



Murdoch
UNIVERSITY

MURDOCH RESEARCH REPOSITORY

This is the author's final version of the work, as accepted for publication following peer review but without the publisher's layout or pagination.

The definitive version is available at
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/mec.13622>

Allen, S.J., Bryant, K.A., Kraus, R.H.S., Loneragan, N.R., Kopps, A.M., Brown, A.M., Gerber, L. and Krützen, M. (2016) *Genetic isolation between coastal and fishery-impacted, offshore bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* spp.) populations. Molecular Ecology, 25 (12). pp. 2735-2753.*

<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/31534/>

Copyright: © 2016 John Wiley & Sons Ltd

It is posted here for your personal use. No further distribution is permitted.

Received Date: 18-Dec-2014

Revised Date: 17-Feb-2016

Accepted Date: 11-Mar-2016

Article Type: Original Article

Genetic isolation between coastal and fishery-impacted, offshore bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* spp.) populations

Simon J. Allen^{1,2*}, Kate A. Bryant³, Robert H. S. Kraus^{4,5}, Neil R. Loneragan³, Anna M. Koppes^{6,7}, Alexander M. Brown¹, Livia Gerber⁶, and Michael Krützen^{6*}

¹ Murdoch University Cetacean Research Unit, School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia 6150, Australia

² Centre for Marine Futures, School of Animal Biology and Oceans Institute, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Western Australia 6009, Australia

³ School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia 6150, Australia

⁴ University of Konstanz, Department of Biology, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

⁵ Max Planck Institute for Ornithology, Department of Migration and Immuno-Ecology, Am Obstberg 1, 78315 Radolfzell, Germany

⁶ Evolutionary Genetics Group, Department of Anthropology, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland

⁷ Marine Evolution and Conservation, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, 9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands

*Corresponding authors:

Email: simon.allen@uwa.edu.au

michael.kruetzen@aim.uzh.ch

Phone: +61 8 416 083 653

+41 44 63 55412

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/mec.13622

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract

The identification of species and population boundaries are important in both evolutionary biology and conservation. In recent years, new population genetic and computational methods for estimating population parameters and testing hypotheses in a quantitative manner have emerged. Using a Bayesian framework and a quantitative model-testing approach, we evaluated the species affiliations and genetic connectivity of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* spp.) populations off remote north-western Australia, with a focus on pelagic ‘offshore’ dolphins subject to incidental capture in a trawl fishery. We analysed 71 dolphin samples from three sites beyond the 50 m depth contour (the inshore boundary of the fishery) and up to 170 km offshore, including incidentally caught and free-ranging individuals associating with trawl vessels; and 273 dolphins sampled at 12 coastal sites within 10 km of the coast. Results from 19 nuclear microsatellite markers showed significant population structure between dolphins from within the fishery and coastal sites, but also among dolphins from coastal sites, identifying three coastal populations. Moreover, we found no current or historic gene flow into the offshore population in the region of the fishery, indicating a complete lack of recruitment from coastal sites. Mitochondrial DNA corroborated our findings of reproductive isolation between dolphins from the offshore population and coastal sites. Most offshore individuals formed a monophyletic clade with common bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*), while all 273 individuals sampled coastally formed a well-supported clade of Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*T. aduncus*). By including a quantitative modelling approach, our study explicitly took evolutionary processes into account for informing the conservation and management of protected species. As such, it may serve as a template for other, similarly inaccessible study populations.

Key words: bycatch; delphinids; gene flow; migration; population structure.

Introduction

Estimating population parameters such as effective population size, migration rate and its directionality, as well as the degree of admixture, are important in evolutionary biology. Whether individuals form part of a single, randomly mating population or are members of different populations with varying levels of genetic isolation also has important bearings on conservation and management (Frankham et al. 2010; Waples and Gaggiotti 2006). Genetic data are frequently employed to determine if, and to what extent, samples from different locations are part of the same population or whether they are genetically differentiated,

because information on geographic separation is not usually sufficient to determine the degree of isolation (Beerli and Palczewski 2010).

Genetic differentiation among populations may be observed in cases where there has been long-term separation with low recurrent gene flow, or recent divergence with no ongoing gene flow (Nielsen and Wakeley 2001; Palsbøll et al. 2004). Discriminating between these two scenarios has important ramifications for conservation, as isolated populations impacted by anthropogenic stressors may require different management strategies from those that may experience homogenizing effects due to gene flow (Hoelzel et al. 1998b; Bilgmann et al. 2014).

Currently, there is no general framework outlining the levels at which populations are demographically independent (Waples and Gaggiotti 2006). In migration-drift equilibrium situations, assuming selective neutrality, genetic differentiation between populations is negatively correlated with the number of migrants/generations between them. Previous approaches inferred the number of migrants between populations based on the degree of genetic divergence between populations, such as Wright's F_{ST} (Wright 1931), based on a symmetric island model. However, it has been shown that these approaches are problematic; particularly as the mathematical model underlying the transformation of F_{ST} into the number of migrants/generation makes numerous assumptions, which are biologically unrealistic (e.g., Whitlock and McCauley 1999). More recently, individual-based methods have been developed that allow individuals to be assigned to populations using matching probabilities (e.g., Pritchard et al. 2000; Corander et al. 2008). Yet, these approaches are not able to estimate important population parameters, such as the directionality and extent of migration, mutation, or population size, which may account for the present population structure (Palsbøll et al. 2007). Such information is important for assessing the impact of human activity on wildlife, but also difficult to obtain in the marine environment.

Most cetacean species are impacted by human activities in at least some parts of their geographical range (Whitehead et al. 2000; Read et al. 2006). The incidental capture, or bycatch, of cetaceans in fisheries is a persistent threat to many populations (Halpern et al. 2007; Reeves et al. 2013), although knowledge of population structure and connectedness is currently lacking for many species. Gill netting, purse seining and trawling operations result in the greatest proportions of fisheries-related mortalities (Read et al. 2006; Slooten 2013). In

Australian waters, dolphins interact with prawn- and fish-trawling operations wherever they occur (e.g., Chilvers and Corkeron 2001; Svane 2005). Off the remote north-western Australian coastline, dolphins regularly interact with the Pilbara Fish Trawl Interim Managed Fishery (Pilbara Trawl Fishery or 'PTF' hereafter, Jaiteh et al. 2013). Bycatch of a range of protected species (including dolphins, sawfish and turtles) was first highlighted in the PTF in 2002; with dolphin bycatch initially estimated at ca. 50 individuals *per annum* (Stephenson and Chidlow 2003). An estimated minimum of 500 dolphins was caught in the ten years from 2003 until 2012 (Allen et al. 2014).

The variable nature of cetacean-fisheries interactions requires species- and fishery-specific approaches to bycatch mitigation (Cox et al. 2004, 2007). Without any prior cetacean research having been conducted in the Pilbara region, the dolphin species interacting with the PTF was previously undetermined, but assumed to be the common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) based on a limited number of length measurements and photographs. Very little is known about common bottlenose dolphins in Australian waters (Ross 2006; Allen et al. 2012). Bottlenose dolphins are globally widespread in tropical and temperate waters, occurring in both coastal and pelagic populations (Rice 1998; Reeves et al. 2002). There are three putative *Tursiops* species in Australian waters; common bottlenose and Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus* and *T. aduncus*, respectively) have wide distributions (Woinarski et al. 2014), and the Burrunan dolphin (*T. australis*; Möller et al. 2008; Charlton-Robb et al. 2011; but see Committee on Taxonomy 2014), a 'species' that is restricted to a few south-eastern Australian embayments. Common bottlenose dolphins are thought to occur further offshore and generally in deeper waters than Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins, which inhabit near-shore areas of much of the Australian coastline, including continental islands and reefs (Woinarski et al. 2014). Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins may mix with and/or be replaced by common bottlenose dolphins in some areas, and many communities of both these species interact with trawling operations around Australia (Allen et al. 2014; Woinarski et al. 2014). Although spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris* sp.) also occur in north-western Australian waters and have been subject to bycatch in commercial fisheries (Ross 2006), they are morphologically and behaviourally distinguishable from the *Tursiops* Genus, and only the bottlenose dolphin phenotype has been reported (by skippers, crew and fisheries observers) as bycatch in the PTF (Stephenson and Chidlow 2003; Allen et al. 2014).

While common bottlenose dolphins tend to occur in deeper waters, further offshore than Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins around Australia, the ‘offshore’ dolphins interacting with the PTF do so between depths of ~ 50 and 100 m (Jaiteh et al. 2013; Allen et al. 2014). This is not deep by oceanic standards, and coastal *T. aduncus* can be found in similar depths, especially when close to islands or where there is a steep gradient adjacent to the coast (Woinarski et al. 2014). Thus, one cannot assume *a priori* the absence of gene flow between the two groups of dolphins (‘coastal’ and ‘offshore’), particularly given the high levels of hybridization among delphinids (e.g. Bérubé 2009; Schaurich et al. 2012; Brown et al. 2014).

Correct species identification is critical in wildlife management, since even closely related and morphologically similar species may possess variable behavioural and life history characteristics (Wade and Angliss 1997; Boness et al. 2002). Here, we used an extended population genetics toolbox to investigate the species status and population genetic structure of a number of bottlenose dolphin populations off north-western Australia (Fig. 1), the first such study in this region. We collected small tissue biopsies from incidentally captured and free-ranging dolphins interacting with the PTF, dolphins at multiple ‘shallow’ coastal sites inshore of the fishery and across north-western Australia, and dolphins in deeper waters off the North West Cape (Fig. 1). We aimed to determine whether dolphins interacting with the PTF showed greater genetic affinities to the common bottlenose dolphin (*T. truncatus*), the Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin (*T. aduncus*), or other closely related delphinid taxa. Furthermore, in addition to the traditionally used combination of basic genetic summary statistics and population structure analysis, we included explicitly model-based, coalescent analyses of genetic connectedness among dolphin populations across the region. In particular, we aimed to elucidate whether there was recruitment into the PTF-associated population/s from nearby coastal sampling sites.

Materials and Methods

Sample collection and fishery characteristics

Biopsy sampling efforts were focussed at 15 sites around north-western Australia (Fig. 1). The Pilbara Trawl Fishery is bound by longitudes of 116°E to the west and 120°E to the east, and by an approximation of the 50 m depth contour inshore and the 100 m depth contour offshore (Fig. 1). Four management areas are open to trawl fishing, representing an area of ca. 23,000 km². Three vessels operated in the PTF at the time of the study and they

completed between ca. 7,300 and 10,300 h of trawling *per annum* from 2010 to 2012 (Fletcher and Santoro 2013).

FIGURE 1

All dolphin biopsy samples from within the fishery were collected between ~ 50 and 170 km offshore, in water > 50 m deep, and over an east-west distance of ~ 300 km. An eastern (Site 15) and a western (Site 14) cluster of samples were collected in the PTF (Fig. 1). Another three samples were collected in water ~ 300 km to the south-west of the PTF: in deep (101 m) water offshore of the North West Cape (Site 13, 'NW Cape offshore', 114°E, Fig. 1). These three samples were included in this study to provide potential insight, albeit limited by the small sample size, into genetic connectedness of the PTF-associated dolphins to other 'offshore' populations.

Coastal biopsy sampling of bottlenose dolphins occurred at 12 sites in waters < 50 m deep and within about 10 km of the coastline, extending from Useless Inlet (Site 1, 26.1°S, 113.3°E) in Shark Bay in the south-west to Cygnet Bay (Site 12, 16.5°S, 123.0°E) in King Sound in the north-east, spanning ~ 2,000 km of coastline (Fig. 1).

A total of 344 dolphin samples were collected between 2008 and 2013 (except those from Shark Bay, Sites 1-4, which were obtained between 1998 and 2013) and used for genetic analyses in this study. The subset of 68 samples of PTF-associated dolphins included three incidentally caught individuals and 65 free-ranging animals obtained during commercial fish trawling operations, on four trips to sea between 2008 and 2011. Biopsies from free-ranging dolphins were obtained using the PAXARMS remote biopsy system (Krützen et al. 2002) from a small (4.5 m) tender, and a biopsy pole (Bilgmann et al. 2007) for sampling individual dolphins close to the bow or stern of trawl vessels (and a large research vessel for the three samples obtained in deeper waters offshore of the North West Cape). All 273 bottlenose dolphins sampled from the 12 coastal sites were collected from free-ranging dolphins using the PAXARMS remote biopsy system from small (5.5 m) research vessels.

Generation of genetic data

DNA was extracted from biopsy samples using the Qiagen Genra tissue kit following the manufacturer's instructions. The extracted genomic DNA was resuspended in TE buffer (10mM Tris, 1mM EDTA, pH 8) and the concentration adjusted to 20ng/μl. Sex determination was carried out by amplification of the sex specific ZFX and SRY loci using a multiplex PCR (Gilson et al. 1998).

A 430 base-pair part of the hyper-variable region I of the mitochondrial control region (HVR-I) was amplified using primers dlp1.5 and dlp5 (Baker et al. 1993). PCR products were cleaned up using silica membrane spin columns (GeneElute™ by Sigma-Aldrich) and sequenced using the Cycle Sequencing Ready Reaction kit (BigDye Terminator v3.1 - Applied Biosystems), based on the protocol described in Bacher et al. (2010), using sequencing primer dlp 1.5. SEQUENCING ANALYSIS v5.2 and BIOEDIT v7.0.5.3 were used to visually quality control, edit and align the sequences.

Nineteen microsatellite loci were amplified using two different multiplex PCR regimes: multiplex 1 - Tur4_98, Tur4_117, MK6, E12, Tur4_105, Tur4_108, Tur4_66, Tur4_111, Tur4_128; multiplex 2 - KWM12, MK3, MK5, MK8, MK9, Tur4_142, Tur4_153, Tur4_162, Tur4_80, Tur4_132 (Krützen et al. 2001; Hoelzel et al. 1998a; Nater et al. 2009). PCRs contained 20 ng template DNA, 5 μl 2× Multiplex PCR Master Mix (Qiagen, containing HotStarTaq DNA Polymerase, dNTPs and 3 mM MgCl₂ final concentration), between 0.05 and 0.5μM of each primer and ddH₂O to a final volume of 10μl. Diluted PCR products were denatured in 10μl HiDi formamide containing 0.07μl of GeneScan™500LIZ size standard (Applied Biosystems). The length of the DNA fragments was determined by running the PCR products on an ABI 3730 DNA Sequencer (Applied Biosystems) and analysing the output files using GENEMAPPER v4.0. We independently amplified and scored 20 randomly selected individuals to estimate error rate for the microsatellite scoring. Our error rate was determined to be 0.0039 (three scoring differences in 760 alleles).

Population structure and gene flow

Population structure and genetic connectedness among sampling localities were inferred using both summary statistics and individual-based approaches based on microsatellite data. Genetic variation within sampling sites was estimated by calculating the number of alleles and effective alleles, observed (H_O), expected (H_E) and unbiased expected heterozygosity

(U_{H_E}) in GENALEX v6.5 (Peakall and Smouse 2012). Tests for departure from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) and the occurrence of linkage disequilibrium and null alleles were carried out for each sampling site in GENEPOP v4.2.1 (Rousset 2008), with Bonferroni-corrected significance levels (Rice 1989). Estimates of F_{ST} (Weir and Cockerham 1984) and Jost's D (Jost 2008) were calculated in GENEPOP and GENODIVE (Meirmans and van Tienderen 2004), respectively.

The software package STRUCTURE v2.3.3 (Pritchard et al. 2000) was used to determine the genetic structure and number of genetic clusters in our dataset. In particular, we were interested in the levels of genetic connectedness among the PTF-associated population/s and the 12 coastal dolphin sampling localities. The STRUCTURE algorithm divides sampled individuals into a number of clusters (K) independent of locality information by minimizing deviations from Hardy-Weinberg and linkage equilibrium in each cluster. The program uses a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedure to estimate $P(X|K)$, the posterior probability that the data fit the hypothesis of K clusters.

Three different STRUCTURE analyses were conducted. For all analyses, we used no prior information. The length of the burn-in period was set to 10^5 , followed by 10^6 MCMC steps. For each K (the maximum number of K for each analysis was the number of sampling locations for the respective analysis), the analysis was run ten times. The first, global analysis involved all samples and used an admixture model with correlated allele frequencies and no prior information. For the two subsequent analyses, we chose the 'Locprior' model, which improves clustering when the signal is weak without spuriously inferring structure, if absent (Hubisz et al. 2009). The second analysis was carried out on PTF individuals only, while the third analysis incorporated only the 12 coastal populations. Since the $P(X|K)$ estimator has been shown to overestimate K , as it frequently plateaus at higher values than biologically meaningful estimates of K , we also calculated the ΔK statistic (Evanno et al. 2005). This provides a very conservative estimate of K only at the highest biological level and was performed using the software STRUCTUREHARVESTER (Earl and vonHoldt 2012).

In addition, a factorial correspondence analysis projecting all genotypes on the factor space, which is defined by the similarity of their allelic states, as implemented in GENETIX v4.05.2 (Belkhir et al. 2004), was used to visualize the degree of dissimilarity among sampling sites.

Accepted Article

Migration patterns and gene flow among the PTF population and selected coastal populations were inferred based on two coalescence modelling approaches. The first approach was implemented in MIGRATE-N v3.6.4 (Beerli and Felsenstein 2001; Beerli 2006), which is based on an equilibrium island model to estimate genetic diversity of each defined population and all pairwise migration rates between these. This analysis was based solely on microsatellite data as the software does not implement a correction for differing inheritance modes, i.e. mtDNA vs nuclear DNA. In order to reduce the number of parameters in our models to arrive at a computationally and statistically tractable analysis, some relevant sampling sites were pooled into three populations (as identified in our STRUCTURE analysis, see Results): Pilbara Trawl Fishery (Sites 14-15), Shark Bay (Sites 1-4), and 'Other Coastal' populations (Sites 5-11; Cygnet Bay was excluded because our STRUCTURE and factorial correspondence analyses revealed at least some Cygnet Bay individuals to be genetically different). Four different models (Table 2) constraining the presence, directionality, and amount of gene flow among the three pooled sampling sites were defined. Model 1 allowed full migration between all population pairs (full model). One cannot define a model that sets migration among PTF and all other populations to nought because, under such circumstances, coalescence trees could not be calculated and general assumptions of the MIGRATE-N approach were violated. Therefore, model 2 allowed only very limited gene flow from and to PTF (\approx nought migration, but sufficient to match MIGRATE-N's needs with regard to coalescence trees). This effectively rendered the PTF population isolated from both Shark Bay and Other Coastal populations, while it allowed full migration between Shark Bay and Other Coastal populations (low migration PTF model). In model 3, gene flow from the PTF population into the Shark Bay and Other Coastal was allowed, but not vice versa. In model 4, gene flow from Shark Bay and Other Coastal populations to the PTF was allowed, but not vice versa. Convergence was achieved by running each model for more than 80,000 CPU hours, parallelized over 240 CPUs. We used 50 independent, replicate runs, each with its own burn-in and heating scheme (see below), to later join the results (c.f., Hartmann et al. 2013). We regard the emergence of clear, unimodal posterior distributions across all these replicates as a strong indicator of convergence.

The run parameters for MIGRATE-N were as follows: for Θ (population size parameter, scaled to mutation rate) and M (migration rate parameter), a uniform prior was used. The prior range for Θ was set to 0-10 (mean 5; Δ 1; 20,000 bins) and for M 0-100 (mean 50; Δ 10; 20,000 bins). Mutation rates of loci were allowed to vary. Five hundred coalescent samples

were recorded per replicate, one every 100 iterations, thus sampling 25,000 (50 x 500) parameter values from chains comprising a total of 2,500,000 iterations. A static heating scheme (4 chains with temperatures 1,000,000; 3; 1.5; 1) and a burn-in of 200,000 steps was applied to each replicate. Model comparisons were carried out using marginal likelihoods calculated using the thermodynamic integration ('Bezier') in MIGRATE-N (Beerli and Palczewski 2010). The estimated mutation scaled migration parameter M was translated into the effective number of immigrants per generation (Nm), as detailed elsewhere (Kraus et al. 2013, Jonker et al. 2013).

The second coalescence approach to assess migration patterns and gene flow between the PTF population and selected coastal populations was implemented in IMA2 (Nielsen and Wakeley 2001; Hey and Nielsen 2007; Hey 2010). This approach is based on an isolation-with-migration (IM) model (allows for lack of gene flow, as opposed to MIGRATE-N) and uses Metropolis-coupled Markov chains to approximate posterior distributions of population size, gene flow, and divergence time. Similar to our MIGRATE-N analysis, relevant sampling sites were pooled into three populations (as identified in our STRUCTURE analysis, see Results): Pilbara Trawl Fishery (PTF, Sites 14-15), Shark Bay (Sites 1-4), and Other Coastal (Sites 5-11, i.e. Cygnet Bay excluded). In contrast to the MIGRATE-N analysis, however, we also included mtDNA data, because the software has a built-in ability to weigh across different inheritance modes. As IMA2 is slow for large multi-locus data sets, we randomly selected 30 individuals from each of the three populations.

For the IMA2 analysis, we used uniform priors for divergence times and population sizes. For migration rates, exponential priors may be more informative when actual rates of gene flow are very low or nought (Runemark et al. 2011). However, among our three populations, gene flow might be substantial among the Other Coastal and Shark Bay populations. Thus, we also used uniform priors for migration rates. Mutation rates were set to 4.8×10^{-8} (range 3.1×10^{-8} to 6.9×10^{-8} ; Oremus et al. 2007) mutations/year for mtDNA, and 1.5×10^{-5} (Brohede and Ellegren 1999) for all microsatellite loci. Upper limits for divergence time were set to $t = 30$, population size $\theta = 150$, and migration rate $M = 50$. The latter value appears high, but several initial runs (burn-in period of 20,000 and run length of 100,000) had shown that the parameter estimate of M between the Other Coastal and Shark Bay populations was very high. We carried out several independent runs. In each run, to ensure adequate mixing of the Markov chain, we used Metropolis-coupling of 60 independent heated

Accepted Article

chains (Geyer 1992). Burn-in took place until stationarity was reached by assessing burn-trend plots for each run. The most heated chain had a heating factor of 0.9, with other chains having heating values between 1 and 0.9. As suggested by Hey (2010), stationarity for each run was evaluated by assessing autocorrelations of splitting time terms, the absence of trends in splitting time trend plots, and by the degree of similarity between parameter estimates from genealogies generated during the first and the second half of the run.

To obtain estimates of magnitude and direction of contemporary gene flow between pairs of pooled populations, we used the software BAYESASS, v3.0.3 (Wilson and Rannala 2003). This approach uses an MCMC algorithm to estimate the posterior probability distribution of the proportion of migrants between pairs of populations without assuming genetic equilibrium. We used the same three population classifications as for the MIGRATE-N and IMA2 analyses, plus a fourth (Cygnet Bay, as BAYESASS accommodates for a larger number of populations with a moderate number of markers), and conducted five independent runs for 10,000,000 generations, while discarding the first 1,000,000 generations as burn-in. Mixing parameters for the five runs were $m = 0.3$, $a = 0.5$, and $f = 0.5$.

Finally, to learn more about coastal dolphin population structure, we conducted an isolation-by-distance analysis (Wright 1943) for all coastal populations, i.e. Shark Bay (sites 1-4) and Other Coastal populations (sites 5-12, i.e. including Cygnet Bay), based on our microsatellite data. Geographic distances between each sampling site were measured in the most direct line through the water using ARCGIS, v. 9.2 (ESRI), where the centroids for each population were estimated by including each sample taken at a particular site. We tested for a decrease in genetic similarity (based on F_{ST}) with increasing geographic distance, using a Mantel test implemented in IBDWS, v.3.23 (Jensen et al. 2005). Significance was evaluated by 10,000 randomizations.

Phylogenetic analyses

The mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) sequence alignment was trimmed to the shortest sequence, and part of the 5' tRNA sequence was removed, resulting in a 399bp fragment. Identical haplotypes were collapsed using DAMBE v5.0.72 (Xia and Xie 2001). We used a General Time Reversible Model with gamma-distributed rate variation across sites and a proportion of invariable sites, as implemented in MRBAYES v3.2, thereby sampling across the substitution model space in the Bayesian MCMC analysis itself (Huelsenbeck et al. 2004).

Parameters for the MRBAYES run were four chains running for 10,000,000 generations, with a sampling frequency of 1,000 and a burn in of 2,500 data points. Consensus trees were displayed and printed using FIGTREE v1.1.2 (<http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/>).

To assess phylogenetic affiliations of the PTF-associated bottlenose dolphins with other delphinids, previously published HVR-I sequences from the following species and regions were included in the analysis: common (*T. truncatus*) and Indo-Pacific (*T. aduncus*) bottlenose dolphins, principally from Chinese and Indonesian waters (Wang et al. 1999), as well as the recently delineated Burrunan dolphin from Victoria, Australia (*T. australis*; Charlton-Robb et al. 2011) and Fraser's dolphins (*Lagenodelphis hosei*; Caballero et al. 2008) (Supplementary Information Table 1). We also included *T. aduncus* samples from coastal south-eastern Australia (Möller and Beheregaray 2001; Möller et al. 2008; Wiszniewski et al. 2010). The tree was rooted with an Atlantic white-sided dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*; Cipriano 1997) sequence as an outgroup (Supplementary Information Table 1).

Results

All 19 microsatellite loci were in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. No significant linkage disequilibrium or consistent occurrence of null alleles in markers across all populations was observed. Allelic diversity and heterozygosity values were generally higher for the PTF samples compared to coastal sampling sites (Supplementary Information Table 2). The pairwise F_{ST} values obtained from microsatellite data were small (generally < 0.06), but significant among almost all sampling sites (Table 1). The highest values (generally > 0.20) were observed for all pairwise comparisons between offshore and coastal sampling sites (Table 1). This suggests a longer period of isolation between offshore and coastal populations than among different coastal sampling sites. Pairwise values for Jost's D were generally larger than F_{ST} values. In particular, pairwise comparisons between PTF and coastal populations were on average two to three times larger for Jost's D than for F_{ST} , suggesting that F_{ST} underestimates divergence (Whitlock 2011).

TABLE 1

For the global dataset containing all samples, the Evanno method identified that $K = 2$ clusters was the most likely scenario. The Structure analysis illustrated a clear pattern of genetic differentiation between the offshore (both the PTF and NW Cape offshore) and all

Accepted Article

coastal sampling sites (Fig. 2A). For higher K values for the global data set, visual inspection revealed four clusters: (i) the four Shark Bay coastal sites; (ii) all coastal sites from Coral Bay to Beagle Bay; (iii) coastal Cygnet Bay; and (iv) the NW Cape offshore and PTF (Fig. 2A).

When only PTF samples were considered, $K = 1$ had the highest probability, suggesting no genetic sub-structuring within the PTF. There was also no indication of any admixed individuals within the PTF, which could have been conceivable given the occurrence of Fraser's dolphin haplotypes in the PTF dataset (see below). When only coastal samples were considered (Fig. 2B), Shark Bay sites formed a distinct cluster from all other coastal sites, which was also supported by the Evanno method ($\Delta K = 2$). At $K = 3$ and higher, samples from Cygnet Bay became distinct, but the remaining coastal populations formed one cluster.

FIGURE 2

The factorial correspondence analysis based on 19 microsatellite loci (Fig. 3) strongly supported the STRUCTURE results. Samples from the PTF formed a single distinct cluster compared to all other samples, including NW Cape offshore. Among the coastal sites, the four Shark Bay sites in the south-west were clearly distinct from other sites across the north-west, while Cygnet Bay was distinct in the north-east. All other coastal sites could not be distinguished from each other (Fig. 3). An isolation-by-distance analysis on coastal samples only revealed a highly significant correlation ($r = 0.48$, $P < 0.01$) among all individual coastal sites (Fig. 4).

FIGURE 3, FIGURE 4

Based on the STRUCTURE results, we pooled most sampling localities into three 'populations' to analyse migration patterns among the combination of: (i) all four Shark Bay coastal sites ('Shark Bay'), (ii) all other coastal sites, other than Cygnet Bay ('Other Coastal'), and (iii) PTF West and East into a single population ('PTF').

Our model comparisons showed a clear lack of migration into the PTF population from any of the coastal populations (Table 2). The model with the lowest support was that which allowed free migration among all populations (Table 2). Thus, our results suggest strongly that the PTF population is reproductively isolated from coastal populations, with no recruitment of dolphins into the PTF population from nearby coastal areas.

TABLE 2

We based our parameter estimates of Θ (a mutation-scaled measure for population size) and Nm (the head-count of effective migrants per generation) on the model that allowed estimation of Θ for all populations. As expected, Θ was highest for the pelagic PTF population ($\Theta = 6.37$, 95% *CI* = 5.60-7.26). The coastal populations had smaller Θ values (Shark Bay $\Theta = 0.78$, 95% *CI* 0.53-1.00; Other Coastal $\Theta = 2.90$, 95% *CI* = 2.48-5.29). Since there was no gene flow from the PTF to any of the coastal populations, we only report Nm estimates between the latter. The Nm estimate differed significantly from nought in both cases, with Nm values from Shark Bay to Other Coastal populations being higher (SB \rightarrow OC: $Nm = 4.31$, 95% *CI* = 3.70-7.89; OC \rightarrow SB: $Nm = 0.21$, 95% *CI* = 0.14-0.26). Importantly, in all models, regardless of their level of support, the Nm parameter estimates concerning migration into the PTF population were always small and confidence intervals included 0, providing further evidence of the lack of recruitment of dolphins into the PTF population from nearby coastal areas. Result files for each model are available online as supplementary material.

Our IMA2 analyses corroborated those obtained by MIGRATE-N. Effective population size was largest for the PTF population (Fig. 5, $\Theta = 2.46$, 95% *CI* = 1.57-3.5) and smaller in the coastal populations (Shark Bay $\Theta = 0.44$, 95% *CI* 0.04-1.09; Other Coastal $\Theta = 1.65$, 95% *CI* = 0.56-4.56). Migration rate parameters were only significant between Shark Bay and Other Coastal populations (Log-likelihood ratio (LLR) = 5.45, $P < 0.01$) and vice versa (LLR = 2.87, $P < 0.05$, Fig. 5). The 95% confidence intervals of all migration parameters between the PTF and the two coastal populations included 0 and were not significant (Fig. 5), providing further evidence for the lack of gene flow between the PTF and all coastal populations.

FIGURE 5

The results from the MIGRATE-N and IMA2 analyses were corroborated by our findings based on BAYESASS (Table 3). We could not detect any significant migration from the coastal populations into the PTF population and vice versa. In general, the proportion of detected migrants within each population (other than Cygnet Bay, which received about 28% of migrants from the Other Coastal population) was small, and the 95% confidence interval included 0 in almost every comparison. These findings suggest strongly that there is no, or at

most only extremely low, migration between the PTF, and the Shark Bay and Other Coastal populations.

TABLE 3

The phylogenetic analyses based on mtDNA revealed some unexpected patterns. We identified 17 unique haplotypes among all individuals collected from within the two sampling sites in the PTF (Sites 14 and 15, Fig. 1), as well as those collected in deep water offshore of the North West Cape (Site 13). These haplotypes formed a well-supported, monophyletic clade with the common bottlenose dolphin. Within this clade, however, clear resolution was lacking (Fig. 6). The haplotype of six individuals sampled within the fishery formed a well-supported monophyletic clade (posterior probability of 0.97) with Fraser's dolphin haplotypes (Fig. 6), an unexpected result that is discussed below. While at-sea differentiation among delphinids can be difficult, all observations and photographs taken during offshore field trips were of the common bottlenose dolphin phenotype. All of the bottlenose dolphins sampled in the coastal regions of north-western Australia formed a highly supported monophyletic clade (posterior probability of 1.00) with other Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*T. aduncus*; Figs. 1, 6).

FIGURE 6

Discussion

Lack of contemporary and historic gene flow between fishery-impacted and coastal dolphins

All our analyses based on nuclear microsatellite data suggest strongly that the bottlenose dolphins sampled in the offshore, pelagic environment (*Tursiops truncatus*) are genetically isolated from those sampled coastally (*T. aduncus*). Both the STRUCTURE and factorial correspondence analyses revealed four clusters of individuals that were geographically separated (one offshore and three coastal 'populations'). Similarly strong patterns of segregation have been reported in other small cetaceans. For example, Perrin et al. (2011) used cranial osteological differentiation to support previous assertions, based on molecular data, for the existence of coastal and offshore forms of common bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*) in Californian waters. Also, false killer whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*) populations sampled offshore in the central and eastern Pacific were recently differentiated from those that are resident and island-associated around the Hawai'ian Archipelago (Martien et al. 2014).

Our STRUCTURE and factorial correspondence analyses, however, did not reveal whether the genetic isolation between the PTF and coastal populations is due to historic cessation of gene flow (i.e. reproductive isolation followed by speciation), or recent divergence. All analyses pertaining to migration rates revealed an absence of gene flow from any coastal population into the PTF population and vice versa, strongly suggesting that the bottlenose dolphin population that is subject to incidental capture in the PTF is genetically isolated from all the adjacent, coastal dolphins, and does not recruit from these coastal dolphin populations. Furthermore, we found no evidence of hybridisation between the pelagic common bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*) and the coastal Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*T. aduncus*). This finding is consistent with that for these two species in Chinese waters, which, despite some areas of overlap in distribution, were found to be reproductively isolated and did not share haplotypes (Wang et al. 1999; Yang et al. 2005).

In our study, the pelagic common bottlenose dolphins showed less genetic sub-structuring than the coastal Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins sampled across a similar geographic distance. Furthermore, the mutation-scaled, effective population sizes (Θ) of common bottlenose dolphins were much larger than those of the Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin population in Shark Bay and the combined coastal populations. These results were to be expected, given the more complex coastal habitat, environmental and social barriers to gene flow, and limited dispersal (Krützen et al. 2004; Frère et al. 2010), as well as the propensity for coastal *Tursiops* of both species to adapt rapidly to local habitats (e.g., Hoelzel et al. 1998b; Sellas et al. 2005; Wiszniewski et al. 2010). Common bottlenose dolphins of open, pelagic environments are capable of long-distance movements: for example, Wells et al. (1999) documented travel distances of ca. 2,000 and > 4,000 km in < 50 days by two satellite-tracked individuals off the east coast of the United States. Furthermore, Quérouil et al. (2007) found no genetic differentiation among common bottlenose dolphins from the Azores, Madeira and other offshore areas of the north-east Atlantic, suggesting that they form a large, pelagic population. The lack of baseline data on Australian common bottlenose dolphins means it is not possible to assess whether the population in the PTF region is an isolated unit or forms part of a large, pelagic population (Ross 2006). The relatively large Θ supports the latter view, but our factorial correspondence analysis revealed some segregation between common bottlenose dolphins in the PTF and those of the North West Cape (Fig. 3), and photographic evidence shows that at least a proportion of the PTF-associated population display long-term fidelity to foraging around the trawlers (Allen 2015).

Pelagic, common bottlenose dolphins of north-western Australia

Most dolphins associated with the PTF, as well as those sampled in deeper waters off the North West Cape, exhibited haplotypes that form a monophyletic clade with those previously published for common bottlenose dolphins (*T. truncatus*) from Chinese and Indonesian waters. Until the current study, the Chinese and Indonesian haplotypes were the only available reference samples for *T. truncatus* in this region, despite the fact that they are globally widespread in both coastal and pelagic populations (Rice 1998; Reeves et al. 2002).

Bottlenose dolphins are polytypic, with two species recognized based on both genetics and morphology; *T. truncatus* and *T. aduncus* (Rice 1998; Wang et al. 1999; Wang et al. 2000a, b), and a third species proposed recently; *T. australis* (Möller et al. 2008; Charlton-Robb et al. 2011). The number of species/subspecies in the complex, however, remains to be resolved (e.g., Natoli et al. 2004), with the Society for Marine Mammalogy currently recognizing only *T. truncatus* and *T. aduncus* (Committee on Taxonomy 2014). All three putative species are present in Australian waters, with *T. truncatus* generally thought to occur further offshore and in deeper waters than *T. aduncus* (Ross 2006), a pattern confirmed for north-western Australia in this study.

The use of the mitochondrial control region for phylogenetic species identification has also proven effective in a range of other studies for closely related delphinids (e.g., Rosel et al. 1994; Möller and Beheregaray 2001; Ross et al. 2003; Beasley et al. 2005). This marker system also has limitations, however, and its usefulness for species identification depends on the evolutionary distinctiveness of the taxa in question. In studies attempting to elucidate the evolutionary relationships amongst the Delphininae, the use of a single mitochondrial gene has provided limited resolution, due to high levels of intraspecific variation and low interspecific differences (Kingston et al. 2009; Viricel & Rosel 2012). Kingston et al. (2009) found that data from amplified fragment length polymorphisms (AFLPs), representing many nuclear genes, gave better resolution. However, even the use of genome-wide multi-locus datasets such as this, and others (Xiong et al. 2009; McGowen 2011; Zhou et al. 2011), have not been able to resolve relationships unambiguously within the Delphininae, which is thought to have undergone a recent and rapid radiation (Kingston et al. 2009; Vilstrup et al. 2011; Hassanin et al. 2012).

In our study, both *T. truncatus* and *T. aduncus* formed well-supported monophyletic clades, as has been documented elsewhere (e.g., Möller & Beheregaray, 2001; Moura et al. 2013). Most individuals from within the PTF, and elsewhere offshore, fell within the *T. truncatus* clade, providing strong evidence that it is predominantly common bottlenose dolphins associating with the fishery. These results were corroborated by the lack of both historic and contemporary gene flow between the PTF-associated common and coastal Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins, identified from our microsatellite data and two independent approaches to estimate gene flow.

Unexpectedly, some offshore individuals exhibited a haplotype that shares a close affinity to Fraser's dolphin haplotypes. Fraser's dolphins occur primarily in waters deeper than 1,000 m (Reeves et al. 2002). They are rarely found in shallow waters or near-shore environs, and field guides and texts report Fraser's dolphins in mixed-species assemblages only with false killer, melon-headed (*Peponocephala electra*) and sperm (*Physeter macrocephalus*) whales, as well as Risso's (*Grampus griseus*), pan-tropical spotted (*Stenella attenuata*) and striped (*S. coeruleoalba*) dolphins (Carwardine 1995; Reeves et al. 2002; Dixon 2008; Jefferson et al. 2008). Fraser's dolphins have not been observed in mixed assemblages with bottlenose dolphins, nor would they be expected in the relatively shallow waters (50 to 100 m deep) in which the PTF operates.

There are three plausible explanations for the occurrence of the Fraser's dolphin haplotypes among the PTF-associated dolphins. First, both *T. truncatus* and *L. hosei* may have been present in the groups of dolphins that were sampled. However, a careful re-examination of all photographs taken in the field revealed only the bottlenose dolphin phenotype, and the STRUCTURE analysis did not reveal any admixed individuals within the PTF. Second, incomplete lineage sorting may have led to the observed pattern. Under a neutral model of evolution, the stochastic lineage sorting leading to reciprocal monophyly proceeds more slowly in large or rapidly diverging populations. In many groups of species with large population size, such as the Delphinidae (Rice 1998; McGowen 2011), genomes will have mixed support for monophyly unless historical bottlenecks have accelerated coalescence. For instance, Kingston et al. (2009) used anonymous nuclear and mtDNA markers to elucidate the phylogenetic relationships among the Delphininae. In their analysis, *L. hosei* showed high affinity to *T. aduncus* for both marker systems, suggesting recent shared ancestry between *Tursiops* and *Lagenodelphis*. A third explanation for the occurrence

of Fraser's dolphin haplotypes among the PTF-associated bottlenose dolphins is that introgression events have taken place, in which Fraser's dolphin mtDNA entered the population through hybridisation.

Coastal, Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins of north-western Australia

Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*T. aduncus*) inhabit near-shore areas of much of the Australian coastline (Ross 2006; Woinarski et al. 2014; this study). Occurring in the shallow, coastal waters of the western Pacific and Indian Oceans, Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins thereby occupy a niche otherwise filled by coastal ecotypes of common bottlenose dolphins in various other regions (e.g., the coastlines of New Zealand, the central and eastern Pacific Ocean, the western and eastern Atlantic Oceans, and the Mediterranean Sea – Natoli et al. 2005; Tezanos-Pinto et al. 2009; Moura et al. 2013; Fruet et al. 2014).

Our study also revealed a strong isolation-by-distance pattern among coastal Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin (sub-) populations across north-western Australia. Fine-scale genetic structuring over scales of just tens to hundreds of kilometres should be viewed as the rule rather than the exception in coastal Australian Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (e.g., Wiszniewski et al. 2009; Ansmann et al. 2012; Kopps et al. 2014), as it should be in coastal common bottlenose dolphins globally (Fernández et al. 2011; Mirimin et al. 2011; Moura et al. 2013; Browning et al. 2014; Fruet et al. 2014; Louis et al. 2014). Here, however, we document the existence of a genetic cline among coastal locations over some hundreds of kilometres (Beagle Bay to Coral Bay, Fig. 1).

An exception to this was the marked genetic differentiation between the dolphins sampled at the two extreme north-east coastal sites (Cygnet Bay and Beagle Bay), located in close proximity to each other (< 150 km apart). The dolphins from Beagle Bay, however, clustered closely with the rest of the coastal populations, distinct from Cygnet Bay. Similar differentiation was detected between Australian snubfin dolphin populations of Cygnet Bay and Roebuck Bay (to the south of Beagle Bay), ~ 300 km apart (Brown et al. 2014). The reasons for this differentiation, which was detected at a smaller spatial scale than elsewhere in the study area, are unknown. The relatively narrow, deep-water entrance to Cygnet Bay, subject to immense tidal movements (~ 12 m on spring tides), may act as a natural barrier to dispersal. Additional sample collection to the east of Cygnet Bay, the incorporation of detailed habitat data (e.g., bathymetry, substrate type) and large-scale genomic data will

better elucidate the patterns and potential drivers of genetic connectedness among coastal populations of bottlenose dolphins across north-western Australia.

Conclusions and recommendations

This study provides evidence that the common bottlenose dolphin (*T. truncatus*) is the predominant species associating with the Pilbara Trawl Fishery and that haplotype sharing or recruitment from adjacent, coastal populations (*T. aduncus*) does not occur. There appears to be no genetic sub-structuring within the PTF-associated population. Data on population size need to be acquired before the viability, or capacity to absorb and recover from, the anthropogenic impact of on-going incidental catch, at an estimated minimum of ~ 50 dolphins *per annum*, can be assessed (Allen et al. 2014). A more complete biopsy sample dataset, from offshore *T. truncatus* populations adjacent to the PTF, needs to be accumulated to allow the quantification of the levels of gene flow with adjacent, pelagic populations. This might also allow: the detection of any changes in population size due to fishery-caused mortalities (c.f., Garza and Williamson 2001); the determination of whether closely related individuals are subject to incidental capture (c.f., Mendez et al. 2010), which can exacerbate the demographic impacts of bycatch in highly social species, such as delphinids (Wade et al. 2012); and the definition of appropriate management units for pelagic dolphins across northern Australia (c.f., Bilgmann et al. 2014). Finally, underwater video footage collected inside trawl nets (Jaiteh et al. 2014), as well as photo-identification data from around trawlers (Allen 2015), suggests that a community of dolphins within the broader population may show fidelity to foraging around trawlers. Estimating the number of individuals interacting with the trawlers is also required to better assess the level of impact this putative community faces.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded primarily by the Australian Marine Mammal Centre (Project 2009/19), with additional contributions from the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (Tactical Research Fund Project 2008/048), the Western Australian Department of Fisheries, the Nickol Bay Professional Fishers Association, the Sea World Research and Rescue Foundation, and the WV Scott Foundation. We thank the commercial trawl operators, Shark Bay Resources, Monkey Mia Wildsights, RAC Monkey Mia Dolphin Resort, Coral Bay Research Station and Eco Beach Resort for in-kind support, and acknowledge the logistical assistance provided by the skippers and crews of the Pilbara Fish Trawl Interim Managed Fishery. Fisheries observer Gavin Kewan, Vanessa Jaiteh of Murdoch University

and the Centre for Whale Research provided assistance with sample collection. MIGRATE-N calculations carried out in this manuscript were performed on the CSC HPC cluster FUCHS of the J. W. Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany. We are grateful to Halina Kobryn and Erik Willems for their deft work on figures 1 and 3, respectively. This manuscript represents publication number 11 of the Shark Bay Dolphin Innovation Project. The research was carried out under cetacean research permits from both the Western Australian State Government (CE002566, SF006538, SF008015) and the Australian Commonwealth Government (2008/003). Dolphin tissue samples were transferred to the University of Zurich under CITES using institutional permits for scientific exchange (CH-019 and AU069) and the research was conducted with animal ethics committee approval from Murdoch University (W2342/10).

Data accessibility section

Data for this manuscript have been made available on DRYAD: doi:10.5061/dryad.908g4.

References

- Allen SJ (2015) Fishery-impacted bottlenose dolphins of north-western Australia: Bycatch patterns, genetic status and abundance. Doctoral thesis submitted to the School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Australia. Pp. 144.
- Allen SJ, Cagnazzi DDB, Hodgson AJ, Loneragan NR, Bejder L (2012) Tropical inshore dolphins of north-western Australia: Unknown populations in a rapidly changing region. *Pac Conserv Biol* 18:56–63
- Allen SJ, Tyne J, Kobryn HT, Bejder L, Pollock KH, Loneragan NR (2014) Patterns of dolphin bycatch in a north-western Australian trawl fishery. *PLoS ONE* 9(4):e93178. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093178
- Ansmann IC, Parra GJ, Lanyon JM, Seddon JM (2012) Fine-scale genetic population structure in a mobile marine mammal: inshore bottlenose dolphins in Moreton Bay, Australia. *Mol Ecol* 21:4472-4485. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05722.x
- Bacher K, Allen S, Lindholm AK, Bejder L, Krützen M (2010) Genes or Culture: Are Mitochondrial Genes Associated with Tool Use in Bottlenose Dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.)? *Behav Genet* 40:706-714
- Baker CS, Perry A, Bannister J, Weinrich MT, Abernethy RB, Calambokidis J, Lien J, Lambertsen RH, Ramirez JU, Vasquez O (1993) Abundant mitochondrial DNA variation and worldwide population structure in humpback whales. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 90:8239-8243
- Beasley I, Robertson KM, Arnold P (2005) Description of a new dolphin, the Australian snubfin dolphin *Orcaella heinsohni* sp. n. (Cetacean, Delphinidae). *Mar Mamm Sci* 21:365–400
- Berli P (2006) Comparison of Bayesian and maximum-likelihood inference of population genetic parameters. *Bioinformatics* 22:341-345
- Berli P, Felsenstein J (2001) Maximum likelihood estimation of a migration matrix and effective population sizes in n subpopulations by using a coalescent approach. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 98:4563-4568
- Berli P, Palczewski M (2010) Unified framework to evaluate panmixia and migration direction among multiple sampling locations. *Genetics* 185:313-326

- Belkhir K, Borsa P, Chikhi L, Raufaste N, Bonhomme F (2004) GENETIX 4.05, logiciel sous Windows TM pour la génétique des populations. Université de Montpellier II, Montpellier.
- Bérubé M (2009) Hybridism. In Perrin WF, Würsig B, Thewissen JGM (eds) Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals, 2nd edn. Academic Press, San Diego, p 588–592.
- Bilgmann K, Griffiths O, Allen S, Möller L (2007) A biopsy pole system for bow-riding dolphins: sampling success, behavioral responses and test for sampling bias. *Mar Mamm Sci* 23:218-225
- Bilgmann K, Parra GJ, Zanardo N, Beheregaray LB, Möller LM (2014). Multiple management units of short-beaked common dolphins subject to fisheries bycatch off southern and southeastern Australia. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 500:265-279
- Boness DJ, Clapham PJ, Mesnick SL (2002) Life history and reproductive strategies. In Hoelzel AR (ed) *Marine Mammal Biology: An evolutionary approach*. Blackwell Science Ltd, Oxford, UK. ISBN 0-632-05232-5
- Brohede J, Ellegren H (1999) Microsatellite evolution: polarity of substitutions within repeats and neutrality of flanking sequences. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 266:825-833
- Brown A, Kopps AM, Allen SJ, Bejder L, Littleford-Colquhoun B, Parra GJ, Cagnazzi D, Thiele D, Palmer C, Frère C (2014) Population differentiation and hybridisation of Australian snubfin (*Orcaella heinsohni*) and Indo-Pacific humpback dolphins (*Sousa chinensis*) in north-western Australia. *PLoS ONE* 9:e101427.
- Browning NE, McCulloch SD, Bossart GD, Worthy GAJ (2014) Fine-scale population structure of estuarine bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) assessed using stable isotope ratios and fatty acid signature analyses. *Mar Biol* doi:10.1007/s00227-014-2420-z
- Caballero S, Jackson J, Mignucci-Giannoni AA, Barrios-Garrido H, Beltran-Pedrerros S, Montiel-Villalobos MG, Robertson KM, Baker CS (2008) Molecular systematics of South American dolphins *Sotalia*: Sister taxa determination and phylogenetic relationships, with insights into a multi-locus phylogeny of the Delphinidae. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 46:252-268
- Carwardine M (1995) Whales, Dolphins and Porpoises. Dorling Kindersley, London
- Charlton-Robb K, Gershwil L-A, Thompson R, Austin J, Owen K, McKechnie S (2011) A New Dolphin Species, the Burrunan Dolphin *Tursiops australis* sp. nov., Endemic to Southern Australian Coastal Waters. *PLoS ONE* 6:e24047. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0024047
- Chilvers BL, Corkeron PJ (2001) Trawling and bottlenose dolphins' social structure. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 268:1901-1905
- Cipriano F (1997) Antitropical distributions and speciation in dolphins of the genus *Lagenorhynchus*: a preliminary analysis. In: Dizon AE, Chivers SJ, Perrin WF (eds) *Molecular genetics of marine mammals*. Soc Mar Mamm, Lawrence, pp 305-316
- Committee on Taxonomy (2014) List of marine mammal species and subspecies. Society for Marine Mammalogy. www.marinemammalscience.org. Accessed 1 November 2014
- Corander JP, Marttinen J, Sirén J, Tang J (2008) Enhanced Bayesian modelling in BAPS software for learning genetic structures of populations. *BMC Bioinformatics* 9: 539.
- Cox TM, Lewison RL, Zydalis R, Crowder LB, Safina C, Read AJ (2007) Comparing effectiveness of experimental and implemented bycatch reduction measures: the ideal and the real. *Conserv Biol* 21:1155–1164
- Cox TM, Read AJ, Swanner D, Urian K, Waples D (2004) Behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, to gillnets and acoustic alarms. *Biol Conserv* 115:203-212

- Dixon JM (2008) Fraser's Dolphin. In: Van Dyck S, Strahan R (eds) *The Mammals of Australia*, 3rd edn. New Holland Publishers, Sydney, p 847
- 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
- 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
- Fernández R, Begoña Santos M, Pierce GJ, Llavona A, López A, Silva MA, Ferreira M, Carrillo M, Cermeño P, Lens S, Piertney SB (2011) Fine-scale genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in Atlantic coastal waters of the Iberian Peninsula. *Hydrobiologia* 670:111–125. doi:10.1007/s10750-011-0669-5
- Fletcher WJ, Santoro K (eds) (2013) *State of the Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Report 2011/12*. Department of Fisheries, Perth. http://www.fish.wa.gov.au/Documents/sofar/status_reports_of_the_fisheries_and_aquatic_resources_2012-13.pdf
- Frankham R, Ballou JD, Briscoe DA (2010) *Introduction to conservation genetics*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK
- Frère CH, Krützen M, Kopps AM, Ward P, Mann J, Sherwin WB (2010). Inbreeding tolerance and fitness costs in wild bottlenose dolphins. *Proc R Soc Lond B*:2667-2673
- Fruet PF, Secchi ER, Daura-Jorge F, Vermeulen E, Flores PAC, Simões-Lopes PC, Genoves RC, Laporta P, Di Tullio JC, Freitas TRO, Dalla Rosa L, Valiati VH, Beheregaray LB, Möller LM (2014) Remarkably low genetic diversity and strong population structure in common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) from coastal waters of the Southwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Conserv Genet* doi:10.1007/s10592-014-0586-z
- Garza JC, Williamson EG (2001) Detection of reduction in population size using data from microsatellite loci. *Mol Ecol* 10:305-318
- Geyer CJ (1992) Practical Markov chain Monte Carlo (with discussion). *Stat Sci* 7:473-511
- Gilson A, Syvanen M, Levine K, Banks J (1998) Deer gender determination by polymerase chain reaction: validation study and application to tissues, bloodstains, and hair forensic samples from California. *Calif Fish Game* 84:159-169
- Halpern BS, Selkoe KA, Micheli F, Kappel CV (2007). Evaluating and Ranking the Vulnerability of Global Marine Ecosystems to Anthropogenic Threats. *Conserv Biol* 21:1301–1315
- Hartmann SA, Steyer K, Kraus RHS, Segelbacher G, Nowak C (2013) Potential barriers to gene flow in the endangered European wildcat (*Felis silvestris*). *Conserv Genetics* 14:413-426
- Hassanin A, Delsuc F, Ropiquet A, Hammer C, van Vuuren BJ, Matthee C, Ruiz-Garcia M, Catzeflis F, Areskoug V, Nguyen TT, Couloux A (2012) Pattern and timing of diversification of Cetartiodactyla (Mammalia, Laurasiatheria), as revealed by a comprehensive analysis of mitochondrial genomes. *Comptes Rendus Biologies* 335:32-50
- Hey J (2010) Isolation with migration models for more than two populations. *Mol Biol Evol* 27:905-920
- Hey J, Nielsen R (2007) Integration within the Felsenstein equation for improved Markov chain Monte Carlo methods in population genetics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 104:2785-2790
- Hoelzel AR, Dahlheim M, Stern SJ (1998a) Low genetic variation among killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the Eastern North Pacific and genetic differentiation between foraging specialists. *J Hered* 89:121-128
- Hoelzel AR, Potter CW, Best PB (1998b) Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore'

populations of the bottlenose dolphin. Proc R Soc Lond B 265:1177-1183

- 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
- Huelsenbeck JP, Larget B, Alfaro ME (2004) Bayesian phylogenetic model selection using reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo. Mol Biol Evol 21:1123-1133
- Jaiteh VF, Allen SJ, Meeuwig JJ, Loneragan NR (2013) Sub-surface behaviour of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) interacting with fish trawl nets in north-western Australia. Mar Mamm Sci e266. doi:10.1111/j.1748-7692.2012.00620.x
- Jaiteh VF, Allen SJ, Meeuwig JJ, Loneragan NR (2014) Combining in-trawl video with observer coverage improves understanding of protected and vulnerable species bycatch in trawl fisheries. Mar Freshw Res 65:1-8
- Jefferson TA, Webber MA, Pitman RL (2008) Marine mammals of the world. Academic Press, London
- Jensen JL, Bohonak AJ, Kelley ST (2005) Isolation by distance, web service. BMC Genetics 6:13. v.3.23 <http://ibdws.sdsu.edu/>
- Jonker RM, Kraus RHS, Zhang Q, van Hooft P, van der Jeugd HP, Kurvers RH, van Wieren SE, Loonen MJ, Crooijmans RP, Ydenberg RC, Groenen MA, Prins HH (2013) Genetic consequences of breaking migratory traditions in barnacle geese *Branta leucopsis*. Mol Ecol 22:5835-5847
- Jost, L. 2008. GST and its relatives do not measure differentiation. Mol Ecol 17:4015-4026
- Kingston SE, Adams LD, Rosel PE (2009) Testing mitochondrial sequences and anonymous nuclear markers for phylogeny reconstruction in a rapidly radiating group: molecular systematics of the Delphininae (Cetacea: Odontoceti: Delphinidae). BMC Evol Biol 9:245
- Kopps AM, Ackermann C, Sherwin WB, Allen SJ, Bejder L and Krützen M 2014. Cultural transmission of tool use combined with habitat specializations leads to fine-scale genetic structure in bottlenose dolphins. Proc R Soc Lond B 281: 20133245. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3245>.
- Kraus RHS, Van Hooft P, Megens H-J, Tsvey A, Fokin SY, Ydenberg RC, Prins HH (2013) Global lack of flyway structure in a cosmopolitan bird revealed by a genome wide survey of single nucleotide polymorphisms. Mol Ecol 22:41-55
- Krützen M, Barre LM, Möller L, Heithaus MR, Sims C, Sherwin WB (2002) A biopsy system for small cetaceans: darting success and wound healing in *Tursiops* spp. Mar Mamm Sci 18:863-878
- Krützen M, Sherwin WB, Berggren P, Gales NJ (2004) Population structure in an inshore cetacean revealed by microsatellite and mtDNA analysis: bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.) in Shark Bay, Western Australia. Mar Mamm Sci 20:28-47
- Krützen M, Valsecchi E, Connor RC, Sherwin WB (2001) Characterisation of microsatellites in *Tursiops aduncus*. Mol Ecol Notes 1:170-172
- Louis M, Viricel A, Lucas T, Peltier H, Alfonsi E, Berrow S, Bronlow A, Covelto P, Dabin W, Deaville R, De Stephanis R, Gally F, Gauffier P, Penrose R, Silva MA, Guinet C, Simon-Bouhet B (2014) Habitat-driven population structure of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in the North-East Atlantic. Mol Ecol 23:857-874. doi:10.1111/mec.12653
- McGowen MR (2011) Toward the resolution of an explosive radiation - A multilocus phylogeny of oceanic dolphins (Delphinidae). Mol Phylogenet Evol 60:345-357
- Martien KK, Chivers SJ, Baird RW, Archer FI, Gorgone AM, Hancock-Hanser BL, Mattila D, McSweeney DJ, Oleson EM, Palmer C, Pease VL, Robertson KM, Schorr GS, Schultz MB, Webster DL, Taylor BL (2014) Nuclear and Mitochondrial Patterns of Population Structure in North Pacific False Killer Whales

(*Pseudorca crassidens*). J Hered: doi:10.1093/jhered/esu029

- Meirmans PG, Van Tienderen PH (2004) GENOTYPE and GENODIVE: two programs for the analysis of genetic diversity of asexual organisms, Mol Ecol Notes 4:792-794
- Mendez M, Rosenbaum HC, Wells RS, Stamper A, Bordino P (2010) Genetic evidence highlights potential impacts of by-catch to cetaceans. PLoS ONE 5: e15550. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0015550
- Mirimin L, Miller R, Dillane E, Berrow SD, Ingram S, Cross TF, Rogan E (2011) Fine-scale population genetic structuring of bottlenose dolphins in Irish coastal waters. Animal Conserv 14:342-353. doi:10.1111/j.1469-1795.2010.00432.x
- Möller LM, Beheregaray LB (2001) Coastal bottlenose dolphins from South Eastern Australia are *Tursiops aduncus* according to sequences of the mitochondrial DNA control region. Mar Mamm Sci 17:249-263
- Möller LM, Bilgmann K, Charlton-Robb K, Beheregaray L (2008) Multi-gene evidence for a new bottlenose dolphin species in Southern Australia. Mol Phylogenet Evol 49:674-681
- Moura AE, Nielsen, SCA, Vilstrup JT, Moreno-Mayar JV, Gilbert MTP, Gray HWI, Natoli A, Möller L, Hoelzel AR (2013) Recent diversification of a marine Genus (*Tursiops* spp.) tracks habitat preference and environmental change. Sys Biol 62:865-877
- Nater A, Kopps AM, Krützen M (2009) New polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellites improve scoring accuracy in the bottlenose dolphin *Tursiops aduncus*. Mol Ecol Resour 9:531-534
- Natoli A, Birkun A, Aguilar A, Lopez A, Hoelzel AR (2005) Habitat structure and the dispersal of male and female bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Proc R Soc Lond B 272:1217-1226
- Natoli A, Peddemors VM, Hoelzel AR (2004) Population structure and speciation in the genus *Tursiops* based on microsatellite and mitochondrial DNA analyses. J Evol Biol 17:363-375
- Nielsen R, Wakeley J (2001) Distinguishing Migration From Isolation: A Markov Chain Monte Carlo Approach. Genetics 158:885-896
- Oremus M, Poole MM, Steel D, Baker CS (2007) Isolation and interchange among insular spinner dolphin communities in the South Pacific revealed by individual identification and genetic diversity. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 336:275-289
- Palsbøll PJ, Bérubé M, Aguilar A, Notarbartolo-Di-Sciara G, Nielsen R (2004) Discerning between recurrent gene flow and recent divergence under a finite-site mutation model applied to North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) populations. Evolution 58:670-675
- Palsbøll PJ, Bérubé M, Allendorf FW (2007) Identification of management units using population genetic data. Trends Ecol Evol 22:11-16
- Peakall R, Smouse PE (2012) GenA1Ex 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research - an update. Bioinformatics 28:2537-2539
- Perrin WF, Thieleking JL, Walker WA, Archer FI, Robertson KM (2011) Common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in California waters: Cranial differentiation of coastal and offshore ecotypes. Mar Mamm Sci 27:769-792
- Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P (2000) Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data. Genetics 155:945-959
- Quérouil S, Silva AM, Freitas L, Prieto R, Magalhães S, Dinis A, Alves F, Matos J, Mendonça D, Hammond PS, Santos RS (2007) High gene flow in oceanic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) of the North Atlantic. Conserv Genet 8:1405-1419

- Read AJ, Drinker P, Northridge S (2006) Bycatch of marine mammals in U.S. and global fisheries. *Conserv Biol* 20:163–169
- Reeves RR, McClellan K, Werner TB (2013) Marine mammal bycatch in gillnet and other entangling net fisheries, 1990 to 2011. *Endang Species Res* 20:71-97
- Reeves RR, Stewart BS, Clapham PJ, Powell JA (eds) (2002) *Guide to Marine Mammals of the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York
- Rice DW (1998) *Marine Mammals of the World: Systematics and distribution*. Soc Mar Mamm, Lawrence
- Rice WR (1989) Analyzing tables of statistical tests. *Evolution* 43:223-225
- Rosel PE, Dizon AE, Heyning JE (1994) Genetic analysis of sympatric morphotypes of common dolphins (genus *Delphinus*). *Mar Biol* 119:159–167
- Ross GJB (2006) Review of the Conservation Status of Australia’s Smaller Whales and Dolphins. Australian Government, Canberra. 124 p.
<http://www.environment.gov.au/coasts/publications/pubs/conservationsmaller-whales-dolphins.pdf>.
- Ross HA, Lento GM, Dalebout ML, Goode M, Ewing G, McLaren P, Rodrigo AG, Lavery S, Baker CS (2003) DNA surveillance: web-based molecular identification of whales, dolphins, and porpoises. *J Hered* 94:111–114
- Rousset F (2008) Genepop’007: a complete reimplementation of the Genepop software for Windows and Linux. *Mol Ecol Resour* 8:103-106
- Runemark A, Hey J, Hansson B, Svensson EI (2012) Vicariance, divergence and gene flow among islet populations of an endemic lizard. *Mol Ecol* 21:117-29
- Schaurich M, Vieira Lopes F, de Oliveira L (2012) Hybridization phenomenon in cetacean and pinniped species. *Neotropical Biology and Conservation* 7:199-209
- Sellas AB, Wells RS, Rosel PE (2005) Mitochondrial and nuclear DNA analyses reveal fine scale geographic structure in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Gulf of Mexico. *Conserv Genet* 6:715–728
- Slooten E (2013) Effectiveness of area-based management in reducing bycatch of the New Zealand dolphin. *Endang Species Res* 20:121-130
- Stephenson PC, Chidlow J (2003) Bycatch in the Pilbara trawl fishery. Final report to the Natural Heritage Trust. Perth: Natural Heritage Trust. 74 p.
- Svane I (2005) Occurrence of dolphins and seabirds and their consumption of by-catch during prawn trawling in Spencer Gulf, South Australia. *Fish Res* 76:317–327
- Tezanos-Pinto G, Baker CS, Russell K, Martien K, Baird RW, Hutt A, Stone G, Mignucci-Giannoni AA, Caballero S, Endo T, Lavery S, Oremus M, Olavarria C, Garrige C (2009) A worldwide perspective on the population structure and genetic diversity of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in New Zealand. *J Hered* 100:11–24
- Viricel A, Rosel PE (2012) Evaluating the utility of cox1 for cetacean species identification. *Mar Mamm Sci* 28:37-62
- Vilstrup JT, Ho SYW, Foote AD, Morin PA, Krieb D, Krützen M, Parra GJ, Robertson KM, de Stephanis R, Verborgh P, Willerslev E, Orlando L, Gilbert MTP (2011) Mitogenomic phylogenetic analyses of the Delphinidae with an emphasis on the Globicephalinae. *BMC Evol Biol* 11:65
- Wade P, Angliss RP (1997) Guidelines for Assessing Marine Mammal Stocks: Report of the GAMMS Workshop April 3-5, 1996, Seattle, WA. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-12, 93 p

- Accepted Article
- Wade PR, Reeves RR, Mesnick SL (2012) Social and behavioural factors in cetacean responses to overexploitation: Are odontocetes less “resilient” than mysticetes? *Mar Biol* doi:10.1155/2012/567276
- Wang JY, Chou L-S, White BN (1999) Mitochondrial DNA analysis of sympatric morphotypes of bottlenose dolphins (genus *Tursiops*) in Chinese waters. *Mol Ecol* 8:1603–1612
- Wang JY, Chou L-S, White BN (2000a) Osteological differences between two sympatric forms of bottlenose dolphins (genus *Tursiops*) in Chinese waters. *J Zool Lond* 252:147–162
- Wang JY, Chou L-S, White BN (2000b) Differences in the external morphology of two sympatric species of bottlenose dolphins (genus *Tursiops*) in Chinese waters. *J Mammal* 81:1157–1165
- Waples RS, Gaggiotti O (2006) What is a population? An empirical evaluation of some genetic methods for identifying the number of gene pools and their degree of connectivity. *Mol Ecol* 15:1419-1439
- Weir B, Cockerham CC (1984) Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of population structure. *Evolution* 38:1358-1370
- Wells RS, Rhinehart HL, Cunningham P, Whaley J, Baran M, Koberna C, Costa DP (1999) Long distance offshore movements of bottlenose dolphins. *Mar Mamm Sci* 15:1098–1114
- Whitehead H, Reeves RR, Tyack P (2000) Science and the conservation, protection, and management of wild cetaceans. In Mann J, Connor RC, Tyack PL, Whitehead H (Eds) *Cetacean Societies: Field Studies of Dolphins and Whales*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 308–332.
- Whitlock MC (2011) G'_{ST} and D do not replace F_{ST} . *Mol Ecol* 20:1083-1091
- Whitlock MC, McCauley DE, (1999) Indirect measures of gene flow and migration: $F_{ST} \neq 1/(4Nm+1)$. *Heredity* 82:117– 125
- Wilson GA, Rannala B (2003) Bayesian inference of recent migration rates using multilocus genotypes. *Genetics* 163:1177–1191
- Wiszniewski J, Allen SJ, Möller LM (2009) Social cohesion in a hierarchically structured embayment population of Indo-Pacific Bottlenose Dolphins. *Anim Behav* 77:1449-1457
- Wiszniewski J, Beheregaray LB, Allen SJ, Möller LM (2010) Environmental and social influences on the genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) of South-Eastern Australia. *Conserv Genet* 11:1405-1419
- Woinarski JCZ, Burbidge AA, Harrison PL (2014) *The Action Plan for Australian Mammals 2012*. Collingwood, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.
- Wright S (1931) Evolution in Mendelian populations. *Genetics* 16:97-159
- Wright S (1943) Isolation by distance. *Genetics* 28:114-138
- Xia X, Xie Z (2001) DAMBE: data analysis in molecular biology and evolution. *J Hered* 92:371–373
- Xiong Y, Brandley MC, Xu S, Zhou K, Yang G (2009) Seven new dolphin mitochondrial genomes and a time-calibrated phylogeny of whales. *BMC Evol Biol* 9:20
- Yang G, Guoqing J, Ren W, Zhou K (2005) Pattern of genetic variation of bottlenose dolphins in Chinese waters. *Raffles B Zool* 53:157-164
- Zhou X, Xu S, Yang Y, Zhou K, Yang G (2011) Phylogenomic analyses and improved resolution of Cetartiodactyla. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 61:255-264

Table 1. Pairwise F_{ST} (above) and Jost's D (below the diagonal) values between sampling sites. Significant F_{ST} values (after Bonferroni correction, Rice 1984) are given in bold. The shaded area represents offshore-coastal population comparisons.

Sampling Site	Useless Inlet	Western Shark Bay	Eastern Shark Bay	Dirk Hartog Island	Coral Bay	North West Cape	Onslow	Dampier Archipelago	Port Hedland	Cable Beach	Beagle Bay	Cygnets Bay	NW Cape offshore	PTF West	PTF East
1 Useless Inlet		0.006	0.031	0.038	0.059	0.042	0.025	0.041	0.033	0.060	0.046	0.065	0.251	0.279	0.263
2 Western Shark Bay	0.025		0.028	0.018	0.045	0.032	0.018	0.043	0.039	0.060	0.047	0.059	0.234	0.272	0.254
3 Eastern Shark Bay	0.106	0.003		0.036	0.054	0.066	0.044	0.053	0.039	0.060	0.058	0.082	0.259	0.279	0.263
4 Dirk Hartog Island	0.225	0.041	0.004		0.047	0.052	0.033	0.042	0.038	0.067	0.036	0.062	0.230	0.263	0.243
5 Coral Bay	0.123	0.145	0.173	0.186		0.015	0.008	0.020	0.025	0.028	0.005	0.051	0.233	0.264	0.244
6 North West Cape	0.117	0.009	0.016	0.003	0.040		0.009	0.020	0.032	0.040	0.022	0.067	0.285	0.291	0.276
7 Onslow	-0.097	-0.126	-0.085	-0.004	0.076	-0.038		-0.006	0.017	0.006	0.009	0.040	0.192	0.252	0.230
8 Dampier Archipelago	0.104	0.001	-0.002	-0.004	0.063	-0.026	-0.097		0.008	0.010	0.012	0.051	0.231	0.268	0.249
9 Port Hedland	0.081	0.088	0.130	0.149	-0.059	0.023	0.001	0.032		0.028	0.012	0.044	0.238	0.264	0.248
10 Cable Beach	-0.016	0.101	0.107	0.253	0.178	0.175	-0.105	0.124	0.142		0.036	0.057	0.199	0.253	0.233
11 Beagle Bay	0.145	0.107	0.168	0.151	-0.051	0.021	0.093	0.062	-0.037	0.264		0.047	0.230	0.256	0.233
12 Cygnets Bay	0.250	0.214	0.225	0.188	-0.038	0.067	0.193	0.105	-0.001	0.324	-0.030		0.199	0.247	0.231
13 NW Cape offshore	0.491	0.774	0.685	0.873	0.706	0.835	0.480	0.721	0.685	0.235	0.892	0.861		0.070	0.063
14 PTF West	0.473	0.686	0.643	0.791	0.613	0.721	0.492	0.664	0.609	0.319	0.743	0.735	0.157		0.002
15 PTF East	0.418	0.626	0.574	0.721	0.563	0.661	0.396	0.589	0.551	0.246	0.701	0.692	0.092	-0.041	

Table 2. Comparisons of four different migration models used in MIGRATE-N. For model comparisons, we pooled sampling sites into three populations (see Material and Methods). SB = Shark Bay (Sites 1-4), OC = Other Coastal (Sites 5-11), PTF = Pilbara Trawl Fishery (Sites 14-15). In each of the migration models, nine parameters, *i.e.* migration rates between populations, were considered. Asterisks indicate that migration rates were estimated by MIGRATE-N. In some migration models, we set the migration rate among certain populations to nought (0), or allowed only a fixed, low (c) migration rate of 0.001 (see Material and Methods). Parameters 1-3 indicate migration rate into the SB populations from the SB, OC and PTF populations, parameters 4-6 indicate migration rate into the OC population from the SB, OC and PTF populations, and parameters 7-9 indicate migration rate into the PTF population from the SB, OC and PTF populations. Model scores are given by Bezier approximation and differences between models highlighted in column Δ BAS.

Model	Populations and model parameters			Bezier approximation score (BAS)	Δ BAS
	SB	OC	PTF		
Full	***	***	***	-359,466	133,001
Low migration PTF	**c	**c	cc*	-237,198	10,733
PTF \rightarrow SB/OC	***	***	00*	-226,465	0
SB/OC \rightarrow PTF	**0	**0	***	-260,614	34,149

Table 3. Mean posterior distribution values (95% CI) of fraction of individuals in population *i* that are migrants derived from population *j* (per generation) among four combined populations as determined by BAYESASS. 95% confidence intervals smaller than 0 and larger than 1 were rounded to the nearest integer.

from/to	Shark Bay	Other Coastal	Cygnnet Bay	PTF
Shark Bay	0.982 (0.963-1.000)	0.013 (0.000-0.031)	0.003 (0.000-0.008)	0.003 (0.000-0.008)
Other Coastal	0.034 (0.000-0.071)	0.961 (0.924-0.998)	0.003 (0.000-0.007)	0.003 (0.000-0.007)
Cygnnet Bay	0.022 (0.000-0.059)	0.284 (0.235-0.334)	0.681 (0.654-0.707)	0.013 (0.000-0.037)
PTF	0.005 (0.000-0.014)	0.005 (0.000-0.014)	0.005 (0.000-0.014)	0.986 (0.971-1.000)

Figure captions

Figure 1. Map of the sampling sites, north-western Australia, showing the biopsy sample collection sites for: incidentally captured and free-ranging dolphins associating with the Pilbara Trawl Fishery ($n = 68$, black fill); Site 15, the ‘PTF East’ sampling site, was collected around 119°E , while 14, the ‘PTF West’ sampling site, was collected ca. 160 km to the west, between ca. 116°E and 117°E ; dolphins in deep water off the North West Cape ($n = 3$, grey fill); and coastal dolphins ($n = 273$) from 12 sites (single circles may indicate multiple samples collected from some locations, light blue fill = Shark Bay sites, dark blue fill = other coastal sites, green fill = coastal Cygnet Bay). The boundaries of the PTF management areas and the 20 m, 50 m and 100 m depth contours are also shown.

Figure 2. Structure plots (each column representing assignment probability of an individual dolphin, with sampling sites separated by a white line) and log-likelihoods for different number of clusters, K : A. Full dataset including all north-western Australian samples ($n = 344$). B. Coastal samples only ($n = 273$). The sampling site numbers correspond to their geographical site from the south-west to the north-east (coastal and then offshore) as in Fig. 1: 1 Useless Inlet; 2 Western Shark Bay; 3 Eastern Shark Bay; 4 Dirk Hartog Island; 5 Coral Bay; 6 North West Cape; 7 Onslow; 8 Dampier Archipelago; 9 Port Hedland; 10 Cable Beach; 11 Beagle Bay; 12 Cygnet Bay; 13 NW Cape offshore; 14 PTF West; 15 PTF East.

Figure 3. Three-dimensional representation of a factorial correspondence analysis projecting all sampled individuals of north-western Australian bottlenose (*Tursiops* spp.) dolphins on the factor space. The factor space is defined by the similarity of allelic states, in order to visualize the degree of dissimilarity among sampling sites. As per Figures 1 and 2: black/grey fill = individuals sampled deeper waters in the PTF/NW Cape offshore; blue/green fill = individuals sampled in shallow, coastal sites.

Figure 4. Isolation-by-distance plot of genetic (F_{ST}) versus geographic (km) distance for all coastal sampling locations (1-12), which is highly significant ($P = 0.0011$, $r = 0.482$).

Figure 5. Posterior density distributions for IMA2 simulations. Θ = relative effective population size, m = migration rate, PTF = Pilbara Trawl Fishery samples, SB = Shark Bay, OC = Other Coastal.


Figure 6. Phylogenetic relationships of offshore north-western Australian (Pilbara Trawl Fishery and North West Cape) dolphin mtDNA haplotypes and coastal north-western Australian dolphin mtDNA haplotypes compared to relevant delphinids, based on an alignment of 399 base pairs of the hypervariable region I. Node labels are posterior probabilities. Taxa in red branches are PTF-associated samples from this study. Coastal samples from this study formed a reciprocally monophyletic clade to previously published *Tursiops aduncus* from coastal south-east Australia.


Supplementary Information

Supplementary Table 1. Sample vouchers from Genbank, species and corresponding references used to provide comparison with the samples collected here.

Supplementary Table 2. Genetic diversity indices for sampling sites for all 19 microsatellite loci. N = number of individuals, N_a = mean number of alleles/locus, N_e = mean number of effective alleles/locus, I = Shannon's information index, H_O = mean observed heterozygosity over all loci, H_E = mean expected heterozygosity over all loci, uH_E = unbiased mean expected heterozygosity over all loci, F = fixation index, SE = standard error of the mean.


1148
1149







1150


1152



1153







1160
1161