A snapshot of progenitor-derivative speciation in action in *Iberodes* (Boraginaceae)

Ana Otero[1], Pablo Vargas[1], Virginia Valcárcel[2,3], Mario Fernández-Mazuecos[1], Pedro

Jiménez-Mejías[2,3] and Andrew L. Hipp[4,5]

[1] Departamento de Biodiversidad, Real Jardín Botánico, CSIC. Pza. de Murillo, 2,

28014 Madrid, Spain

[2] Centro de Investigación en Biodiversidad y Cambio Global (CIBC-UAM),

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 28049 Madrid, Spain

[3] Departamento de Biología (Botánica), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, C/Darwin,

2, 28049 Madrid, Spain

[4] The Morton Arboretum, 4100 Illinois Route 53, Lisle, IL 60532, USA

[5] The Field Museum, 1400 S Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60605, USA

SUMMARY

- Traditional classification of speciation modes has focused on physical barriers to gene flow. While allopatry has been viewed as the most common mechanism of speciation, parapatry and sympatry, both entail speciation in the face of ongoing gene flow and thus both are far more difficult to detect and demonstrate. *Iberodes* (Boraginaceae, NW Europe) with a small number of recently derived species (five) and contrasting morphological traits, habitats and distribution patterns constitutes an ideal system in which to study drivers of lineage divergence and differentiation.

- To reconstruct the evolutionary history of the genus, we undertook an integrative study entailing: (i) phylogenomics based on restriction-site associated DNA sequencing (RAD-seq), (ii) morphometrics, and (iii) climatic niche modelling.

- Key results revealed a history of repeated progenitor-derivative speciation, manifesting in paraphyletic pattern within *Iberodes*. Climatic niche analyses, together with the morphometric data and species distributions, suggest that ecological and geographical differentiation have interacted to shape the diversity of allopatric and parapatric distributions observed in *Iberodes*.

- Our integrative study has enabled to overcome previous barriers to understanding parapatric speciation by demonstrating the recurrence of progenitor-derivative speciation in plants with gene flow and ecological differentiation, explaining observed parapatry and paraphyly.

Keywords: Budding speciation, ecological speciation, restriction-site associated DNA sequencing (RAD-seq), molecular dating, species distribution modelling, niche overlap, paraphyly, parapatry.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding what modes of speciation dominate diverse clades across the tree of life has been a contentious domain of evolutionary biology for decades (e.g. Templeton, 1981; Rieseberg & Brouillet, 1994; Butlin *et al.*, 2008; Horandl & Stuessy, 2010). Reproductive barriers are the most frequently used criteria for distinguishing among three overarching modes of speciation (Futuyma, 2009). Speciation of adjacent populations in the absence of clear physical or reproductive barriers is frequently explained under the process of (1) parapatric speciation, which entails the evolution of reproductive isolation in the face of limited but ongoing gene flow (Coyne & Orr, 2004, p. 112). Parapatric speciation can be considered intermediate between allopatric and sympatric speciation. In (2) allopatric speciation, gene flow is prevented by geographic barriers between populations. In (3) sympatric speciation, partial or complete reproductive isolation arises between subsets of a single population with overlapping ranges, without spatial segregation. Sympatric speciation often entails significant levels of gene flow at the early stages of differentiation (Gavrilets, 2003; Futuyma, 2009). Whereas allopatry is widely viewed to be the most common mode of speciation (Coyne & Orr, 2004; Vargas *et al.*, 2018), the relative importance of parapatry and sympatry has been the subject of considerable debate (Fitzpatrick *et al.*, 2008; Fitzpatrick *et al.*, 2009; Arnold, 2015) in large part due to the difficulty of (1) resolving phylogenetic relationships among very closely related populations that may still be exchanging genes at a low level, and (2) quantifying the amount of gene flow between populations during population divergence (Barluenga *et al.*, 2006; Fontdevilla, 2014). In the last decade, new genomic, phylogenetic, and ecological tools have made non-allopatric modes of speciation increasingly amenable to study, allowing us to explore with statistical rigor a wider range of speciation scenarios (e.g. Savolainen *et al.*, 2006; Chozas *et al.*, 2017; Zheng *et al.*, 2017). In particular, there are some critical points of evidence that together provide support for a parapatric speciation scenario: (1) phylogenetic relationships usually reflect a progenitor-derivative (budding) pattern in which the more widely distributed species is the living progenitor of the more restricted one; (2) the absence of any physical barrier to gene-flow in both present and past times, i.e. distribution ranges are adjacent; (3) interspecific genetic differentiation that putatively discards processes of secondary contact; (4) alternative forces of reproductive isolation factors—e.g., differential climatic niches, reproductive exclusion, ploidy variation, among others—are present.

Ecological differentiation is often associated with non-allopatric speciation (Sobel

et al., 2010; Nosil, 2012; Stankowsky *et al*., 2015), particularly in plants, because a

sessile habit makes plants more sensitive to fine-scale environmental heterogeneity

(Anacker & Strauss, 2014). Both the influence of niche conservatism (i.e. retention of

ancestral ecological characteristics of species over time, Peterson *et al*., 1999) and niche

evolution (i.e. adaptation of lineages to changes in the environment, Donoghue &

Edwards, 2014) have been argued to play a role in speciation and lineage diversification

(Wiens & Graham, 2005; Cavender-Bares, 2019). Nevertheless, the contribution of

ecological factors as primary drivers of speciation remains more elusive (Mayr, 1954;

Pyron & Burbrink, 2010; Yin *et al*., 2016).

The advent of inexpensive phylogenomic approaches in the last decade have made

the genetic side of testing recent speciation scenarios tractable (McCormack *et al.*,

2013; McVay *et al.*, 2017a). High Throughput Sequencing (HTS) approaches make it

possible to analyze loci sampled from the entire genome in reconstructing species trees

(Fernández-Mazuecos *et al.*, 2018) and the history of speciation in the face of gene flow

(Leroy *et al.*, 2017; Folk *et al.*, 2018; Crowl *et al.*, 2019). Restriction-site associated

DNA sequencing (RAD-seq) has contributed particularly strongly to our understanding

of recent evolutionary processes, especially in non-model organisms, since a reference

genome is not needed for accurate phylogenetic inference (e.g. Fitz-Gibbon *et al.*,

2017). RAD-seq has as a consequence been useful in inferring complex speciation

histories: repeated cycles of island connectivity and isolation (the pump hypothesis;

Papadopoulou & Knowles, 2015), incipient sympatric speciation (Kautt *et al.*, 2016),

allopatric speciation despite historical gene flow (Maguilla *et al.*, 2017), ancient

introgression among now-extinct species (McVay *et al.*, 2017b).

The Mediterranean subendemic genus *Iberodes* M.Serrano, R.Carbajal & S.Ortiz

(Boraginaceae, Cynoglossoideae; Serrano *et al.*, 2016) provides an excellent system for

studying recent speciation, morphological and ecological differentiation because it is

clearly demonstrated to be a recently-derived genus (Chacón *et al.*, 2017; Otero *et al.*,

2019a). *Iberodes* comprises five species and one subspecies that differ in geographic

ranges (including allopatric and parapatric species) and habitat (ranging from forest

understories to scrublands and coastal dunes). Moreover, all species are endangered and

narrowly endemic, except for the widely-distributed *I. linifolia* of the Iberian Peninsula

and southeastern France (Talavera *et al.*, 2012). Sanger sequencing has failed to resolve

phylogenetic relationships among *Iberodes* species because the markers used to date

provide minimal variability (Otero *et al.*, 2014; Holstein *et al.*, 2016a; Holstein *et al.*,

2016b; Otero *et al.*, 2019a). The question consequently remains as to what is the relative

importance of extrinsic geographical and ecological barriers to the complex speciation

patterns observed in *Iberodes*. Given the narrow endemicity in most *Iberodes* species,

we hypothesize that geographic barriers rather than ecological factors have been

predominant in the speciation history of *Iberodes*. To test this hypothesis, we aim to: (1)

reconstruct phylogenetic relationships of the five species; (2) infer speciation patterns

and lineage diversification during the last geological epochs comparing diverse

morphologies and ecologies; and (3) evaluate the relative contribution of geographical

and ecological processes in speciation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Taxon sampling

Based on species distributions, between one and four individuals from one to nine

populations were sampled for each of the five species of *Iberodes* including ssp.

gallaecica and ssp. *littoralis* of *I. littoralis*) (Fig. 1, Table S1, in Supporting

Information). Samples of *I. littoralis*, *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. brassicifolia* were collected

in the field during 2015 and stored in silica gel until extraction. Since these species are

considered threatened according to IUCN criteria (Lopes & Carvalho, 1990; Serrano &

Carbajal, 2003; ICNB, 2007; Moreno, 2008; IUCN, 2019; INPN, 2019), permits were

obtained prior to collecting. Mature seeds of *I. commutata* were collected in 2015 and

germinated in a glasshouse to obtain green leaves for DNA extraction. Both field and

herbarium materials were used to represent the large distribution of *I. linifolia* (Table

S1). Three species (17 individuals) of the tribe Omphalodeae were included as the

outgroup (Otero *et al.*, 2019b): *Omphalodes nitida*, *Myosotidium hortensia*, and

Gyrocaryum oppositifolium (Table S1).

DNA extraction and RAD library preparation

DNA was extracted from leaf tissue using a modified CTAB protocol from Doyle and

Doyle (1987) and Shepherd and Mc Lay (2011), including a precipitation step in

isopropanol and ammonium acetate 7.5M at -20ºC overnight to improve yield. DNA

extractions were visualized and quantified with NanoDrop 2000/2000c (Thermo-Fisher,

Waltham, Massachusetts) and Qubit Fluorometric Quantification (Thermo-Fisher,

Waltham, Massachusetts) in the *Instituto de Investigaciones Biomédicas* (IIBm, CSIC-

UAM). Final DNA sample concentrations were standardized to 10 ng/ul. Preparation of

single-end RAD-seq libraries using restriction enzyme *Pst*I from genomic DNA was

conducted at Floragenex Inc. (Eugene, Oregon) following Baird *et al.* (2008) and

sequenced as single-end, 100-bp reactions on an Illumina HiSeq 2500 at the University

of Oregon Genomics & Cells Characterization Core Facility (library C606). Processed

data were returned in the Illumina 1.3 variant of the FASTQ format, with Phred quality

scores for all bases.

Data clustering

Sequences from Illumina were analyzed in *PyRAD* v. 3.0.6, a *de novo* clustering

pipeline with seven main steps that filter and cluster putatively orthologous loci from

RAD sequencing reads (Eaton, 2014). This pipeline is able to cluster highly divergent

sequences, taking into account indel variation and nucleotide (SNP) variation. It is thus

well-suited to the inter- and intraspecific scales addressed in our study. As no evidence

of polyploidy was found from flow cytometry, we did not assess sensitivity of paralog

detection to sequencing depth or number of heterozygotic positions allowed per loci or

shared among individuals. Base calls with a Phred Quality score <20 were replaced by

the ambiguous base code (N). Three similarity percentages were set for the clustering

(c) threshold of reads: 85%, 90% and 95%. Four levels of minimum coverage (m) of a

sample in a final locus (4, 12, 20, 28) were tested for each of the three percentages of

clustering similarity, resulting in a fully factorial set of 12 matrices from the

combination of filtering parameters, so we could assess sensitivity of our phylogenetic

inferences to clustering assumptions. Consensus base calls were made for clusters with

a minimum depth of coverage >5. From each parameter combination we obtained three

kinds of output: (1) a matrix with all loci retrieved for each individual (concatenated

matrix), (2) a matrix with single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP matrix), and (3) a

matrix with one SNP per locus (unlinked SNP matrix). The loci matrix was explored

with the RADami (Hipp, 2014) and vegan (Oksanen *et al.*, 2013) packages of R version

3.3.2 (R Core Team, 2013).

Phylogenetic analysis

Maximum likelihood analyses of concatenated matrices obtained in *PyRAD* were

performed in RAxML v8.2.10 (Stamatakis, 2014) through the Cipres Portal (Miller *et*

al., 2010). We used rapid bootstrapping, the GTRGAMMA model, and automatic-stop

bootstrapping with the majority rule criterion. We conducted a maximum likelihood

analysis for each of the 12 *PyRAD* concatenated matrices. Finally, we compared the

topologies based on average bootstrap support (BS). Between the two topologies with

average BS>98%, we chose the one maximizing the number of loci (HBS tree) for the

remaining phylogenetic-based analyses. Moreover, we used the unlinked SNP matrix

from the HBS tree (HBS matrix) to perform a coalescent-based phylogeny using

SVDquartets (Chifman & Kubatko, 2014) in PAUP (Swofford, 2001) through the

Cipres portal (Miller *et al.*, 2010). For SVDquartets we grouped individuals based on

main clades obtained from concatenated analysis in RAxML and evaluated all possible

quartets with 100 bootstrap replicates.

Estimates of divergence times

We used penalized likelihood as implemented in TreePL (Smith & O'Meara, 2012) to

estimate a time-calibrated tree for all bootstrap trees (with branch lengths) obtained in

RAxML from the HBS tree. TreePL is suitable for divergence time estimation when

dealing with large amounts of data, such as those yielded by high throughput

sequencing RAD-sequencing (Zheng & Wiens, 2015). Two calibration points were

used: (1) tribe Omphalodeae (root) (minimum age (minAge) = 9.062; maximum age

(maxAge) = 24.4097) and (2) clade *Iberodes* (ingroup) (minAge = 0.6591; maxAge =

3.7132) based on the averaged ages and standard deviation inferred in Otero *et al.*

(2019a). While secondary calibrations tend to underestimate the uncertainty of the age

estimates in the trees from which they are derived, use of multiple secondary

calibrations with the full range of uncertainty found in the original study have the

potential to recover more accurate clade ages (Schenk, 2016). Average node ages over

all posterior trees from the latter study were calculated using *treeStat* from the BEAST

v 1.8.2 package (Drummond *et al.*, 2012). We first conducted an analysis under the

"prime" option to select the optimal set of parameter values, using random subsample

and replicate cross-validation (RSRCV) to identify the best value for the smoothing

parameter, lambda. For this first analysis we used the thorough analysis option and set

200,000 iterations for penalized likelihood and 5,000 iterations for cross validation. We

then repeated the same thorough analysis and iterations but setting the smoothing value

of lambda to 10, gradient based (opt) and auto-differentiation based optimizers (optad)

to five, and auto-differentiation cross-validation-based optimizers to two (optcvad).

Although TreePL does not draw a prior distribution for the phylogenetic tree, we took

into account the bootstrapped variance in topology and branch length by running the

same TreePL analysis for each bootstrap tree and then a maximum clade credibility tree

using the mean heights was reconstructed in *TreeAnnotator* from the BEAST v. 1.8.2

package (Drummond *et al.*, 2012). Our dating analysis thus accounts for the uncertainty

in branch length that is due to variance in molecular substitution process across the

RAD-seq loci used.

Species-level analyses

Phylogenetic inferences showed two cases of paraphyly within the lineage of *I. linifolia*

that involved three other taxa (*I. kuzinskyana*, *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis* and ssp.

gallaecica; see results). To evaluate these cases of paraphyly, a set of analyses were

done to analyze the degree of genetic, morphological and ecological differentiation

among the four taxa involved. Therefore, the following analyses were performed on a

subset of data including only these four taxa.

Genetic structure—

The HBS matrix was used to perform a Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components

(DAPC) to identify and describe clusters of genetically related individuals (Jombart *et*

al., 2010). The format of the HBS matrix was converted from *vcf* to *genlight* with vcfR

(Knaus & Grünwald, 2017). DAPC analysis was performed in adegenet (Jombart,

2008). We fixed the number of clusters to four, based on the natural groups of four

taxonomic species and subspecies (the Linifolia clade, see results). We used the

function 'optim.a.score' to estimate the optimal number of principal components for

discriminant analysis. We represented genetic differentiation using scatterplots of the

principal components and a barplot representing assignment probabilities of individuals

to groups (compoplot). In addition, analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was

performed in Arlequin v. 3.5.2.1 (Excoffier & Lischer, 2010). AMOVA was run to

evaluate the level of genetic differentiation of the paraphyletic *I. linifolia* as a whole

with respect to the other two species (*I. kunzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*) of the Linifolia

clade. Therefore, we considered only two groups, *I. linifolia* on one hand, and the two

coastal species together (*I. kusinskyana* and *I. littoralis*) on the other. Finally, to

evaluate a potential role of historical introgression in determining paraphyly, we

conducted D-statistic tests in PyRAD (see Methods S1 for details).

Morphometric evaluation—

We performed a morphometric exploration using principal component analysis (PCA).

We consulted the taxonomic literature to identify diagnostic characters in *Iberodes*

(Talavera *et al.*, 2012). We measured 12 diagnostic macromorphological vegetative and

reproductive characters for 111 individuals from 58 vouchers (two different individuals

per voucher except for 5 vouchers with only one individual). We averaged measures

from each two individuals of the same voucher. As a result, we obtained a final matrix

of 58 accessions from 47 locations (74 individuals from 35 locations of *I. linifolia*, 14

from five locations of *I. kuzinskyana*, and 23 from seven locations of *I. littoralis*

(including the two subsppecies) (Fig. 1, Table S2). Ten morphological characters were

quantitatively continuous: four vegetative characters (length of stem, leaves and

pedicels, and width of leaves) and six reproductive characters (length of fruiting calix,

width and length of nutlet, length of nutlet margin, length of the nutlet margin teeth, and

hair length). In addition, one binomial character (presence or absence of bracts) and one

quantitative, discrete character (hairs per mm^2 on the abaxial surface of the nutlet) were

also considered.

PCA was run using the function 'prcomp' from Stats R package (R Core Team,

2013). Results were visualized with the function 'ggbiplot' in the ggbiplot R package

(Vu, 2011).

Climatic niche differentiation and distribution modelling—

Occurrences of the four taxa were collected from GBIF (https://www.gbif.org/). We

filtered the resulting dataset by removing points suspected to be incorrect, such as those

placed clearly outside of the known species distribution range (based on taxonomic

literature and databases; Fernández & Talavera, 2012; Muséum National d'Histoire

Naturelle, 2003-2019). Additional geographic coordinates were obtained from

herbarium material and our own fieldwork data. We also estimated the geographic

coordinates of non-georeferenced herbarium specimens, whenever the locality provided

could be pinpointed with an accuracy of ± 5 km (Table S3, Fig. 1). To reduce sampling

bias, we filtered the dataset by randomly removing points that were within 0.2° latitude

or longitude of each other for *I. linifolia* and 0.1° for *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis* and ssp.

gallaecica. Filtering was not applied for *I. kuzinskyana* because of the low number of

occurrences. The final dataset after filtering included 115 occurrences of *I. linifolia*, 11

of *I. kuzinskyana*, 16 of *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis* and 11 of ssp. *gallaecica*.

We obtained 19 bioclimatic variables (resolution of 30") from WorldClim 1.4

(http://www.worldclim.org/; Hijmans *et al.*, 2006) for the study region (34° to 50° N;

11° W to 7° E). To avoid collinearity among bioclimatic variables, we first excluded

variables displaying a high correlation coefficient with other variables ($|r| > 0.7$) in the

study area (Dormann *et al.*, 2013). Then, we calculated the variance inflation factor

(VIF) for each remaining variable using the HH package in R (Heiberger, 2017) and

selected variables with VIF <5 following Benítez-Benítez *et al.* (2018). As a result, the

following six variables were selected: bio1, bio3, bio4, bio8, bio12 and bio14. We

assessed climatic niche overlap among the four taxa by pairwise comparisons. The E-space (i.e. environmental space resulting from the six climatic variables) of each taxon was analyzed in a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) as implemented in the R package ecospat (Di Cola *et al.*, 2017). To visualize niche differences along each of the first two principal components, the result was plotted using the niceOverPlot function (Fernández-López & Villa-Machío, 2017), which relies on the ggplot2 package (Wickham, 2016). We calculated values of Schoener's index (D) as a measure of niche overlap (Schoener, 1968; Warren *et al.*, 2008). Then, we conducted tests of niche equivalency and niche similarity using ecospat (Di Cola *et al.*, 2017). The niche equivalency test evaluates whether the observed niche overlap is significantly different from a null simulated by randomly reallocating the occurrences of both entities between their ranges (Broennimann *et al.*, 2012; Warren *et al.*, 2008). The niche similarity test checks whether the overlap between two niches is significantly different from the overlap obtained if random shifts within each environmental space are allowed (Schoener, 1968; Warren *et al.*, 2008). In both cases, we tested for niche divergence by using the alternative="lower" option. All tests were based on 100 iterations. In similarity tests, both ranges were randomly shifted (rand.type=1).

In addition, we modeled the potential range of the four taxa of the Linifolia clade under present conditions, which was then projected to last interglacial (LIG, c. 120–140 kya) and last glacial maximum (LGM, c. 21 kya) conditions. To this end, we used the same six WorldClim bioclimatic variables employed for niche differentiation analyses, including present layers, LIG layers from Otto-Bliesner *et al.* (2006) and LGM layers based on the CMIP5 project (three global climate models (GCMs): CCSM4, MIROC-ESM and MPI-ESM-P). Resolution was 30″ for current and LIG, and 2.5′ for LGM layers. We performed species distribution modeling (SDM) using the maximum entropy algorithm, as implemented in Maxent v3.4 (Phillips *et al.*, 2006). We used the same occurrences for each taxon employed for niche differentiation analyses (see above). 80% of occurrences for each taxon were used for model training and 20% for model evaluation. For each taxon, ten subsample replicates were run by randomly partitioning the data into a training set and evaluation set, and a mean model was calculated. For the LGM, an average of the three GCMs was calculated. Logistic outputs were converted into presence/absence using the maximum training sensitivity plus specificity logistic threshold.

Ploidy level estimation—

Flow cytometry was used to estimate genome size, explore the possible role of polyploidization in speciation, and assess the risk of clustering paralogs in RAD-seq *de novo* clustering. Earlier cytogenetic studies for three *Iberodes* species showed them to be diploids (2n=28 for *I. linifolia*, *I. commutata* and *I. kuzinskyana* (Franco, 1984; Saly, 1997; Talavera *et al.*, 2012), and aneuploidy was inferred for *I. littoralis* based on its chromosome count of 2n=24 (Fernández-Casas, 1975). Nevertheless, some of these references do not cite the plant sources, making it difficult to assess the connection of cytotypes to populations. Individuals of the five *Iberodes* species were cultivated at the glasshouse and five individuals per species were sampled. In addition, samples of the diploid *Solanum lycopersicum* of known genome size (2n=24, 2C=1.88-2.07 pg, Grandillo *et al.*, 2011) were also cultivated to compare standardized results with our study species and estimate genome sizes (Doležel & Bartoš, 2005). We performed a two-step nuclear DNA Content Analysis using Partec Buffer (de Laat *et al.*, 1987) and DAPI fluorochrome through a Cell Lab Quanta SC flow cytometer (Beckman Coulter, Fullerton, CA, USA) equipped with a mercury lamp following the protocol of Doležel *et al.* (2007). Samples were visualized through the Cell Lab Quanta SC Software package. FL1 detector (530 nm / 28 nm; DAPI emission maximum=461) and FL1-Area was used as directly correlated to DNA content. A minimum number of 1000 nuclei for G1 peak were analyzed. Only histograms with a coefficient of variation (CV) lower than 10% for the G1 peak were accepted.

RESULTS

Phylogenetic analysis

After filtering and processing all samples under the different parameter combinations in *PyRAD*, 12 matrices of 54 taxa each but varying in numbers of loci and SNPs were analyzed (see Table S4). The same topology was obtained in RAxML from each of the 12 matrices, differing only in bootstrap support (BS) values for the nodes (Fig. S1). The highest BS supports and highest number of loci were obtained for the c95m20 matrix (95% similarity within clusters and minimum coverage of 20 samples for a final locus). Consequently, this matrix was used for the remaining phylogenetic analyses (HBS matrix). *Iberodes brassicifolia* was inferred to be the earliest-diverging lineage, sister to a clade that contains *I. commutata* sister to another subclade with the remaining species (Fig. 2). Paraphyly was inferred for *I. linifolia* since a clade including *I. kuzinskyana*

and *I. littoralis* is nested within. Likewise, paraphyly was inferred for *I. littoralis* ssp.
gallaecica since ssp. *littoralis* is nested within populations of subsp. *gallaecica* (Fig. 2).

Taxon groups for coalescent-based phylogenetic inference (SVDquartets) were based on the eight main lineages recovered using RAxML (*Iberodes brassicifolia*, *I. commutata*, populations of *I. linifolia* from Seville, core clade of *I. linifolia*, populations of *I. linifolia* from southern Spain, populations of *I. linifolia* from central Portugal, *I. kusinskyana*, and *I. littoralis*, Fig. S2). The species tree topology was mostly congruent with the concatenated phylogenetic topology. The only difference was the placement of *I. linifolia* populations from Seville and southern Spain, which were nested within the core of *I. linifolia* (Fig. S2). In any case, paraphyly of *I. linifolia* is still inferred because of the nested position of *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis* sister to populations of *I. linifolia* from Portugal (Fig. S2).

Divergence time estimates

The stem age estimated for *Iberodes* was 17.56 myr (17.26-17.86 Bootstrapped Variance, BV) with a crown age of 5.32 myr (5.32-5.32 BV) (Fig. 2). Crown age estimates for *I. brassicifolia* and *I. commutata* were 1.29 (1.21-1.33 BV) and 2.22 myr (2.17-2.28 BV), respectively. The crown age of the Linifolia clade (*I. linifolia* s.l., *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*) was inferred to be 4.33 myr (4.25-4.59 BV). Divergence time between Portuguese populations of *I. linifolia* and ancestor of the coastal species (*I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*) was estimated at 3.67 myr (3.60-3.85 HPD). The origin of *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*, possibly from an *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica* ancestor, was inferred to have taken place ca. 10,000 years ago (Fig. 2).

Genetic structure

We set four as the *a priori* number of clusters (K=4) based on the four taxa circumscribed within the Linifolia clade. DAPC analysis identified only one optimal principal component for the scatterplot which revealed two well-differentiated clusters: *I. linifolia* (LIN) on the one side, and the coastal *I. kuzinskiana* (KUZ) and *I. littoralis* (LIT_LIT, LIT_GAL) on the other (Fig. 3c). Within the coastal species cluster, *I. kuzinskyana* occupied a position closer to *I. linifolia*, while the two subspecies of *I. littoralis* were intermingled (Fig. 3c). Compoplot assigned all individuals of *I. linifolia* to a separate cluster, without admixture (Fig. 3c). The other three clusters were shared among coastal species with different membership probability (Fig. 3c). One of the two individuals of *I. kuzinskyana* was uniquely assigned to one of the clusters, whereas the other individual showed a mixed assignment, with admixture of the three genetic groups

(Fig. 3c). Most individuals (nine) of both subspecies of *I. littoralis* were placed in the
same two clusters, and two of them showed admixture with the same cluster shared by
the two samples of *I. kuzinskyana* (Fig. 3c). Given the interdigitated pattern of the two
subspecies of *I. littoralis*, we repeated the analysis by considering the two subspecies as
part of a single group (K=3) to evaluate the genetic clustering of *I. littoralis* as a genetic
group. Compoplot for K=3 assigned most individuals (nine) of *I. littoralis* to the same
cluster, while two samples had mixture assignment probability to the cluster of *I.*
kuzinskyana (Fig. S3). Likewise, AMOVA of the two groups (*I. linifolia* vs coastal
species) showed significant among-group variance (58.88%) higher than within-
population variance (38.09%) or variance within populations among groups (3.03%),
with a fixation index of F_{ST}= 0.619 (Table 1). D-statistic tests did not conclusively
support a role of historical introgression in determining paraphyletic pattern since
ancient introgression was inferred indiscriminately among lineages of *I. linifolia* and
both coastland species (see Methods S1).

Morphometric analysis

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed morphological differentiation between
the three taxa. *Iberodes linifolia* exhibited the greatest morphological variation, ranging
from the two extremes of both PC1 and PC2 compared to the more restricted variation
of coastal species that is concentrated in higher scores of PC1 and lower of PC2. Three
species of the Linifolia clade were almost completely differentiated, which supports the
previous taxonomic observations. *Iberodes linifolia* and *I. littoralis* occupied the two
extremes of variation ranging from higher length of vegetative characters, higher nutlet
and nutlet teeth sizes for *I. linifolia* to higher length and density of nutlet trichomes and
presence of bracts for *I. littoralis* (Fig. 3a). *Iberodes kuzinskyana* occupied an
intermediate position between *I. littoralis* and *I. linifolia*, overlapping very slightly with
the latter. The two subspecies of *I. littoralis* were intermingled at the highest scores of
PC1 and the lowest of PC2 (Fig. 3a).

Climatic niche differentiation and distribution modelling

The two main principal components of the 6 climatic variables explained 73.59%
(PC1=48.86% and PC2=24.73%) of the climatic variability in the study region. The
variables that contributed most to PC1 were: bio1 (annual mean temperature), bio8
(mean temperature of wettest quarter), bio12 (annual precipitation), and bio14
(precipitation of the driest month). Bio3 (isothermality) and bio4 (temperature
seasonality) were the two variables most related to PC2. The visualization of the E-

space showed little overlap among taxa (Fig. 3b). The geographically widespread *Iberodes linifolia* showed the widest niche, whereas the more narrowly distributed coastal species are more restricted in climatic niche space (Fig. 3b). Among coastal species, *I. kuzinskyana* differs from *I. littoralis* in PC1 (less precipitation and higher temperatures for *I. kuzinskyana*) and overlaps with *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica* but not with *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis* in PC2 (higher isothermality in *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*). The two subspecies of *I. littoralis* have well-differentiated niches particularly along PC2. *Iberodes kuzinskyana* occupies an intermediate position between *I. linifolia* and *I. littoralis* subsp. *gallaecica*. Thus, *I. kuzinskyana* marginally overlaps *I. linifolia* in those parts of the niche of *I. linifolia* with higher isothermality, lower temperature and higher precipitation. Indeed, minimum niche overlap was inferred between both subspecies of *I. littoralis* and *I. linifolia* due to lower temperature and higher precipitation for coastal taxa. Consequently, although tests of similarity indicated that observed values of niche overlap are not significantly lower than random overlap, all pairwise equivalency tests significantly rejected the equivalency of niches and this is supported by the low values of D obtained (Table 2).

The potential ranges for the species of the Linifolia clade in the present are broadly congruent with known geographic distributions, with overlapping distributions of *I. linifolia* and *I. kuzinskyana* (Fig. 4). In contrast, a contraction of distribution ranges was inferred for the LIG, including the disappearance of the potential range of *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica* (Fig. 4), but maintaining the overlap and absence of physical barriers between *I. linifolia* and *I. kuzinskyana*. Projections to the LGM showed a range similar to the present one for *I. linifolia* and expanded ranges for both *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*. The range of *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica* is inferred to have occupied most of the current range of both subspecies in the LGM, before subsp. *littoralis* differentiated from subsp. *gallaecica*.

Ploidy level estimation

Mean peaks of fluorescence, CV values, and genome sizes obtained for each species are summarized in Fig. S4 and Table S5. Fluorescence peaks were similar among all *Iberodes* species, ranging from 45.2 to 62.6 nm for G1. No evidence of duplicated DNA content was observed, suggesting no ploidy differences among taxa or populations. Likewise, similar genome sizes were obtained for the five species ranging from 1.788 to 1.980 pg. *Iberodes kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis* exhibited the largest and

the smallest genome sizes in the genus, respectively. The five species are similar in
genome size to the *S. lycopersicum* standard (1.88-2.07 pg, Grandillo *et al.*, 2011).

DISCUSSION

Phylogenetic relationships among *Iberodes* species are robustly inferred by RAD-
sequencing, which demonstrated the monophyly of populations except for *I. linifolia*.
Two early-diverging monophyletic species (*I. brassicifolia* and *I. commutata*) contrast
with paraphyly of three species in the Linifolia clade (Fig. 1). The paraphyly of *I.*
linifolia with respect to *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis* suggests a progenitor-derivative
relationship between the species, with the widespread species giving rise to the coastal
endemics in the course of a northward colonization from the coast of Portugal to the
west coast of France. Our results provide multiple lines of evidence that support
parapatric divergence of the coastland lineage (*I. kuzinskyana-I. littoralis* clade): (1)
lack of any physical barrier to gene flow between inland and coastland in the present or
the past; (2) low level of contemporary gene flow combined with evidence of historical
introgression, supporting budding differentiation rather secondary contact; (3) recent
niche differentiation from inland habitats with higher temperature seasonality to
coastland ones with higher precipitation; (4) paraphyly of *I. linifolia*, which can be
interpreted as the extant inland ancestor of the coastland lineage; and (5) incipient
morphological differentiation between *I. linifolia* and the coastal lineage. Subsequently,
differentiation in allopatry of the two coastal species during the mid-Pleistocene led to
the modern-day species *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*, most likely mediated by
geographic isolation and niche differentiation. Thus ecological and geographic
differentiation contributed to both parapatric and allopatric speciation in the clade.

A predominant paraphyletic pattern during *Iberodes* evolution

Our RAD-seq analyses reveal a pattern of predominant paraphyly within the recently
diverged Linifolia clade (Fig. 2). While the populations of *I. brassicifolia* and those of *I.*
commutata form monophyletic groups, paraphyly is inferred for *I. linifolia* populations
with respect to the two coastal species. While apparent paraphyly of species may be a
consequence of introgression dragging populations toward the species to which they
have introgressed (e.g., Eaton *et al.*, 2015), our analyses of historical introgression using
D-statistics do not conclusively support a role of introgressive hybridization in shaping
the paraphyletic topology (Methods S1), and genetic structure shows no evidence of
recent admixture involving *I. linifolia* (Fig. 3c). This suggests that *Iberodes* contains

some truly paraphyletic species, supporting a progenitor-derivative or "budding"
speciation history. Despite the tendency in taxonomy to only consider monophyletic
species, paraphyletic ones have been reported as particularly common in groups
showing recent local speciation, i.e. groups composed of a 'mother' species that
coexists in time and space with more restricted derivative species (Rajakaruna, 2018).

Recent ecological speciation in parapatric *Iberodes*

Although parapatry has been argued to be common in plants (Rieseberg & Brouillet,
1994), few empirical examples are found on the literature (Table 3). Our study provides
strong evidence for parapatry through a process of progenitor-derivative (or budding)
speciation between *I. linifolia* and the ancestor of *I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*. Indeed,
the projection of distribution models to past climatic periods during the Quaternary
revealed a similar or greater degree of geographic overlap between the potential ranges
of *I. linifolia* and *I. kuzinskyana* (Fig. 4)*,* which makes allopatry unlikely (Zheng *et al.*,
2017). Peripheral populations of the widespread *I. linifolia* close to the coast of Portugal
are the most closely related potential living progenitor of the coastal species (*I.*
kuzinskyana and *I. littoralis*; Fig. 2), which seem to have differentiated in an adjacent
area with no apparent physical barrier. Paraphyly similarly supports the hypothesis of
budding (progenitor-derivative) speciation (Stuessy & Hörandl, 2013). In addition, the
historical introgression inferred among *I. linifolia* and coastland species (Methods S1),
does not conclusively underlie the paraphyletic topology. Moreover, our results of
AMOVA and DAPC pointed to lack of recent gene flow between the nearby species (*I.*
kuzinskyana and *I. linifolia*). This pattern supports strong isolation rather than secondary
contacts as suggested in other cases of ecological differentiation (e.g. *Mimulus*,
Stankowski *et al.*, 2015; *Stauracanthus*, Chozas *et al.*, 2017; Table 3). Nevertheless, a
deeper population genetics study focused on the adjacent populations of Portugal is
necessary to obtain more detailed estimates of gene flow.

In the earliest stages of parapatric speciation mediated by ecological differentiation,
reproductive barriers are expected to evolve in response to selection towards locally
adapted, divergent ecotypes (Sakaguchi *et al.*, 2019). The niche identity tests point to a
role of ecologically-based selection in the speciation of the coastal lineage from *I.*
linifolia. The coastal lineage is distributed in niches with less temperature seasonality
and higher precipitation means than *I. linifolia* (Fig. 3b). Interestingly, although niche
overlap is close to zero, similarity tests indicated a certain degree of similarity within
the E-space, which points to recent divergence and suggests ongoing differentiation or

some degree of niche conservatism. Besides, edaphic factors such as the specialization

in coastal dune substrates may also have contributed to ecological differentiation,

although this is a fine-scale soil variable that has not been mapped at high enough

resolution to include meaningfully in niche models. The differentiation of coastal

lineages (*I. kuzinskyana* and *I. littoralis*) from inland populations of *I. linifolia* seems to

have started in western Iberian Peninsula during the Mid Pliocene (3.85-3.60 myr, Fig.

2), when increasing seasonality led to the origin of Mediterranean climate with its

summer droughts (Suc, 1984). The onset of Mediterranean climate favored the

differentiation and configuration of modern Mediterranean flora (Vargas *et al.*, 2018),

which agrees with recent *Iberodes* speciation (Fig. 2). Posterior glacial/interglacial

periods during the Late Pliocene promoted the expansion and contraction of geographic

ranges and the formation of sources and sinks of genetic diversity for most

Mediterranean species (Médail & Diadema, 2009). Interestingly, the overlapping area

inferred for *I. linifolia* and *I. kuzinskyana* in the past is congruent with the location of

glacial refugia (Estremadura and Beira litoral) proposed by Médail and Diadema (2009)

and plant species previously studied as glacial refugial species (e.g. *Drosophyllum*

lusitanicum: Müller & Deil, 2001; *Cistus monspeliensis*: Fernández-Mazuecos &

Vargas, 2010; Coello *et al.*, unpublished; *Linaria elegans*: Fernández-Mazuecos &

Vargas, 2013).

In addition, ecological differentiation in parapatric speciation involves divergent

natural selection towards contrasting environments that promotes adaptation to different

environments and subsequent barriers to gene flow (Schluter, 2001; Rundle & Nosil,

2005). The strength of divergent selection can modulate the degree of completeness of a

speciation process (Nosil *et al.*, 2009). In our case, both the high interspecific genetic

differentiation and clear morphological and ecological divergence (Fig. 3) between

inland and coastal species may reflect strong divergent selection promoting rapid

speciation (Pliocene-Pleistocene, Fig. 2). Indeed, our study reinforces the common trend

for Mediterranean plants in which narrow endemics arise from ecological differentiation

of peripheral populations of more widespread progenitor species (Papuga *et al.*, 2018).

Moreover, this trend highlights the role of peripheral populations in setting the scene for

diversification, thus revealing their conservation value (Debussche & Thompson, 2003).

Allopatric differentiation along the Atlantic coast

An allopatric pattern is also found in the Linifolia clade. Given the current separation

between ranges of the three coastal taxa (Fig. 1), allopatry seems to have triggered

speciation. On the one hand, the widely separated ranges of *I. kuzinskyana* and *I.*

littoralis subsp. *gallaecica* both in current times and in projections to the LIG (despite

probable intermittent contact during the LGM) suggest either a colonization mediated

by LDD followed by geographic isolation and niche shift (Fig. 3, 4) or a vicariant

process mediated by an early expansion and contraction of distribution ranges. We find

similar examples of recent allopatric speciation for both hypotheses: by LDD among

coastal Mediterranean flora in the same period (e.g. Jakob *et al.*, 2007; Carnicero *et al.*,

2017; Herrando-Moraira *et al.*, 2017); and expansion/contraction of distribution ranges

(e.g. Ortiz *et al.*, 2007; Lo Presti & Oberprieler, 2011; Fernández-Mazuecos & Vargas,

2011). On the other hand, the allopatric differentiation of the two subspecies of *I.*

littoralis was likely preceded by an expansion of *I. littoralis* during the LGM, followed

by geographic isolation as its range contracted and niche shifted, leading to the

differentiation of *I. littoralis* subsp. *littoralis* in more recent times (Fig. 3, 4). In this

case, the probable role of long distance dispersal (LDD) is further supported by the fact

that the expanded area during the LGM does not seem to have formed a continuous

range (Fig. 4). Indeed, unlike inland species of *Iberodes*, the three coastal taxa seem to

have specializations for LDD in the form of uncinated hooks (Fig. 1) in the nutlet,

related to the attachment to feathers and fur in other closely related Boraginaceae genera

(Selvi *et al.*, 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

Our integrative approach provides a comprehensive history of parapatric speciation,

which has long posed a challenge to our understanding of ecological speciation. The

integration of RAD-sequencing, morphometrics and climatic niche modelling provide

strong evidence that progenitor-derivative speciation with gene flow, associated with

ecological divergence, shapes the parapatry we observe today in Iberodes. Our work

thus serves as a model for how integrative studies may serve as a powerful resource for

investigating scenarios of non-allopatric processes in other groups of plants. Processes

such as budding speciation bring to light the need to extend species concepts to

encompass paraphyletic species as natural units of both taxonomic classification and

evolutionary history: species in every sense of the word.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank those botanists and colleagues that help us with material sampling and particularly, Diana Íñigo, Paola Pérez, Celia Otero, David Vallecillo, Yurena Arjona, Lua López, Joaquín Ramírez, George Hinton, Javier Morente, Manuel Joao Pinto, Ruben Retuerto, Miguel Serrano, Antonio Rivas, Claude Dauge, Asli Koca, Peter Heenan, Enrique Rico, Ester Vega, Santiago Martín-Bravo, Íñigo Pulgar, and Juan Carlos Zamora. Likewise, we would also appreciate the worthy loans provided by numerous herbaria mentioned at supplementary tables. We gratefully acknowledge the work of the lab technicians of Real Jardín Botánico de Madrid, Yolanda Ruiz, Emilio Cano, Jose Gónzalez, Olga Popova, and Lucía Sastre. We also thank Lucía Checa and Miriam Pérez for the cytometry lab work. We are grateful for the many methodological comments of John McVay, Irene Villa-Machío, Yurena Arjona, Marcial Escudero, Tamara Villaverde, Javier Fernández-López, Alberto Coello, Santiago Martín-Bravo and Carmen Benítez-Benítez. Finally, we would like to thank the researchers of the Herbarium and Center for Tree Science at The Morton Arboretum (Lisle, Illinois, USA), in particular Marlene Hahn for lab assistance, and the Botany Department of the Field Museum (Chicago, Illinois, USA) for accommodating me at the Field Museum and handling the hosting during the lab stay in Chicago. These data were initially analyzed during a research stay by the first author in the Herbarium of The Morton Arboretum and The Field Museum. This study was supported by the Fundación General CSIC and Banco Santander as part of the project titled "Do all endangered species hold the same value?: origin and conservation of living fossils of flowering plants endemic to Spain."

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

AO, PJM, VV and PV contributed to developing the question and experimental design. AO led the material collection. AO, MFM and ALH conducted the data analysis. AO wrote the manuscript with the contribution of all authors in both interpretation and writing.

REFERENCES

Anacker BL, Strauss SY. 2014. The geography and ecology of plant speciation: range overlap and niche divergence in sister species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **281**(1778): 20132980.

Andrew RL, Rieseberg LH. 2013. Divergence is focused on few genomic regions

early in speciation: incipient speciation of sunflower ecotypes. *Evolution* **67**(9):

2468-2482.

Arnold ML. 2015. *Divergence with genetic exchange*. New York, USA: OUP Oxford.

Baird NA, Etter PD, Atwood TS, Currey MC, Shiver AL, Lewis ZA, Selker EU,

Cresko WA, Johnson EA. 2008. Rapid SNP discovery and genetic mapping

using sequenced RAD markers. *PLoS One* **3**: 1-7.

Barluenga M, Stölting KN, Salzburger W, Muschick M, Meyer A. 2006. Sympatric

speciation in Nicaraguan crater lake cichlid fish. *Nature* **439**: 719.

Benítez-Benítez C, Escudero M, Rodríguez-Sánchez F, Martín-Bravo S,

Jiménez-Mejías P. 2018. Pliocene–Pleistocene ecological niche evolution

shapes the phylogeography of a Mediterranean plant group. *Molecular Ecology*

27(7): 1696-1713.

Broennimann O, Fitzpatrick MC, Pearman PB, Petitpierre B, Pellissier L, Yoccoz

NG, Thuiller W, Fortin M-J, Randin C, Zimmermann NE, et al. 2012.

Measuring ecological niche overlap from occurrence and spatial environmental

data. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **21**(4): 481-497.

Butlin RK, Galindo J, Grahame JW. 2008. Review. Sympatric, parapatric or

allopatric: the most important way to classify speciation? *Philosophical*

Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **363**(1506): 2997-3007.

Carnicero P, Sáez L, Garcia-Jacas N, Galbany-Casals M. 2017. Different speciation

types meet in a Mediterranean genus: The biogeographic history of *Cymbalaria*

(Plantaginaceae). *Taxon* **66**(2): 393-407.

Cavender-Bares J. 2019. Diversification, adaptation, and community assembly of the

American oaks (*Quercus*), a model clade for integrating ecology and evolution.

New Phytologist **221**(2): 669-692.

Chacón J, Luebert F, Weigend M. 2017. Biogeographic Events Are Not Correlated

with Diaspore Dispersal Modes in Boraginaceae. *Frontiers in Ecology and*

Evolution **5**.

Chifman J, Kubatko L. 2014. Quartet inference from SNP data under the coalescent

model. *Bioinformatics* **30**(23): 3317-3324.

Chozas S, Chefaoui RM, Correia O, Bonal R, Hortal J. 2017. Environmental niche

divergence among three dune shrub sister species with parapatric distributions.

Annals of Botany **119**(7): 1157-1167.

Coyne JA, Orr HA. 2004. *Speciation.* Sunderland, MA, USA: Sinauer.

Crowl AA, Manos PS, McVay JD, Lemmon AR, Lemmon EM, Hipp AL. 2019.
656   Uncovering the genomic signature of ancient introgression between white oak
657   lineages (*Quercus*). *New Phytologist*.

658   **de Laat A, Gohde W, Vogelzakg M. 1987.** Determination of ploidy of single plants
659   and plant populations by flow cytometry. *Plant Breeding* **99**(4): 303-307.

660   **Debussche M, Thompson JD. 2003.** Habitat differentiation between two closely
661   related Mediterranean plant species, the endemic *Cyclamen balearicum* and the
662   widespread *C. repandum*. *Acta Oecologica* **24**(1): 35-45.

663   **Di Cola V, Broennimann O, Petitpierre B, Breiner FT, D'amen M, Randin C,**
664   **Engler R, Pottier J, Pio D, Dubuis A. 2017.** Ecospat: an R package to support
665   spatial analyses and modeling of species niches and distributions. *Ecography*
666   **40**(6): 774-787.

667   **Doležel J, Bartoš J. 2005.** Plant DNA flow cytometry and estimation of nuclear
668   genome size. *Annals of Botany* **95**(1): 99-110.

669   **Doležel J, Greilhuber J, Suda J. 2007.** Estimation of nuclear DNA content in plants
670   using flow cytometry. *Nature Protocols* **2**(9): 2233.

671   **Donoghue MJ, Edwards EJ. 2014.** Biome shifts and niche evolution in plants. *Annual*
672   *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **45**:, 547-572.

673   **Dormann CF, Elith J, Bacher S, Buchmann C, Carl G, Carré G, Marquéz JRG,**
674   **Gruber B, Lafourcade B, Leitão PJ. 2013.** Collinearity: a review of methods
675   to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*
676   **36**(1): 27-46.

677   **Doyle J, Doyle J. 1987.** A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of fresh
678   leaf tissue. *Phytochemistry Bulletin* **19**: 11—15.

679   **Drummond AJ, Suchard MA, Xie D, Rambaut A. 2012.** Bayesian phylogenetics with
680   BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **29**: 1969-1973.

681   **Eaton DA. 2014.** PyRAD: assembly of de novo RADseq loci for phylogenetic analyses.
682   *Bioinformatics* **30**(13): 1844-1849.

683   **Eaton DA, Hipp AL, González-Rodríguez A, Cavender-Bares J. 2015.** Historical
684   introgression among the American live oaks and the comparative nature of tests
685   for introgression. *Evolution* **69**(10): 2587-2601.

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**(3): 564-567.

Excoffier L, Smouse PE, Quattro JM. 1992. Analysis of molecular variance inferred

from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: application to human

mitochondrial DNA restriction data. *Genetics* **131**(2): 479-491.

Fernández-Casas J. 1975. Números cromosomicos de plantas españolas. *Anales del*

Instituto Botánico Cavanilles **32**: 301–307.

Fernández-López J, Villa-Machío I 2017. NiceOverPlot, or when the number of

dimensions does matter (R script).

Fernández-Mazuecos M, Mellers G, Vigalondo B, Sáez L, Vargas P, Glover BJ.

2018. Resolving recent plant radiations: power and robustness of genotyping-by-

sequencing. *Systematic Biology* **67**(2): 250-268.

Fernández-Mazuecos M, Vargas P. 2011. Historical isolation versus recent long-

distance connections between Europe and Africa in bifid toadflaxes (*Linaria*

sect. *Versicolores*). *PLoS One* **6**(7): e22234.

Fernández-Mazuecos M, Vargas P. 2010. Ecological rather than geographical

isolation dominates Quaternary formation of Mediterranean *Cistus* species.

Molecular Ecology **19**(7): 1381-1395.

Fernández-Mazuecos M, Vargas P. 2013. Congruence between distribution modelling

and phylogeographical analyses reveals Quaternary survival of a toadflax

species (*Linaria elegans*) in oceanic climate areas of a mountain ring range. *New*

Phytologist **198**(4): 1274-1289.

Fernández I, Talavera S. 2012. *Omphalodes* Mill. In: Talavera S, Andrés C, Arista M,

Fernández Piedra M, Gallego M, Ortiz P, Romero Zarco C, Salgueiro F,

Silvestre S, Quintanar A eds. *Flora Iberica*. Madrid: Real Jardín Botánico,

CSIC, 324-532.

Fitz-Gibbon S, Hipp AL, Pham KK, Manos PS, Sork VL. 2017. Phylogenomic

inferences from reference-mapped and de novo assembled short-read sequence

data using RADseq sequencing of California white oaks (*Quercus* section

Quercus). *Genome* **60**(9): 743-755.

Fitzpatrick B, Fordyce J, Gavrilets S. 2008. What, if anything, is sympatric

speciation? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **21**(6): 1452-1459.

Fitzpatrick BM, Fordyce JA, Gavrilets S. 2009. Pattern, process and geographic

modes of speciation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **22**(11): 2342-2347.

Folk RA, Soltis PS, Soltis DE, Guralnick R. 2018. New prospects in the detection and

comparative analysis of hybridization in the tree of life. *American Journal of*

Botany **105**(3): 364-375.

Fontdevila A 2014. Speciation. In: Vargas P, Zardoya R eds. *The tree of life*.

Sunderland, MA, USA: Sinauer Associates, 445-456.

Franco JA. 1984. *Nova Flora de Portugal (Continente e Açores). Vol. 2, Clethraceae-*

Compositae. Lisboa, Portugal: Instituto Superior de Agronomia.

Futuyma DJ. 2009. *Evolution*. Sunderland, MA, USA: Sinauer.

Gavrilets S. 2003. Perspective: models of speciation: what have we learned in 40

years? *Evolution* **57**(10): 2197–2215.

Grandillo S, Chetelat R, Knapp S, Spooner D, Peralta I, Cammareri M, Pérez O,

Termolino P, Perez P, Tripodi ML, et al. 2011. *Solanum* sect. *Lycopersicon*.

In: Kole C ed. *Wild Crop Relatives: Genomic and Breeding Resources*. Berlin,

Heidelberg: Springer, 129-215.

Heiberger RM 2017. HH: Statistical analysis and data display: Heiberger and Holland.

R package v. 3.1-34.

Herrando-Moraira S, Carnicero P, Blanco-Moreno JM, Sáez L, Véla E,

Vilatersana R, Galbany-Casals M. 2017. Systematics and phylogeography of

the Mediterranean *Helichrysum pendulum* complex (Compositae) inferred from

nuclear and chloroplast DNA and morphometric analyses. *Taxon* **66**(4): 909-

933.

Hijmans RJ, Cameron S, Parra J, Jones P, Jarvis A, Richardson K. 2006. World-

Clim version 1.4. *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology of the University of California,*

CIAT, and Rainforest CRC.

Hipp A. 2014. RADami: R package for phylogenetic analysis of RADseq data. *R*

package version: 1.0-3.

Holstein N, Chacón J, Hilger HH, Weigend M. 2016a. No longer shipwrecked—

Selkirkia (Boraginaceae) back on the mainland with generic rearrangements in

South American "*Omphalodes*" based on molecular data. *Phytotaxa* **270**: 231-

251.

Holstein N, Chacón J, Otero A, Jiménez-Mejías P, Weigend M. 2016b. Towards a

monophyletic *Omphalodes*—or an expansion of North American *Mimophytum*.

Phytotaxa **288**(2): 131-144.

Hörandl E, Stuessy TF. 2010. Paraphyletic groups as natural units of biological

classification. *Taxon* **59**(6): 1641–1653.

Huang CL, Ho CW, Chiang YC, Shigemoto Y, Hsu TW, Hwang CC, Ge XJ, Chen

C, Wu TH, Chou CH, Huang HJ, Gojobori T,Osada N, Chiang TY. 2014.

Adaptive divergence with gene flow in incipient speciation of *Miscanthus*

floridulus/sinensis complex (Poaceae). *The Plant Journal* **80**(5): 834-847.

ICNB 2007. Plano Nacional de Conservaçao da Flora em Perigo (1º Fase). Relatorio

Final. Portugal: Instituto da Conservaçao da Naturaleza.

INPN 2019. Liste Rouge de la Flore Vasculaire de Poitou-Charentes.

IUCN 2019. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019.1. .

Jakob SS, Ihlow A, Blattner FR. 2007. Combined ecological niche modelling and

molecular phylogeography revealed the evolutionary history of *Hordeum*

marinum (Poaceae)--niche differentiation, loss of genetic diversity, and

speciation in Mediterranean Quaternary refugia. *Molecular Ecology* **16**(8):

1713–1727.

Jombart T. 2008. Adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic

markers. *Bioinformatics* **24**(11): 1403-1405.

Jombart T, Devillard S, Balloux F. 2010. Discriminant analysis of principal

components: a new method for the analysis of genetically structured

populations. *BMC Genetics* **11**(1): 94.

Kautt AF, Machado-Schiaffino G, Torres-Dowdall J, Meyer A. 2016. Incipient

sympatric speciation in Midas cichlid fish from the youngest and one of the

smallest crater lakes in Nicaragua due to differential use of the benthic and

limnetic habitats? *Ecology and Evolution* **6**(15): 5342-5357.

Knaus BJ, Grünwald NJ. 2017. VCFR: a package to manipulate and visualize variant

call format data in R. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **17**(1): 44-53.

Leroy T, Roux C, Villate L, Bodénès C, Romiguier J, Paiva JA, Dossat C, Aury

JM, Plomion C, Kremer A. 2017. Extensive recent secondary contacts between

four European white oak species. *New Phytologist* **214**(2): 865-878.

Lo Presti RM, Oberprieler C. 2011. The central Mediterranean as a phytodiversity

hotchpotch: phylogeographical patterns of the *Anthemis secundiramea* group

(Compositae, Anthemideae) across the Sicilian Channel. *Journal of*
Biogeography **38**(6): 1109-1124.

Lopes MHR, Carvalho MLS, Silva ARP 1990. Lista de espécies botânicas a proteger
em Portugal continental.In SNPRCN. Lisboa, Portugal.

Maguilla E, Escudero M, Hipp AL, Luceño M. 2017. Allopatric speciation despite
historical gene flow: Divergence and hybridization in *Carex furva* and *C.*
lucennoiberica (Cyperaceae) inferred from plastid and nuclear RAD-seq data.
Molecular Ecology **26**(20): 5646-5662.

Mayr E. 1954. Geographic speciation in tropical Echinoids. *Evolution* **8**(1): 1-18.

McCormack JE, Hird SM, Zellmer AJ, Carstens BC, Brumfield RT. 2013.
Applications of next-generation sequencing to phylogeography and
phylogenetics. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **66**(2): 526-538.

McVay JD, Hauser D, Hipp AL, Manos PS. 2017a. Phylogenomics reveals a complex
evolutionary history of lobed-leaf white oaks in western North America.
Genome **60**(9): 733-742.

McVay JD, Hipp AL, Manos PS. 2017b. A genetic legacy of introgression confounds
phylogeny and biogeography in oaks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
Biological Sciences **284**(1854): 20170300.

Médail F, Diadema K. 2009. Glacial refugia influence plant diversity patterns in the
Mediterranean Basin. *Journal of Biogeography* **36**(7): 1333-1345.

Miller MA, Pfeiffer W, Schwartz T. 2010. Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for
inference of large phylogenetic trees. *Proceedings of the Gateway Computing*
Environments Workshop: 1-8.

Moreno JC coord. 2008. *Lista Roja 2008 de la flora vascular española.* Madrid, Spain:
Dirección General de Medio Natural y Política Forestal (Ministerio de Medio
Ambiente, y Medio Rural y Marino, y Sociedad Española de Biología de la
Conservación de Plantas).

Müller J, Deil U. 2001. Ecology and structure of *Drosophyllum lusitanicum* (L.) link
populations in the southwestern of the Iberian Peninsula. *Acta Botanica*
Malacitana **26**: 47-68.

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle 2003-2019. *Omphalodes littoralis* Lehm.
France: Inventaire National du Patrimoine Naturel.

Nosil P. 2012. *Ecological speciation*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Nosil P, Harmon LJ, Seehausen O. 2009. Ecological explanations for (incomplete)
speciation. *Trends in ecology and evolution* **24**(3): 145-156.

Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'hara R, Simpson
GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Wagner H. 2013. Package 'vegan'.
Community ecology package, version **2**(9).

Ortiz M, Tremetsberger K, Talavera S, Stuessy T, García‐Castaño J. 2007.
Population structure of *Hypochaeris salzmanniana* DC.(Asteraceae), an endemic
species to the Atlantic coast on both sides of the Strait of Gibraltar, in relation to
Quaternary sea level changes. *Molecular Ecology* **16**(3): 541-552.

Otero A, Jiménez‐Mejías P, Valcárcel V, Vargas P. 2014. Molecular phylogenetics
and morphology support two new genera (*Memoremea* and *Nihon*) of
Boraginaceae s.s. *Phytotaxa* **173**: 241-277.

Otero A, Jiménez‐Mejías P, Valcárcel V, Vargas P. 2019a. Being in the right place at
the right time? Parallel diversification bursts favored by the persistence of
ancient epizoochorous traits and hidden factors in Cynoglossoideae. *American*
Journal of Botany **106**(3): 438-452.

Otero A, Jiménez‐Mejías P, Valcárcel V, Vargas P. 2019b. Worldwide long distance
dispersal favored by epizoochorous traits in the biogeographic history of
Omphalodeae (Boraginaceae). *Journal of Systematics and Evolution*.

Otto-Bliesner BL, Brady EC, Clauzet G, Tomas R, Levis S, Kothavala Z. 2006.
Last glacial maximum and Holocene climate in CCSM3. *Journal of Climate*
19(11): 2526-2544.

Papadopoulou A, Knowles LL. 2015. Genomic tests of the species‐pump hypothesis:
recent island connectivity cycles drive population divergence but not speciation
in Caribbean crickets across the Virgin Islands. *Evolution* **69**(6): 1501-1517.

Papuga G, Gauthier P, Pons V, Farris E, Thompson J. 2018. Ecological niche
differentiation in peripheral populations: a comparative analysis of eleven
Mediterranean plant species. *Ecography* **41**(10): 1650-1664.

Paule J, Wagner ND, Weising K, Zizka G. 2017. Ecological range shift in the
polyploid members of the South American genus *Fosterella* (Bromeliaceae).
Annals of Botany **120**(2): 233-243.

Peterson AT, J. S, Sánchez-Cordero V. 1999. Conservatism of Ecological Niches in
Evolutionary Time. *Science* **285**: 1265-1267.

Phillips SJ, Anderson RP, Schapire RE. 2006. Maximum entropy modeling of species
geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling* **190**(3-4): 231-259.

Pyron AR, Burbrink FT. 2010. Hard and soft allopatry: physically and ecologically
mediated modes of geographic speciation. *Journal of Biogeography* **37**(10):
2005-2015.

Rajakaruna N. 2018. Lessons on evolution from the study of edaphic specialization.
The Botanical Review **84**(1): 39-78.

R Core Team 2013. R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

Richards TJ, Ortiz-Barrientos D. 2016. Immigrant inviability produces a strong
barrier to gene flow between parapatric ecotypes of *Senecio lautus*. *Evolution*
70(6): 1239-1248.

Rieseberg LH, Brouillet L. 1994. Are many plant species paraphyletic? *Taxon* **43**: 21-
32.

Rundle HD, Nosil P. 2005. Ecological speciation. *Ecology Letters* **8**(3): 336-352.

Sakaguchi S, Horie K, Ishikawa N, Nishio S, Worth JRP, Fukushima K, Yamasaki
M, Ito M, Bonser S. 2019. Maintenance of soil ecotypes of *Solidago virgaurea*
in close parapatry via divergent flowering time and selection against immigrants.
Journal of Ecology **107**(1): 418-435.

Saly F. 1997. *Étude botanique, cytogénétique et pédologique de l'arc dunaire Gavres-*
Quiberon. Incidences sur la conservation du patrimoine végétal sauvage. PhD,
Muséum national d'histoire naturelle de Paris France.

Savolainen V, Anstett M-C, Lexer C, Hutton I, Clarkson JJ, Norup MV, Powell
MP, Springate D, Salamin N, Baker WJ. 2006. Sympatric speciation in palms
on an oceanic island. *Nature* **441**(7090): 210.

Schenk JJ. 2016. Consequences of secondary calibrations on divergence time
estimates. *PLoS One* **11**(1): e0148228.

Schulte LJ, Clark JL, Novak SJ, Jeffries SK, Smith JF. 2015. Speciation within
Columnea section *angustiflora* (Gesneriaceae): islands, pollinators and climate.
Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution **84:** 125-144.

Schluter D. 2001. Ecology and the origin of species. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*
16(7): 372-380.

Schoener TW. 1968. The *Anolis* lizards of Bimini: resource partitioning in a complex
fauna. *Ecology* **49**(4): 704-726.

Selvi F, Coppi A, Cecchi L. 2011. High epizoochorous specialization and low DNA

sequence divergence in mediterranean *Cynoglossum* (Boraginaceae): Evidence

from fruit traits and ITS region. *Taxon* **60**: 969-985.

Serrano M, Carbajal R 2003. *Omphalodes littoralis* subsp. *gallaecica* M. Laínz. In:

Bañares Á, Blanca G, Güemes J, Moreno JC, Ortiz S eds. *Atlas y Libro Rojo de*

la Flora Vascular Amenazada de España. Madrid, Spain: Dirección General de

Conservación de la Naturaleza., 274-275.

Serrano M, Carbajal R, Pereira-Coutinho A, Ortiz S. 2016. Two new genera in the

Omphalodes group (Cynoglosseae, Boraginaceae). *Nova Acta Científica*

Compostelana (Bioloxía) **23**: 1-14.

Shepherd LD, Mc Lay TG. 2011. Two micro-scale protocols for the isolation of DNA

from polysaccharide-rich plant tissue. *Journal of Plant Research* **124**(2): 311-

314.

Smith SA, O'Meara BC. 2012. treePL: divergence time estimation using penalized

likelihood for large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* **28**(20): 2689-2690.

Sobel JM, Chen GF, Watt LR, Schemske DW. 2010. The biology of speciation.

Evolution **64**(2): 295-315.

Sobel JM, Streisfeld MA. 2015. Strong premating reproductive isolation drives

incipient speciation in *Mimulus aurantiacus*. *Evolution* **69**(2): 447-461.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-

analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* **30**(9): 1312-1313.

Stankowski S, Sobel JM, Streisfeld MA. 2015. The geography of divergence with

gene flow facilitates multitrait adaptation and the evolution of pollinator

isolation in *Mimulus aurantiacus*. *Evolution* **69**(12): 3054-3068.

Stuessy TF, Hörandl E. 2013. The importance of comprehensive phylogenetic

(evolutionary) classification—a response to Schmidt-Lebuhn's commentary on

paraphyletic taxa. *Cladistics*: 1-3.

Suc JP. 1984. Origin and evolution of the Mediterranean vegetation and climate in

Europe. *Nature* **307**(5950): 429.

Swofford DL. 2001. Paup*: Phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (and other

methods) 4.0. B5.

Talavera S, Andrés C, Arista M, Fernández Piedra M, Gallego M, Ortiz P,

Romero Zarco C, Salgueiro F, Silvestre S, Quintanar A 2012. Boraginaceae.

In: Talavera S, Andrés C, Arista M, Fernández Piedra M, Gallego M, Ortiz P,

Romero Zarco C, Salgueiro F, Silvestre S, Quintanar A eds. *Flora Iberica*.

919   Madrid: Real Jardín Botánico, CSIC, 324-532.

Templeton AR. 1981. Mechanisms of speciation- a population genetic approach.

Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics **12**: 23-48.

Vargas P, Fernández-Mazuecos M, Heleno R. 2018. Phylogenetic evidence for a

Miocene origin of Mediterranean lineages: species diversity, reproductive traits

and geographical isolation. *Plant Biology* **20**: 157-165.

Vu VQ. 2011. ggbiplot: A ggplot2 based biplot. *R package*.

Warren DL, Glor RE, Turelli M. 2008. Environmental niche equivalency versus

conservatism: quantitative approaches to niche evolution. *Evolution* **62**(11):

2868-2883.

Wickham H. 2016. *ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis*. Switzerland: Springer.

Wiens JJ, Graham CH. 2005. Niche Conservatism: Integrating Evolution, Ecology,

and Conservation Biology. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*

Systematics **36**(1): 519-539.

Yin H, Yan X, Zhang W, Shi Y, Qian C, Yin C, Tian F, Wang X, Ma X-F. 2016.

Geographical or ecological divergence between the parapatric species *Ephedra*

sinica and *E. intermedia*? *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **302**(8): 1157-1170.

Zheng H, Fan L, Milne RI, Zhang L, Wang Y, Mao K. 2017. Species Delimitation

and Lineage Separation History of a Species Complex of Aspens in China.

Frontiers in Plant Sciences **8**: 375.

Zheng XM, Ge S. 2010. Ecological divergence in the presence of gene flow in two

closely related *Oryza* species (*Oryza rufipogon* and *O. nivara*). *Molecular*

Ecology **19**(12): 2439-2454.

Zheng Y, Wiens JJ. 2015. Do missing data influence the accuracy of divergence-time

estimation with BEAST? *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **85**: 41-49.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Locations of the *Iberodes* species sampled for the different analyses performed. The star symbols indicate locations for RAD-sequencing, squares represent the locations for the morphometric analysis, and circles indicate locations for the ecological niche modelling. Color legend for each taxa of *Iberodes* is shown in the figure. Images of the six taxa are framed following each taxa color in the map.

Fig. 2 Time-calibrated phylogeny obtained from TreePL by using maximum clade credibility from 1000 bootstrap trees of the maximum likelihood analysis of c95m20 matrix. Branch thickness indicates the ML bootstrap supports above 98. Node bars in blue indicate the node age ranges taking into account the branch length variance along the 1000 bootstrap trees. No branch length variation was inferred for nodes without blue bar. The international stratigraphic scale is included from 26 myr until present. Text codes for each individual location are detailed in the Table S1. The color for each lineage of the Linifolia clade is geophycally represented through the colored ellipses of the map. Grey ellipses group the different lineages of the four taxa within the Linifolia clade.

Fig. 3 Morphometric, niche overlap and genetic clustering analyses of the Linifolia clade. Codes for each taxa are: LIN for *I. linifolia*, KUZ for *I. kuzinskyana*, LIT-GAL for *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*, and LIT-LIT for *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*. (a) Morphometric analysis. Principal Component Analaysis (PCA) of the 12 morphologic chartacters: LS, length of the stem; LL, length of the leaf; WL, wide of the leaf; PINFL, pedicel of inflorescence; LCFR, length of fruit calix; DN, diameter of the nutlet; LN, length of the nutlet; LM, length of the margin nutlet; LT, length of the margin teeth; DH, density of trichomes; LH, length of trichome; BR: absence=0, presence=1 of flowering bracts). The contribution of each trait to the two principal components (PC1, PC2) as well as the positive or negative sense of the relationship is represented through the length of each arrow and the directionality of the arrow, respectively. The percentages of the variability explained by the two PCs are indicated close to the axes. (b) Niche overlap analysis. PCA of the six climatic variables obtained from WorldClim. BIO1, Annual Mean Temperature; BIO3, Isothermality; BIO4, Temperature Seasonality; BIO8, Mean Temperature of Wettest Quarter; BIO12, Annual Precipitation; BIO14, Precipitation of Driest Month. The strength of contribution of each variable to PCs and the sense of the relationship is represented, as explained above, through the length and the directionality of the arrows. The percentages of the

variability explained by the two PCs are indicated close to the axes. Values of the
variables are also represented for each PC separately following Fernández-López and
Villa-Machío (2017). (c) Genetic clustering. Scatterplot from the DAPC analysis
showing the genetic differentiation retained in one PC as the optimal number of PC for
the discriminant function. Compoplot for K=4 is also represented indicating
membership probability to each genetic cluster for each taxa.

Fig. 4 Species distribution modelling obtained through the entropy algorithm, as
implemented in Maxent for the four taxa of the Linifolia clade. Codes for each taxa are:
LIN for *I. linifolia*, KUZ for *I. kuzinskyana*, and LIT for *I. littoralis* (LIT-GAL for *I.*
littoralis ssp. *gallaecica*, LIT-LIT for *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*). Analyses are based on
WorldClim and projected to past conditions: last interglacial (LIG, c. 120–140 kya) and
last glacial maximum (LGM, c. 21 kya). The presence/absence was estimated using the
maximum training sensitivity plus specificity logistic threshold. The projection to the
past is only presented according to the inferred times of divergence of each taxa.

TABLES

Table 1 Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) results for individuals from two
contrasted groups: (1) mainland, *I. linifolia* and (2) coastal, *I. kuzinskyana* and *I.*
littoralis.

1004

Source of Varitation	d.f.	Sum of squares	Variance components	Percentage of variation
Among groups	1	1602.666	106.33509 Va	58.88
Among populations within groups	2	181.372	5.47321 Vb	3.03
Within populations	24	1651.033	68.79306 Vc	38.09
Total	27	3435.071	180.60135	

1005 Note: Variance components are as in Excoffier *et al.* (1992). Fst = 0.61909; Fsc = 0.07370; Fct
1006 = 0.58878.

1007

1008

1009

1010   **Table 2** Pairwise statistical test for comparison of ecological niche overlap between the
1011   different taxa within the Linifolia clade. The statistical significance is represented by p-
1012   values (Warren *et al.*, 2008). Asterisk (*) indicate significant values for *p*-values < 0.01.

Taxa comparison	Schoener's D	Niche equivalency p-value	Niche similarity p-value
I. linifolia vs *I. kuzinskyana*	0.026	0.0099*	0.94059
I. linifolia vs *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*	0.003	0.003	0.60396
I. linifolia vs *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*	0.004	0.0099*	0.69307
I. kuzinskyana vs *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*	0.000	0.0099*	0.64356
I. kuzinskyana vs *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*	0.000	0.0099*	0.71287
I. littoralis ssp. *gallaecica* vs *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*	0.000	0.0099*	0.67327

1013

1014   **Table 3** Examples of parapatric speciation in plants.

Genus	Family	Event suggested	Reference
Ephedra	Ephedraceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche	Yin *et al.* (2016)
Fosterella	Bromeliaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by polyploidization and	Paule *et al.* (2017)
Helianthus	Asteraceae	Ecological divergence mediate by bioclimatic niche	Andrew & Rieseberg (2013)
Mimulus	Phrymaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by pollinator shift	Sobel & Streisfeld (2015), Stankowski *et al.* (2015)
Miscanthus	Poaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic	Huang *et al.* (2014)

		niche	
Oryza	Poaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche	Zheng & Ge (2010)
Populus	Salicaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche	Zheng *et al.* (2017)
Roscoea	Zingiberaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche	Zhao *et al.* (2016)
Senecio	Asteraceae	Ecological divergence mediated by ecological niche	Richards & Ortiz-Barrientos (2016)
Stauracanthus	Fabaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche	Chozas *et al.* (2017)
Columnea	Gesneriaceae	Ecological divergence mediated by bioclimatic niche and pollinator shift	Schulte *et al.* (2015)

1015

1016

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Fig. S1 RAxML trees of *Iberodes* using three different similarity percentages (85%, 90%, 95%) and four levels of minium coverage (m4, m12, m20, m28). Bootstrap support are indicated when is lower than 100.

Fig. S2. SVDquartets species tree of *Iberodes* using the eight main lineages obtained in the RAxML analyses.

Fig. S3 Compoplot showing individual assignment probability to different species-groups of the Linofolia clade of *Iberodes*, considering the two subspecies of *I. littoralis* as one group (k=3). Codes for each taxa are: LIN for *I. linifolia*, KUZ for *I. kuzinskyana*, LIT-GAL for *I. littoralis* ssp. *gallaecica*, and LIT-LIT for *I. littoralis* ssp. *littoralis*.

Fig. S4 Flow cytometry peaks for each of five samples used for each of the five species

of *Iberodes* (including the two subspecies of *I. littoralis*. Peak of the standard *Solanum*

lycopersicum is included. FL1 in the X axis indicates the signal intensity (530 nm / 28

nm; DAPI emission maximum=461). Y axis indicates the number of events found.

Mean, mode, and median values of FL and percentage of variation coefficient is shown

for each colored peak.

Table S1 Data information and NCBI SRA accession numbers of all individuals

sampled for RADseq.

Table S2 Morphological characters analyzed. Values represent the mean of two

individuals measured per herbarium sheet. LS: length of the stem, LL: length of the leaf,

WL: wide of the leaf, PINFL: pedicel of inflorescence, LCFR: length of fruit calix, DN:

diameter of the nutlet, LN: length of the nutlet, LM: length of the margin nutlet, LT:

length of the margin teeth, DH: density of the hair, LH: length of trichome.

Table S3 Data points for environmental analysis

Table S4 Number of loci, SNPs retrieved for each of the 12 parameter combinations.

Parameter abbreviations indicate: c, clustering threshold; m, minimum taxon coverage to

consider a locus.

Table S5 Genome size estimation for the five species of *Iberodes* (including the two

subspecies of *I. littoralis*.

Methods S1 Introgression analysis.

LINIFOLIA CLADE

I. littoralis ssp. *littoralis*

I. littoralis ssp. *gallaecica*

I. kuzinskyana

I. linifolia

Outgroup

I. brassicifolia

I. commutata

I.linifolia SEV 2
I.linifolia SEV 1
I.linifolia BUR 2
I.linifolia JAE 1
I.linifolia MAD 15
I.linifolia MAD 16
I.linifolia ZAR 2 2
I.linifolia ZAR 2 3
I.linifolia ZAR 1 3
I.linifolia ZAR 1 1
I.linifolia BAD 1
I.linifolia BAD 2
I.linifolia BAD 3
I.linifolia SET 2
I.linifolia LIS 2
I.kuzinskyana LIS 2 1
I.kuzinskyana LIS 1 1
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica XUN 1
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica XUN 2
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica PC 1
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica DON 1
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica DON 2
I.littoralis ssp. gallaecica BAL 1
I.littoralis ssp. littoralis POI 1
I.littoralis ssp. littoralis POI 1
I.littoralis ssp. littoralis LOI 1
I.littoralis ssp. littoralis LOI 2
I.littoralis ssp. littoralis BRE 1

Oligocene	Miocene		Pliocene	Pleistocene	Holocene
Paleogene	Neogene			Quaternary	

20   10   0 (myr)

(a) Morphometric analysis

(b) Niche overlap

(c) Genetic clustering

| | **Last interglacial** (120,000 - 140,000 yr BP) | **Last Glacial Maximum** (21,000 yr BP) | **Present** |