR, MON) showed

deviations at two, one, one and two out of the 16 loci respectively (see Supporting

information, Table S4). Since these loci did not show consistent deviations across all

populations, we included them in subsequent analyses attributing this disequilibrium in

processes specific to those populations. No LD was detected between any of the loci across

all populations. The Wilcoxon signed rank test conducted in BOTTLENECK software, detected

signs of a population bottleneck for Sicily (SIC), Limnos island (LIM) and Israel (ISR)

populations (Supporting information, Table S5). On the other hand, inspection of plots of

allele frequency classes for recent bottlenecks did not reveal any mode-shift distortion in

any of the populations. However, they did show that the Croatian population (CRO) is

moving towards allele fixation, since this was the only population that exhibited an allele

frequency in the class 0.9-1.0 (see Supporting information, Figure S3). Most of the peripheral

populations were found to have small effective population sizes (Supporting information,

Table S5), ranging from 24.2 (LIM) to 88.4 (LES). However, in some cases (SIC, LES and ISR

populations) results should be treated with caution as 95% CIs were broad.

DISCUSSION

Across all sampled populations, STRUCTURE analysis suggested the presence of two

major clusters (Fig. 2) concurring with the longitudinal distribution of the species; a

'western' (European) and an 'eastern' (Asian) cluster that are both represented in the

population of Israel. This result reflects the proposed phylogeographic pattern of the

species; based on the mitochondrial Cyt b region, European and Asian populations were

found to be divergent whereas birds from Israel seem to cluster with both of them indicating

a degree of genetic mixing (Wink *et al.*, 2004). Interestingly, a comparison of plumage

patterns of Lesser Kestrels unveiled substantial differences between individuals of European

and Chinese descent whereas birds from Asian/Middle East populations (including Israel)

exhibit an intermediate plumage pattern (Corso *et al.*, 2016). In addition, this eastern cluster

is highly represented in the eastern Greek population of Limnos Island (LIM) and extends

gradually up to central Greece suggesting a population consisting of birds of eastern origin

possibly from populations of Asia Minor. Future inclusion of samples from Western Anatolia

(i.e. Turkey) and the Middle East could shed light on such hypotheses.

Despite the high number of private alleles, suggesting that gene flow could be restricted

(at some level), our analysis showed low F_{ST} values among the core populations of Europe

(Spain, Apulia region in Italy and Central Greece) which is in concordance with previous

larger-scale studies (Alcaide *et al.*, 2008b). However, we should note that the degree that F_{ST}

reflects population differentiation can be affected in populations that exhibit high genetic

diversity and similar allele frequency patterns, albeit different frequencies of rare alleles

(Hedrick, 1999; Meirmans & Hedrick, 2011; Jakobsson, Edge & Rosenberg, 2013). D_{est} on the

other hand, generally showed higher values of differentiation among populations including

the core ones (ES and APU). We found significant levels of differentiation among CE

Mediterranean populations (Table 1) and a correlation of pairwise genetic and geographic

distance. We should note that STRUCTURE may overestimate genetic structure in datasets

characterized by such correlation (Frantz *et al.*, 2009) thus explaining the high number of

clusters supported in the region (Fig. 2). Correlation between genetic and geographic

distance has been previously reported for the species at both local (Ortego *et al.*, 2008b) and

large spatial scales (Alcaide *et al.*, 2008a; Alcaide *et al.*, 2008b) and can be driven by the

distance-dependent dispersal exhibited by the species (Serrano & Tella, 2003; Serrano *et al.*,

2003; Ortego *et al.*, 2008b). It has been proposed that sufficient gene flow and large

effective population sizes could prevent any genetic impoverishment that is due to random

genetic drift in the species (Alcaide *et al.*, 2008b). This is partially true for our study. Some

long-distance dispersal events that could have facilitated gene flow among populations have

been reported across the CE Mediterranean (Gustin, Mendi & Pedrelli, 2011; Bounas *et al.*

2016a). Actually, restricted dispersal in a fragmented range, coupled with high philopatry

rates, along with a relatively short generation time of the species (average lifespan of 4-6

years; Newton & Olsen, 1990; Negro, 1997), might have contributed to a more frequent

individual turnover in the breeding colonies thus allowing relatively quick changes in allele

frequencies that led to the patterns of genetic differentiation observed in the region (Ortego

et al., 2008a).

Our results suggest that the past population declines have left genetic bottleneck signs in

four populations across the species' range. The Israeli population (ISR) has gone through a

steep decline and is estimated to be less than 10% of the population prior to 1950 (Liven-

Schulman *et al.*, 2004). However, the high levels of diversity we found despite the small N_E

could be a result of its genetic admixture. Bottleneck signs were also detected in two of the

peripheral populations in the CE Mediterranean region (SIC, LIM), that were also

differentiated and showed a relatively limited gene flow with other populations (Fig. 3) and

small N_E but nevertheless similar diversity patterns. Despite its small N_E, Ioannina (GIA)

population exhibits high levels of diversity and gene flow with both core populations of CE

Mediterranean (APU, CNG), a process that can alleviate the bottleneck effects. In addition,

genetic drift could also play a role on the observed genetic patterns of populations in the

region, since they exhibit small size and limited gene flow with other populations. This is

particularly evident in the small Croatian population. This population consists of only 25

pairs and was recently discovered (Mikulic *et al.*, 2013). Therefore we are ignorant regarding

its history, that is if the population may have been recently colonized or present historically

and simply not detected. The population did not show any signs of bottleneck but there

seems to be a loss of rare alleles, including private alleles, as well as signs of allele fixation

(Table 2, Supporting information, Figure S3). Despite that, there is no observed decrease in

heterozygosity, which could be consistent with a scenario of a recently founded population

that experienced the effects of genetic drift, since heterozygosity can be relatively

insensitive to the loss of rare alleles due to drift (Allendorf, 1986; Allendorf, Aitken & Luikart,

2013).

Finally, we should consider that the genetic structure of long-distance migrants cannot be

unambiguously defined based solely on the spatial distribution of their breeding sites (Esler,

2000). Despite its pronounced philopatry, the Lesser Kestrel is a potentially good disperser

thus not limited by geographical barriers. However, barriers to dispersal may be caused by

other factors such as non-breeding distributions (Szczys, Oswald & Arnold, 2017), these

being either wintering grounds (Rodríguez *et al.*, 2011), migration routes or even

premigratory sites that exist in the study region (Minias *et al.*, 2009; Bounas *et al.*, 2016b), as

well as breeding phenology that could for example lead to assortative mating and

consequently affect the genetic structure of populations (Casagrande *et al.*, 2006). Given the

recent advances in genomics, future work examining such factors could provide a better

understanding of the underlying processes shaping the genetic structure of the species in

the region.

According to our results, the genetic structure of the CE Mediterranean populations of the

Lesser Kestrel appears to reflect to some extent the demographic decline that led to its

range fragmentation. In addition, in spite of bottleneck signs in some of the peripheral

populations within the CE Mediterranean, allelic diversity was not lower than in core

populations. Therefore, we suggest the management of the whole CE Mediterranean

population as a single conservation unit (ESU). However, the population could be divided

into four different management units (MUs) since three peripheral populations (CRO, LIM,

SIC) showed limited migration rates and different allele frequencies from all the other

populations. These processes along with their small effective and census population sizes

could eventually render them vulnerable to extinction. Thus a mixed conservation strategy

that aims to preserve the existent high diversity of the core populations of Italy and Greece,

while focusing on the recovery of bottlenecked peripheral populations (SIC, LIM), should be

appropriate for the conservation of the species in the region. Prevention of the negative

effects of drift in the peripheral populations could imply actions towards increasing

population sizes and dispersal rates among them, by promoting the expansion of natural

populations and the foundation of new colonies.

Increase of population sizes could be achieved by translocations of individuals from the

core populations to the peripheral or newly founded colonies. In fact, reintroductions could

be a more effective way to establish populations than the natural expansion of existing ones

(Morandini *et al.*, 2017). As mentioned before, the individuals from Bulgaria used in this

study were actually of Spanish origin (ES/BG), that have been translocated in the country for

the reinforcement of the species within the framework of LIFE11 NAT/BG/360 Project

(Gradev *et al.*, 2015). Based solely on our results from the microsatellite analysis, it seems to

be an acceptable action since this population was found to exhibit high diversity and low

differentiation from all the others. However, the fact that our results were based solely on

the analysis of selectively neutral loci prevents us from conclusions regarding the adaptive

and evolutionary consequences of the specific action (Holderegger, Kamm & Gugerli, 2006).

Although translocations could restore the genetic variation in the short-term (Bouzat *et al.*,

2009), the Iberian and CE Mediterranean Lesser Kestrels follow clearly different migration

routes and could possibly have different genetic adaptations (Pulido, 2007; Rodríguez *et al.*,

2011). Thus any future translocation programmes should consider maximizing both the

genetic and the adaptive similarity between populations (Edmands, 2007). Undoubtedly,

genetic monitoring (Schwartz, Luikart & Waples, 2007) would be a useful practice for this

reintroduced population especially for future captive breeding schemes in the region. In the

meanwhile, since the proposed conservation strategies could be fruitful in the long-term,

monitoring of demographic parameters such as population size, breeding success and

survival, as well as the genetic diversity of the small peripheral populations after few

generations, would be highly desirable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Action for Wildlife and ANIMA rehabilitation centers, the Lesser Kestrel

Recovery project team (LIFE11 NAT/BG/360), J. Hernandez-Pliego and G. Giglio for helping

with sample collection. D. Vavylis, G. Vakis and E. Toli assisted in the fieldwork. LIFE for the

Lesser Kestrel project team (LIFE+ 11 NAT/GR/1011), and namely K. Vlachopoulos, S.

Polymeros and A. Evangelidis greatly helped with sampling in Central Greece. N. Chakarov

and M. Stubbe kindly provided samples from Mongolia and we are thankful for that. V.

Saravia, P. Kordopatis and S. Marin provided valuable comments on a previous draft of this

manuscript. This study was financially supported by a scholarship awarded to A.B. by the

A.G. Leventis Foundation.

REFERENCES

Alberto F. 2009. MsatAllele_1. 0: an R package to visualize the binning of microsatellite
alleles. *Journal of Heredity* **100**: 394-397.
Alcaide M, Edwards SV, Negro JJ, Serrano D, Tella JL. 2008a. Extensive polymorphism and
geographical variation at a positively selected MHC class II B gene of the lesser
kestrel (Falco naumanni). *Molecular Ecology* **17**: 2652-2665.
Alcaide M, Serrano D, Negro JJ, Tella JL, Laaksonen T, Müller C, Gal A, Korpimäki E. 2008b.
Population fragmentation leads to isolation by distance but not genetic
impoverishment in the philopatric Lesser Kestrel: a comparison with the widespread
and sympatric Eurasian Kestrel. *Heredity* **102**: 190-198.
Alcaide M, Serrano D, Tella JL, Negro JJ. 2009. Strong philopatry derived from capture–
recapture records does not lead to fine-scale genetic differentiation in Lesser
Kestrels. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **78**: 468-475.
Alcala N, Goudet J, Vuilleumier S. 2014. On the transition of genetic differentiation from
isolation to panmixia: what we can learn from GST and D. *Theoretical population*
biology **93**: 75-84.
Allendorf FW. 1986. Genetic drift and the loss of alleles versus heterozygosity. *Zoo Biology*
5: 181-190.
Allendorf FW, Aitken SN, Luikart G. 2013. *Conservation and the genetics of populations.* 2nd
edn. Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
Amos W, Balmford A. 2001. When does conservation genetics matter? *Heredity* **87**: 257-
265.
Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful
approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the royal statistical society* **57**: 289-300.
BirdLife International. 2004. Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation
status. BirdLife Conservation Series, Cambridge.
BirdLife International. 2017a. European birds of conservation concern: populations, trends
and national responsibilities. BirdLife International, Cambridge.
BirdLife International. 2017b. Species factsheet: *Falco naumanni.* Downloaded from
http://www.birdlife.org on 21/03/2017.
Bounas A, Panuccio M, Evangelidis A, Sotiropoulos K, Barboutis C. 2016a. The Migration of
the Lesser Kestrel Falco naumanni in Eastern Europe-A Ringing Recovery and Direct
Observation Approach. *Acrocephalus* **37**: 49-56.
Bounas A, Tsiakiris R, Vlachopoulos K, Bukas N, Stara K, Sotiropoulos K. 2016b. Large
Premigratory Roost of Lesser Kestrels (Falco naumanni) in Ioannina City, Greece:
Trends, Roost Characteristics, and Implications for Conservation. *Journal of Raptor*
Research **50**: 416-421.
Bouzat JL, Johnson JA, Toepfer JE, Simpson SA, Esker TL, Westemeier RL. 2009. Beyond the
beneficial effects of translocations as an effective tool for the genetic restoration of
isolated populations. *Conservation Genetics* **10**: 191-201.
Casagrande S, Dell'Omo G, Costantini D, Tagliavini J. 2006. Genetic differences between
early-and late-breeding Eurasian kestrels. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **8**: 1029-
1038.
Cornuet JM, Luikart G. 1996. Description and power analysis of two tests for detecting
recent population bottlenecks from allele frequency data. *Genetics* **144**: 2001–2014.
Corso A, Vigano M, Jansen JJ, Starnini L. 2016. Geographical plumage variation in Lesser
Kestrel. *Dutch Birding* **38**: 271-292.

Cramp S, Simmons K. 1980. Birds of the Western Palearctic, Vol. 2: Oxford University Press,
Oxford.
Cristescu R, Sherwin WB, Handasyde K, Cahill V, Cooper DW. 2010. Detecting bottlenecks
using BOTTLENECK 1.2. 02 in wild populations: the importance of the microsatellite
structure. *Conservation Genetics* **11**: 1043-1049.
Di Maggio R, Mengoni C, Mucci N, Campobello D, Randi E, Sarà M. 2014. Do not disturb the
family: roles of colony size and human disturbance in the genetic structure of lesser
kestrel. *Journal of Zoology* **295**: 108-115.
Do C, Waples RS, Peel D, Macbeth G, Tillett BJ, Ovenden JR. 2014. NeEstimator v2:
re-implementation of software for the estimation of contemporary effective
population size (Ne) from genetic data. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **14**: 209-214.
Dyer R. 2014. GSTUDIO: Analyses and functions related to the spatial analysis of genetic
marker data. *R package version* 3.
Earl DA, vonHoldt BM. 2012. STRUCTURE HARVESTER: a website and program for visualizing
STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method. *Conservation Genetics*
Resources **4**: 359-361.
Edmands S. 2007. Between a rock and a hard place: evaluating the relative risks of
inbreeding and outbreeding for conservation and management. *Molecular Ecology*
16: 463-475.
Esler D. 2000. Applying metapopulation theory to conservation of migratory birds.
Conservation Biology **14**: 366-372.
Evanno G, Regnaut S, Goudet J. 2005. Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using
the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. *Molecular Ecology* **14**: 2611-2620.
Excoffier L, Lischer HE. 2010. Arlequin suite ver 3.5: a new series of programs to perform
population genetics analyses under Linux and Windows. *Molecular Ecology*
Resources **10**: 564-567.
Fahrig L. 2003. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology,*
Evolution, and Systematics **34**: 487-515.
Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK. 2003. Inference of population structure using multilocus
genotype data: linked loci and correlated allele frequencies. *Genetics* **164**: 1567-
1587.
Frankham R, Ballou JD, Briscoe DA. 2002. *Introduction to conservation genetics.* 2nd edn.
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Frantz A, Cellina S, Krier A, Schley L, Burke T. 2009. Using spatial Bayesian methods to
determine the genetic structure of a continuously distributed population: clusters or
isolation by distance? *Journal of Applied Ecology* **46**: 493-505.
Gerlach G, Jueterbock A, Kraemer P, Deppermann J, Harmand P. 2010. Calculations of
population differentiation based on GST and D: forget GST but not all of statistics!
Molecular Ecology **19**: 3845-3852.
Goudet J. 2002. FSTAT version 2.9. 3.2, a program to estimate and test gene diversities and
fixation indices. *Institute of Ecology, Lausanne, Switzerland. Website http://www2.*
unil. ch/popgen/softwares/fstat. htm [accessed 20 August 2012].
Gradev G, Marin S, Zhelev P, Antolin J. 2015. Recovering the Lesser kestrel (*Falco*
naumanni) as a breeder in Bulgaria. First National Conference of Reintroduction of
Conservation-reliant Species, Presses Universitaire St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, 136-
144.
Gustin M, Mendi M, Pedrelli M. 2011. Grillaio nato a Montescaglioso (MT) si riproduce in
Emilia-Romagna. *Picus* **37**: 83 (in Italian).
Gustin M, Ferrarini A, Giglio G, Pellegrino S, Scaravelli D. 2013. Il Parco per il Grillaio *(Falco*
naumanni) nel Parco Nazionale dell' alta Murgia. Recupero pulli, divulgazione e
monitoraggio. Technical report, Lipu Press, Parma (in Italian).

Hanski I, Gaggiotti OE. 2004. *Ecology, genetics, and evolution of metapopulations*. Academic
Press.
Hedrick PW. 1999. Perspective: highly variable loci and their interpretation in evolution and
conservation. *Evolution* **53**: 313-318.
Hill WG. 1981. Estimation of effective population size from data on linkage disequilibrium.
Genetical research **38**: 209-216.
Holderegger R, Kamm U, Gugerli F. 2006. Adaptive vs. neutral genetic diversity: implications
for landscape genetics. *Landscape Ecology* **21**: 797-807.
Hubisz MJ, Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK. 2009. Inferring weak population structure
with the assistance of sample group information. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **9**:
1322-1332.
Iñigo A, Barov B. 2010. Action Plan for the Lesser Kestrel (Falco naumanni) in the European
Union. SEO Birdlife & Birdlife International for the European Commision, Madrid.
Jakobsson M, Edge MD, Rosenberg NA. 2013. The relationship between FST and the
frequency of the most frequent allele. *Genetics* **193**: 515-528.
Jensen JL, Bohonak AJ, Kelley ST. 2005. Isolation by distance, web service. *BMC genetics* **6**:
13.
Keenan K, McGinnity P, Cross TF, Crozier WW, Prodöhl PA. 2013. diveRsity: an R package
for the estimation and exploration of population genetics parameters and their
associated errors. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **4**: 782-788.
Kmetova E, Zhelev P, Mechev A, Gradev G, Ivanov I. 2012. Natural Colonies of Lesser
Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) in European Turkey and Discussion on the Chances of
Natural Re-colonization of the Species in Bulgaria. *Acta Zoologica Bulgarica* **4**: 47-54.
Lagnel J. 2015. ParaStructure. GitHub repository https://github.com/jacqueslagnel/
parastructure.
Liven-Schulman I, Leshem Y, Alon D, Yom-Tov Y. 2004. Causes of population declines of the
Lesser Kestrel Falco naumanni in Israel. *Ibis* **146**: 145-152.
Luikart G, Allendorf F, Cornuet J, Sherwin W. 1998. Distortion of allele frequency
distributions provides a test for recent population bottlenecks. *Journal of Heredity*
89: 238-247.
Meirmans PG. 2015. Seven common mistakes in population genetics and how to avoid
them. *Molecular Ecology* **24**: 3223-3231.
Meirmans PG, Hedrick PW. 2011. Assessing population structure: FST and related measures.
Molecular Ecology Resources **11**: 5-18.
Mikulic K, Ivan Budinski, Antica Culina, Luka Jurinovic, Lucic V. 2013. The return of the
Lesser Kestrel (Falco naumanni) as a breeding bird to Croatia. *Acrocephalus* **34**: 71-
74.
Minias P, Kaczmarek K, Piasecka A, Kuncewicz M. 2009. Large Roost of Lesser Kestrels in
Southeastern Albania. *Journal of Raptor Research* **43**: 166-167.
Morandini V, Benito E, Newton I, Ferrer M. 2017. Natural expansion versus translocation in
a previously human-persecuted bird of prey. *Ecology and Evolution* **7**: 3682-3688.
Moritz C. 1994. Defining 'evolutionarily significant units' for conservation. *Trends in Ecology*
& Evolution **9**: 373-375.
Negro JJ. 1997. Lesser Kestrel *Falco naumanni*. Birds of the Western Palaearctic. Update 1,
49-56..
Negro JJ, Hiraldo F, Donázar JA. 1997. Causes of natal dispersal in the lesser kestrel:
inbreeding avoidance or resource competition? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **66**: 640-
648.
Nesje M, Røed KH, Lifjeld JT, Lindberg P, Steen OF. 2000. Genetic relationships in the
peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus) analysed by microsatellite DNA markers.
Molecular Ecology **9**: 53-60.

Newton I, Olsen P. 1990. *Birds of prey.* Merehurst Press, London.
Ortego J, Aparicio JM, Cordero PJ, Calabuig G. 2008a. Individual genetic diversity correlates
with the size and spatial isolation of natal colonies in a bird metapopulation.
Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences **275**: 2039-2047.
Ortego J, Calabuig G, Aparicio JM, Cordero PJ. 2008b. Genetic consequences of natal
dispersal in the colonial lesser kestrel. *Molecular Ecology* **17**: 2051-2059.
Ortego J, González EG, Sánchez-Barbudo I, Aparicio JM, Cordero PJ. 2007. Novel highly
polymorphic loci and cross-amplified microsatellites for the lesser kestrel Falco
naumanni. *Ardeola* **54**: 101-108.
**Padilla JA, Parejo JC, Salazar J, Martínez-Trancón M, Rabasco A, Sansinforiano E, Quesada
A. 2009.** Isolation and characterization of polymorphic microsatellite markers in
lesser kestrel (Falco naumanni) and cross-amplification in common kestrel (Falco
tinnunculus). *Conservation Genetics* **10**: 1357-1360.
Palsbøll PJ, Berube M, Allendorf FW. 2007. Identification of management units using
population genetic data. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **22**: 11-16.
Peakall R, Smouse PE. 2012. GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic
software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics* **28**: 2537-2539.
Piry S, Luikart G, Cornuet JM. 1999. BOTTLENECK: a computer program for detecting recent
reductions in the effective size using allele frequency data. *Journal of Heredity* **90**:
502-503.
Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P. 2000. Inference of population structure using
multilocus genotype data. *Genetics* **155**: 945-959.
Pulido F. 2007. The genetics and evolution of avian migration. *Bioscience* **57**: 165-174.
R Core Team. 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available at: https://www.R-project.org/.
Rodriguez A, Alcaide M, Negro JJ, Pilard P. 2011. Using major histocompatibility complex
markers to assign the geographic origin of migratory birds: examples from the
threatened lesser kestrel. *Animal Conservation* **14**: 306-313.
Rosenberg NA. 2004. DISTRUCT: a program for the graphical display of population structure.
Molecular Ecology Notes **4**: 137-138.
Sarà M. 2010. Climate and land-use changes as determinants of lesser kestrel Falco
naumanni abundance in Mediterranean cereal steppes (Sicily). *Ardeola* **57**: 3-22.
Schwartz MK, Luikart G, Waples RS. 2007. Genetic monitoring as a promising tool for
conservation and management. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **22**: 25-33.
Serrano D, Tella JL. 2003. Dispersal within a spatially structured population of lesser
kestrels: the role of spatial isolation and conspecific attraction. *Journal of Animal
Ecology* **72**: 400-410.
Serrano D, Tella JL, Donázar JA, Pomarol M. 2003. Social and individual features affecting
natal dispersal in the colonial lesser kestrel. *Ecology* **84**: 3044-3054.
Sundqvist L, Keenan K, Zackrisson M, Prodöhl P, Kleinhans D. 2016. Directional genetic
differentiation and relative migration. *Ecology and Evolution* **6**: 3461-3475.
Szczys P, Oswald SA, Arnold JM. 2017. Conservation implications of long-distance migration
routes: Regional metapopulation structure, asymmetrical dispersal, and population
declines. *Biological Conservation* **209**: 263-272.
Taylor B, Dizon A. 1999. First policy then science: why a management unit based solely on
genetic criteria cannot work. *Molecular Ecology* **8**.
Toonen RJ, Hughes S. 2001. Increased throughput for fragment analysis on an ABI Prism®
377 automated sequencer using a membrane comb and STRand software.
Biotechniques **31**: 1320-1325.

Uzunova D, Lisichanets E. 2016. Lesser Kestrel's population and conservation status in
Macedonia. In: *Abstracts of the International Lesser Kestrel Expert Workshop*,
Plovdiv, Bulgaria.
Van Oosterhout C, Hutchinson WF, Wills DP, Shipley P. 2004. MICRO-CHECKER: software for
identifying and correcting genotyping errors in microsatellite data. *Molecular*
Ecology Notes **4**: 535-538.
Vucetich JA, Waite TA. 2003. Spatial patterns of demography and genetic processes across
the species' range: null hypotheses for landscape conservation genetics.
Conservation Genetics **4**: 639-645.
Waples RS. 2006. A bias correction for estimates of effective population size based on
linkage disequilibrium at unlinked gene loci. *Conservation Genetics* **7**: 167.
Waples RS, Do C. 2010. Linkage disequilibrium estimates of contemporary Ne using highly
variable genetic markers: a largely untapped resource for applied conservation and
evolution. *Evolutionary Applications* **3**: 244-262.
Wink M, Sauer-Gurth H, Pepler D. 2004. Phylogeographic relationships of the Lesser Kestrel
(Falco naumanni) in breeding and wintering quarters inferred from nucleotide
sequences of the mitochondrial cytochrome b gene. Raptors worldwide**,** 505-510.

Figure 1. Map of the Lesser Kestrel populations used in the present study. SES: Andalucia,

ES/BG: Extremadura, APU: Apulia, SIC: Sicily, CRO: Croatia, GIA: Ioannina, LES: Agrinio, TRI:

Trikala, LAR: Larisa, VOL: Volos, KIL: Kilkis, KAL: Komotini, LIM: Limnos, ISR: Israel, MON:

Mongolia. Shaded areas represent the breeding distribution of the Lesser Kestrel (modified

from BirdLife International). Sampling sites pooled for the analyses are circled (ES: Spain;

CNG: Central-North Greece)

Figure 2. Admixture proportions (proportions of membership to each of K inferred clusters) of

individual Lesser Kestrels. Upper plots correspond to the number of clusters when the full

dataset was modeled (K = 2, K = 3), whereas the lower 3 plots show admixture proportions of

the CE Mediterranean populations only, for K=2, K=4 and K=5 inferred clusters respectively

Figure 3. Directional relative migration networks of grouped Lesser Kestrel populations from

CE Mediterranean. Networks were visualized with divMigrate using Alcala's Nm. (a) all relative

migration rate values (b) only values above 0.2 threshold (c) only gene flow values estimated

>0.4. Line shading and thickness increases with the relative strength of gene flow. APU: Apulia

and CGR: Central Greece are the largest (core) populations. SIC: Sicily, CRO: Croatia, GIA:

Ioannina, LES: Agrinio, KAL: Komotini, LIM: Limnos are the smaller peripheral populations

Figure 4. Correlation of genetic divergence with linear geographic distance for (a) all Lesser

Kestrel populations sampled in this study and (b) Lesser Kestrel populations across CE

Mediterranean

Table 1. Pairwise F_{ST} values (below diagonal) and D_{est} values (above diagonal) among Lesser Kestrel populations. Statistically significant values after B-H

correction for multiple comparisons are given in bold

	ES	APU	SIC	CRO	GIA	LES	CNG	LIM	ISR	MON
ES	-	**0.024**	**0.097**	**0.134**	**0.050**	**0.049**	**0.018**	**0.152**	**0.061**	**0.109**
APU	0.003	-	**0.100**	**0.103**	**0.076**	**0.072**	**0.025**	**0.143**	**0.054**	**0.121**
SIC	**0.031**	**0.029**	-	**0.167**	**0.105**	**0.128**	**0.092**	**0.175**	**0.115**	**0.183**
CRO	**0.032**	**0.026**	**0.048**	-	**0.152**	**0.117**	**0.116**	**0.191**	**0.117**	**0.168**
GIA	**0.015**	**0.019**	**0.035**	**0.044**	-	**0.077**	**0.044**	**0.143**	**0.088**	**0.151**
LES	**0.014**	**0.019**	**0.038**	**0.033**	**0.029**	-	**0.062**	**0.183**	**0.074**	**0.158**
CNG	0.004	0.008	**0.028**	**0.032**	0.012	**0.020**	-	**0.115**	**0.052**	**0.097**
LIM	**0.035**	**0.036**	**0.051**	**0.064**	**0.041**	**0.046**	**0.026**	-	**0.152**	**0.143**
ISR	**0.018**	**0.015**	**0.029**	**0.035**	**0.029**	**0.022**	**0.020**	**0.045**	-	**0.094**
MON	**0.034**	**0.042**	**0.055**	**0.059**	**0.052**	**0.053**	**0.033**	**0.042**	**0.033**	-

684 **Table 2** Measures of genetic variation of the Lesser Kestrel populations. Number of

685 genotyped individuals (N), number of alleles per locus (A), allelic richness (A_R), observed (H_O)

686 and expected (H_E) heterozygosity, number of private alleles (P) and inbreeding coefficient

687 (F_{IS}). Values are presented as means ± standard error (in brackets)

Code	Location	N	A	A_R	H_O	H_E	P	F_{IS}
ES	Spain	44	9.4 (1.6)	5.6 (0.6)	0.657 (0.039)	0.695 (0.038)	8	0.062 (0.036)
APU	Apulia	44	9.4 (1.5)	5.5 (0.6)	0.669 (0.038)	0.707 (0.036)	3	0.053 (0.025)
SIC	Sicily	12	5.9 (0.8)	5.1 (0.6)	0.682 (0.038)	0.667 (0.041)	2	-0.045 (0.045)
CRO	Croatia	14	5.6 (0.6)	4.7 (0.5)	0.654 (0.048)	0.650 (0.048)	0	-0.023 (0.043)
GIA	Ioannina	24	7.6 (1.1)	5.2 (0.6)	0.634 (0.051)	0.654 (0.048)	2	0.036 (0.031)
LES	Agrinio	16	6.7 (0.8)	5.4 (0.6)	0.603 (0.058)	0.684 (0.042)	2	0.136 (0.047)
CNG	Central-North Greece	93	10.8 (2.0)	5.5 (0.6)	0.660 (0.050)	0.694 (0.044)	3	0.053 (0.033)
LIM	Limnos	11	5.1 (0.6)	4.8 (0.5)	0.661 (0.060)	0.667 (0.041)	1	0.024 (0.060)
ISR	Israel	20	7.3 (1.1)	5.5 (0.7)	0.619 (0.062)	0.682 (0.042)	5	0.124 (0.055)
MON	Mongolia	17	7.2 (1.0)	5.4 (0.6)	0.585 (0.057)	0.655 (0.049)	10	0.155 (0.046)