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]*Movement Ecology Laboratory, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, Edmond J.*

Safra campus, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, IL-9190401, Israel.

[5]*Green Balkans NGO, 1Skopie 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, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-

6724-0151

Abstract

The Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) has suffered from both population decline 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 where a

significant correlation between genetic and geographic distance was observed. We detected

signs of genetic bottlenecks in some of the peripheral populations, values of genetic

differentiation among populations were rather small, albeit most of them significant,

whereas gene flow levels were relatively low among the discontinuously distributed

populations of CE Mediterranean region. We argue that the observed spatial genetic

structure can be attributed to the combined influence of recent population declines, range

fragmentation and species' philopatric behaviour. Finally, we discuss how management

strategies should focus in the maintenance of current genetic diversity levels and the

avoidance of inbreeding depression through restoration of gene flow rates among peripheral

populations.

Keywords: Genetic Diversity, Genetic Structure, Falco naumanni, Microsatellites, Migration

Rates, Population Fragmentation

Introduction

Measuring genetic variation and connectivity among populations allows the understanding

of the influential impact of both historical events and contemporary processes. Besides, this

constitutes an essential goal of conservation genetics (Frankham et al. 2010; Allendorf et al.

2013). Fragmentation and isolation of populations may lead to severe demographic

alterations, which in turn can have major genetic consequences in wild populations.

Depending on the degree of fragmentation, coupled with the species' dispersal capability,

partially or totally impeded connectivity could eventually lead to increased genetic

differentiation as well as to considerable reduction of population size (Fahrig 2003). Such

highly fragmented and locally isolated populations are expected to be susceptible to the

combined influence of genetic drift and inbreeding, which might result in loss of genetic

diversity as well as in fitness reduction, further compromising their adaptive potential and

viability in a changing environment (Amos & Balmford 2001; Frankham et al. 2010).

Considering the spatial distribution of population fragments, the above impacts are

expected to be more prominent in the peripheral ones, where population sizes can vary

intensely with time, rather than in the core populations (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 (Moritz 1994; Taylor & Dizon 1999; Palsbøll et al. 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*) 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 (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), where the two largest populations located

in the Apulia-Basilicata area of southern Italy and in Central Greece still hold several

thousand pairs (BirdLife International 2004; Gustin et al. 2013). Smaller geographically

peripheral populations, 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 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). Certain conservation actions, including

population reinforcement, improvement of nesting conditions and maintenance of habitat

quality, were mainly implemented in Western Europe and have led to a stabilization and

slightly positive population trend thus recently leading to the down-listing of the species

status from Vulnerable to Least Concern (BirdLife International 2017b). However,

conservation actions have only recently been implemented in CE Mediterranean.

Several previous studies have been examining the genetic structure of the species and

the underlying processes, at both continental (Wink et al. 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,

the size and the degree of spatial isolation of populations have been suspected as potential

factors causing varying levels of gene flow among populations that consequently could

create fine-scale genetic structuring (Ortego et al. 2008b; Alcaide et al. 2009). However, such

restricted gene flow patterns do not necessarily result from physical barriers to 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, returning to breed close to

its natal or previous breeding territory (Negro et al. 1997; Serrano & Tella 2003; Bounas et

al. 2016a). Such behavior could further enhance any effects of fragmentation (Greenwood

1980).

In this study, we examine the genetic structure of Lesser Kestrel populations firstly on a

larger scale across the species distribution as well as focusing on the patchily distributed

populations of CE Mediterranean. We aim to identify any patterns of genetic variation and

gene flow among populations shaped by their decline and subsequent fragmentation that

took place in the region. Such knowledge could be of crucial importance for conservation

programs to identify the need of local level conservation actions and thus help to determine

the appropriate conservation strategy in the region.

Materials 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 from Extremadura, Spain (ES/BG) were used for the reinforcement of the species

in Bulgaria (Fig.1). A total of 295 unrelated individuals were sampled during four consecutive

breeding seasons (2013 - 2016) with the exception of Spanish samples (SES) that were

collected in 2007. A single fledgling per brood, to avoid relatedness, and few adult birds

were caught by hand in the nesting crevice whereas in some cases adults were trapped by

mist nets close to the nest. 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.

Microsatellite amplification and genotyping

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

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

false alleles 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 Micro-Checker (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 variability in each breeding population, standard genetic diversity

indices (A: number of alleles, P: number of private alleles, Ho: observed and He: expected

heterozygosity and Fis: inbreeding coefficient) were calculated using the program GenAlEx

version 6.5 (Peakall & Smouse 2012). Allelic richness (Ar) corrected for different sample

sizes, was calculated using FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet 2002). Deviations from Hardy-Weinberg

proportions at each locus and sampled population and linkage disequilibrium (LD) were

tested in Genepop 4.2 (Rousset 2008) following program's default settings. Signs of recent

bottlenecks were evaluated using the software Bottleneck (Piry et al. 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

IAM (Cornuet and Luikart 1996), we fixed the proportions of the TPM to include 5% of SMM

and 95% of IAM (Cristescu et al. 2010). 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).

To evaluate the genetic population structure, the Bayesian clustering software Structure

2.3.4 (Pritchard et al. 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 et al. 2003), using

sampling location as prior information (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 et al. 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).

The software Arlequin 3.5.1.3 (Excoffier & Lischer 2010) was used to calculate F_{st} values

between all pairs of sampled populations, as a measure of population differentiation, and

test them for statistical significance (10,000 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 (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 et al. 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.

Finally, the breeding populations of CE Mediterranean were grouped according to

Structure results as well as F_{st} and D_{est} calculations, and the directional contemporary gene

flow and its relative magnitude among them was estimated using 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 Nm

(Alcala et al. 2014) as a measure of genetic distance, and tested whether gene flow among

populations was asymmetrical using 10,000 bootstrap iterations.

Results

Genetic diversity

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; Table S1).

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

however, the two island populations of Croatia (CRO) and Limnos (LIM) exhibited lower

values than the others. The average Ho was 0.65, Ho and He were similar and F was low in

all cases (Table 1). Private alleles were present at a low frequency in all sampled populations

but absent in those from Croatia (CRO), Komotini (KAL) and one subpopulation in Central

Greece (TRI). Generally, loci and populations conformed to Hardy-Weinberg proportions but

some deviations were detected: three populations (CRO, ISR, MON) showed deviations at

two, one and three out of the 16 loci respectively. 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), Agrinio (LES), Limnos

island (LIM) and Israel (ISR) populations (Table S2). 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 (Figure S1).

Population structure

The Bayesian clustering method implemented in Structure suggested the presence of

considerable population structuring. The results were consistent for both the full and the

reduced dataset. 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; Figure S2, Table S3). 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 up to Central Greece (CGR) 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 (Fig. 2).

Finally, for K = 5, the western and eastern clusters are further partitioned: the two

populations of western Greece (GIA, LES) stand out as a single group, Mongolia (MON) is

represented as a single cluster and one cluster is present in Limnos Island (LIM), gradually

extending to all populations up to Central Greece (CGR). Israel (ISR) was found to be

extensively admixed, while 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 (Figure S3, Table S4). Population structure proved to

be rather consistent with the previous runs when the full dataset was used: the populations

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

in Limnos (LIM) extending throughout Greek populations up to Central Greece (CGR), while

two other clusters are present in all other populations in different proportions (again the 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 Greek core population, CGR (Fig. 2).

Pairwise F_{st} and D_{est} values were highly correlated (Pearson's correlation: r = 0.94, p<

0.001) and consistent with Structure groupings. However, differentiation values among

populations were not very high albeit most of them significant (Table 2). Estimates of both

F_{st} and D_{est} varied between population pairs (F_{st}: 0.00 − 0.06; D_{est}: 0.00 − 0.18), with

geographically proximate populations showing no differentiation at all (e.g. subpopulations

of Spain and Central Greece). In addition, the population of Kilkis (KIL) showed no

differentiation from the Central Greek one (CGR) and all the core populations of Europe

(Spain, Apulia, Central Greece) showed very low or no differentiation among them. On the

other hand, Mongolia and Israel seem rather differentiated from all others, while the small

peripheral CE Mediterranean populations showed low to medium 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 2). Mantel tests showed that genetic distance is not significantly

correlated with geographical distance across all sampled populations (r = 0.33, p = 0.1, Fig.

3a). Conversely, genetic divergence of CE Mediterranean populations correlated significantly

with the geographical distance among them (r = 0.57, p = 0.01, Fig. 3b).

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. 4) reflects the genetic structuring revealed by previous analyses, 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. 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 rather isolated from each other (i.e. a star-shaped pattern of

the migration networks; Fig. 4), 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.

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 rather

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 (thus a

western-ward dispersal of individuals) 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 presence of private alleles, suggesting that gene flow is 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). This is an expected pattern since in populations that exhibit

high genetic diversity and similar allele frequency patterns albeit different frequencies of

rare alleles, the degree that F_{st} reflects population differentiation can be affected (Hedrick

1999; Meirmans & Hedrick 2011; Jakobsson et al. 2013). D_{est} on the other hand, generally

showed higher values of differentiation among populations including the core ones (ES and

APU). We found low to medium but statistically significant levels of differentiation among CE

Mediterranean populations (Table 2) 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 CE Mediterranean (Gustin et al. 2011; Bounas et al. 2016a). Nevertheless,

some of these movements took place in the '50s when the species showed a wider

distribution. 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 could suggest its

recovery. Bottleneck signs were also detected in three of the peripheral populations in the

CE Mediterranean region (SIC, LES, LIM), that were also differentiated and showed a

relatively limited gene flow with other populations (Fig. 4) but nevertheless similar diversity

patterns. Different areas seem to be differentially impacted by population declines as we

found no evidence of bottleneck in the rest of the peripheral populations. Ioannina (GIA) and

Komotini (KAL) populations for example although they experienced a population decline in

the past, they exhibit high levels of gene flow with the core populations, a process that can

annihilate 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 was

always present there, but failed to detect it, or this is a recently colonized area. 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 1, Fig. S1). 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 et al. 2013). While the case of the Croatian population might be attributed

to its relative large distance from any core population, this does not seem to apply to the

other insular population of Limnos which is located at a relatively short distance from both

the Anatolian and the continental Greek population. Therefore we could consider the

hypothesis that insularity per se, plays some role in population isolation (Frankham 1997),

either due to effective competition for nesting sites by the first colonizers, or due to some

behavioral barriers.

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

unambiguously defined based solely on geography and life stage (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 et al. 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; Friesen 2015). 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.

Conservation implications

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, we did not observe any extensive loss of alleles

that could render them under immediate risk of genetic erosion. Therefore, we suggest the

management of the whole CE Mediterranean population as a single unit. However,

peripheral populations should be of increased concern and especially the Croatian one, since

limited immigration along with its small size could lead to inbreeding. 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, 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. Although such actions

could be challenging in the absence of conspecific cues (Serrano & Tella 2003; but see

Calabuig et al. 2010), they might be of crucial importance to restore the connectivity among

populations thus resembling the former continuous distribution of the species in the region.

Additionally, increase of population sizes could be achieved by translocations of

individuals from the core populations to the peripheral or newly founded colonies

(Rodríguez et al. 2013). 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 et al. 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

et al. 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 both demographic and genetic

parameters of the small peripheral populations would be highly desirable.

Acknowledgments

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. We are grateful to V. Friesen and three anonymous reviewers for their

comments that greatly improved 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. J Hered 100:394-397. doi: 10.1093/jhered/esn110
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*). Mol Ecol 17:2652-2665. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03791.x
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. doi: 10.1038/hdy.2008.107
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. J
Anim Ecol 78:468-475. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01493.x

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. Theor Popul Biol 93:75-84.

Allendorf FW (1986) Genetic drift and the loss of alleles versus heterozygosity. Zoo Biol

5:181-190. doi: 10.1002/zoo.1430050212

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.

doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2540.2001.00940.x

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful

approach to multiple testing. J R Stat Soc B, 57:289–300.

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. J Raptor Res 50:416-421. doi:

10.3356/JRR-15-77.1

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. Conserv Genet 10:191-201. doi: 10.1007/s10592-008-9547-8

Calabuig G, Ortego J, Cordero PJ, Aparicio JM (2010) Colony foundation in the lesser kestrel:

patterns and consequences of the occupation of empty habitat patches. Anim Behav

80:975-982. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.08.016

Casagrande S, Dell'Omo G, Costantini D, Tagliavini J (2006) Genetic differences between

early-and late-breeding Eurasian kestrels. Evol Ecol Res 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. Conserv Genet 11:1043-1049. doi: 10.1007/s10592-009-9949-2

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. J Zool 295:108-115. doi: 10.1111/jzo.12191

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. Conserv Genet Resour 4:359-
361. doi: 10.1007/s12686-011-9548-7

Edmands S (2007) Between a rock and a hard place: evaluating the relative risks of
inbreeding and outbreeding for conservation and management. Mol Ecol 16:463-475.

Esler D (2000) Applying metapopulation theory to conservation of migratory birds. Conserv
Biol 14:366-372.

Evanno G, Regnaut S, Goudet J (2005) Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using
the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. Mol Ecol 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. Mol Ecol Resour 10:564-567.

Fahrig L (2003) Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. Ann Rev Ecol Evol Syst
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 (1997) Do island populations have less genetic variation than mainland
populations? Heredity 78:311-327

Frankham R, Ballou JD,Briscoe DA (2010) 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? J Appl Ecol 46:493-505.

Friesen VL (2015) Speciation in seabirds: why are there so many species… and why aren't
there more? J Ornithol 156:27-39.

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! Mol
Ecol 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, PressesUniversitaire St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, 136-144

Greenwood PJ (1980) Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals.
Animal Behav 28:1140-1162.

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. doi: 10.2307/2640768

Holderegger R, Kamm U, Gugerli F (2006) Adaptive vs. neutral genetic diversity: implications
for landscape genetics. Landscape Ecol 21:797-807.

Hubisz MJ, Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK (2009) Inferring weak population structure
with the assistance of sample group information. Mol Ecol Resour 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. doi: 10.1186/1471-2156-6-13

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 Ecol Evol 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. J Hered 89:238-247.

Meirmans PG (2015) Seven common mistakes in population genetics and how to avoid

them. Mol Ecol 24:3223-3231. doi: 10.1111/mec.13243

Meirmans PG, Hedrick PW (2011) Assessing population structure: FST and related measures.

Mol Ecol Resour 11:5-18.

Mikulic K, Budinski I, Culina A, Jurinovic L, 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. J Raptor Res 43:166-167.

Morandini V, De Benito E, Newton I, Ferrer M (2017) Natural expansion versus translocation

in a previously human-persecuted bird of prey. Ecology and Evolution. doi:

10.1002/ece3.2896

Moritz C (1994) Defining 'evolutionarily significant units' for conservation. Trends Ecol Evol

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? J Anim Ecol 66:640-648. doi:

10.2307/5917

Nesje M, Røed KH, Lifjeld JT, Lindberg P, Steen OF (2000) Genetic relationships in the

Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) analysed by microsatellite DNA markers. Mol Ecol

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. Proc Roy Soc
Lond B Bio 275:2039-2047.

Ortego J, Calabuig G, Aparicio JM, Cordero PJ (2008b) Genetic consequences of natal
dispersal in the colonial lesser kestrel. Mol Ecol 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*).
Conserv Genet 10:1357-1360. doi: 10.1007/s10592-008-9711-1

Palsbøll PJ, Berube M, Allendorf FW (2007) Identification of management units using
population genetic data. Trends Ecol Evol 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 population size using allele frequency data. J Hered 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/.

Rodríguez 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. Anim Conserv 14:306-313.

Rodríguez A, Negro JJ, Bustamante J, Antolín J (2013) Establishing a lesser kestrel colony in
an urban environment for research purposes. J Raptor Res 47:214-218.

Rosenberg NA (2004) DISTRUCT: a program for the graphical display of population structure.
Mol Ecol Notes 4:137-138. doi: 10.1046/j.1471-8286.2003.00566.x

Rousset F (2008) genepop'007: a complete re-implementation of the genepop software for
Windows and Linux. Mol Ecol Resour 8:103-106.

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 Ecol Evol 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. J Anim Ecol 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. doi:

10.1002/ece3.2096

Taylor B, Dizon A (1999) First policy then science: why a management unit based solely on

genetic criteria cannot work. Mol Ecol 8:S11-S16. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-294X.1999.00797.x

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. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00684.x

Vucetich JA, Waite TA (2003) Spatial patterns of demography and genetic processes across

the species' range: null hypotheses for landscape conservation genetics. Conserv Genet

4:639-645.

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.

Fig. 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 where the species is continuously distributed are

circled (ES: Spain; CGR: Central Greece)

Fig. 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 = 4 and K = 5), 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

Fig. 3 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

Fig. 4 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 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, SIC:

Sicily, CRO: Croatia, GIA: Ioannina, LES: Agrinio, CGR: Central Greece, KAL: Komotini, LIM:

Limnos.

Table 1 Measures of genetic variation of the 15 Lesser Kestrel populations used in the

present study. Number of genotyped individuals (n), number of alleles per locus (A), allelic

richness (Ar), observed (Ho) and expected (He) heterozygosity, number of private alleles (P)

and inbreeding coefficient (Fis). Values are presented as means ± standard error (in

brackets)

Code	Location	n	A	Ar	Ho	He	P	Fis
SES	Andalucia	19	7.1 (0.9)	5.4 (0.6)	0.635 (0.037)	0.696 (0.037)	1	0.082 (0.041)
ES/BG	Extremadura	25	8.3 (1.3)	5.6 (0.7)	0.674 (0.040)	0.699 (0.037)	6	0.029 (0.037)
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)
TRI	Trikala	20	7.6 (1.3)	5.5 (0.7)	0.626 (0.056)	0.680 (0.046)	0	0.087 (0.046)
LAR	Larisa	20	7.4 (1.1)	5.4 (0.6)	0.669 (0.053)	0.680 (0.044)	1	0.024 (0.045)
VOL	Volos	20	7.6 (1.2)	5.5 (0.7)	0.678 (0.051)	0.662 (0.048)	1	-0.027 (0.035)
KIL	Kilkis	13	6.4 (0.9)	5.3 (0.7)	0.621 (0.062)	0.661 (0.048)	1	0.067 (0.064)
KAL	Komotini	20	7.1 (1.077)	5.3 (0.6)	0.689 (0.053)	0.677 (0.046)	0	-0.019 (0.040)
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)

Table 2 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 (p < 0.039)

	SES	ES/BG	APU	SIC	CRO	GIA	LES	TRI	LAR	VOL	KIL	KAL	LIM	ISR	MON
SES	-	0.018	**0.038**	**0.099**	**0.132**	**0.048**	**0.053**	0.014	0.030	**0.053**	0.016	**0.027**	**0.147**	**0.059**	**0.093**
ES/BG	0.000	-	**0.035**	**0.096**	**0.138**	**0.056**	**0.049**	0.015	**0.046**	0.003	0.029	**0.041**	**0.160**	**0.069**	**0.126**
APU	0.001	0.004	-	**0.100**	**0.103**	**0.076**	**0.072**	0.014	**0.021**	**0.041**	0.030	**0.052**	**0.143**	**0.054**	**0.121**
SIC	**0.026**	**0.035**	**0.029**	-	**0.167**	**0.105**	**0.128**	**0.111**	**0.099**	**0.108**	**0.069**	**0.096**	**0.175**	**0.115**	**0.183**
CRO	**0.033**	**0.032**	**0.026**	**0.048**	-	**0.152**	**0.117**	**0.101**	**0.112**	**0.146**	**0.117**	**0.130**	**0.191**	**0.117**	**0.168**
GIA	**0.012**	**0.018**	**0.019**	**0.035**	**0.044**	-	**0.077**	**0.027**	**0.078**	**0.065**	0.026	**0.054**	**0.143**	**0.088**	**0.151**
LES	**0.013**	**0.014**	**0.019**	**0.038**	**0.033**	**0.029**	-	**0.065**	**0.084**	**0.072**	**0.050**	**0.067**	**0.183**	**0.074**	**0.158**
TRI	0.003	0.005	0.004	**0.033**	**0.027**	0.009	**0.023**	-	0.000	**0.035**	0.000	0.000	**0.100**	**0.030**	**0.110**
LAR	0.005	**0.010**	0.006	**0.032**	**0.036**	**0.019**	**0.030**	0.000	-	0.027	0.005	**0.028**	**0.153**	**0.064**	**0.112**
VOL	0.010	0.004	**0.013**	**0.030**	**0.037**	**0.018**	**0.018**	0.012	0.012	-	0.015	**0.047**	**0.132**	**0.080**	**0.121**
KIL	0.001	0.009	0.008	0.016	**0.034**	0.004	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.004	-	**0.037**	**0.136**	**0.020**	**0.095**
KAL	**0.011**	**0.013**	**0.021**	**0.038**	**0.044**	**0.025**	**0.024**	0.005	**0.010**	**0.021**	0.019	-	**0.092**	**0.088**	**0.085**
LIM	**0.035**	**0.035**	**0.036**	**0.051**	**0.064**	**0.041**	**0.046**	**0.020**	**0.034**	**0.040**	**0.039**	0.019	-	**0.152**	**0.143**
ISR	**0.017**	**0.019**	**0.015**	**0.029**	**0.035**	**0.029**	**0.022**	**0.015**	**0.026**	**0.024**	**0.012**	**0.035**	**0.045**	-	**0.094**
MON	**0.032**	**0.035**	**0.042**	**0.055**	**0.060**	**0.052**	**0.053**	**0.038**	**0.039**	**0.043**	**0.039**	**0.024**	**0.042**	**0.033**	-