Multiple independent colonization of the Canary Islands by the winged grasshopper genus *Sphingonotus* Fieber, 1852
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**Abstract**

Volcanic archipelagos represent ideal systems to study processes of colonization, differentiation and speciation. The Canary Islands are one of the best studied archipelagos, being composed of seven main islands with a well-known geological history. Most taxa have colonized these islands stepwise from the African or Iberian mainland from east to west, following their geological origin as well as the predominating wind direction and ocean currents. Furthermore, within-island radiations have been reported for several taxa. The grasshopper genus *Sphingonotus* is species-rich and occurs with nine fully winged species on the Canary Islands, seven of which are endemic to single or few islands. We inferred a phylogeny of these species and their North African and Iberian relatives based upon sequences of three mitochondrial genes and one nuclear gene of 136 specimens. Surprisingly, our results suggest that almost all *Sphingonotus* species colonized the archipelago independently from the mainland and nearly no inter-island colonization occurred. Despite their strong flight capabilities, only one pair of endemic species are closely related (*S. sublaevis* from Gran Canary and *S. pachecoi* from Lanzarote). Moreover, no within-island speciation events were detected. We hypothesize that passive wind dispersal from the African mainland was the main driver of the colonization process and that most *Sphingonotus* species are not able to cover inter-island distances by active flight. This, together with strong intrageneric niche overlap might explain the lack of within-island speciation in this taxon.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

**1. Introduction**

Oceanic archipelagos represent ideal settings to study colonization and differentiation processes (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967; Gilbert, 1980; Emerson, 2002; Whittaker et al., 2008). As such the Galapagos, the Caribbean, Hawaii and the Canary Islands have become model systems for biogeographic and evolutionary research (Gillespie et al., 1994a; Emerson et al., 1999, 2000a; Grant and Grant, 2002; Shaw, 2002; Losos, 2009). The main processes determining speciation on islands are colonization, extinction and speciation as a result of geographical barriers or ecological niche differentiation (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967; Emerson, 2008; Losos, 2009). The geographical setting and the geological history of an archipelago have strong effects on the relative importance of each of these processes. Hence, a good knowledge on the origin and history of islands is crucial to understand the evolution of island radiations.

The Canary Islands are one of the best studied volcanic archipelagos, concerning both their geological history (e.g. Ancochea et al., 1990; Acosta et al., 2003) and phylogeography (reviewed in Juan et al., 2000). Due to their geographic position, the African mainland is the predominate colonization source (Juan et al., 2000). Many taxa have undergone radiations within the archipelago subsequent to a single colonization event. Most of these radiations follow a simple stepping stone model from east to west following the prevailing ocean currents and wind directions (e.g. Díaz-Pérez et al., 2008; Hochkirch and Górgiz, 2009). However, multiple variants of this pattern have been found, including back-colonization, within-island speciation or reverse colonization from the Canary Islands to the African mainland (Juan et al., 2000). In many cases, the successful colonization of one island is followed by subsequent radiation on the complete archipelago. This has been reported for darkling beetles of the genus *Pimelia* (Contreras-Díaz et al., 2003) and *Hegeter* (Juan et al., 1996), ground beetles of the genus *Calathus*...
(Emerson et al., 2000a), bark beetles of the genus Tarphius (Emerson et al., 2000b), Gallotia lizards (Cox et al., 2010), Chalcides skinks (Brown and Pestano, 1998), and plants of the genus Echium (Böhle et al., 1996). However, the individual patterns and timing of colonization differ depending on the taxon and its intrinsic characteristics (Juan et al., 2000).

Orthoptera represent interesting model systems for the study of island biogeography as they include both mobile as well as rather sessile taxa, which allows a comparison of the colonization mechanisms in organisms with different mobility. The phylogenies of several Canarian Orthoptera have already been reconstructed (López et al., 2007; Arnedo et al., 2008; Hochkirch and Görzig, 2009). However, most of these taxa have rather limited dispersal abilities. For example, a phylogenetic study of the flightless genus Arminda has revealed a stepwise colonization pattern which has led to single island endemics (Hochkirch and Görzig, 2009). Similarly, the very sedentary genus complex Acrostriga/Purpuraria consists mainly of single island endemics, albeit with very close genetic relationships (López et al., 2007). In the katydid genus Calliphona, which has variable wing lengths, phylogenetic analyses suggested an inter-island taxon cycling process (Arnedo et al., 2008).

Here, we analyze the island biogeography of a grasshopper genus with strong flight abilities, which nevertheless has a high number of endemic species on the Canary Islands. The genus Sphingonotus Fieber, 1852 is one of the most species-rich grasshopper genera worldwide, with currently 145 described species in three subgenera (Neosphingonotus 14 species, Parasphingonotus 3 species, Sphingonotus s. s. 128 species) (Eades et al., 2014). Nine Sphingonotus species occur on the Canary Islands, seven of which are endemic to single or two islands: (1) S. pachecoi (Bolivar, 1908) from Lanzarote; (2) S. fuerteventurae Husemann, 2008 from Fuerteventura; (3) S. rugosus (Bland, 1998) from Lanzarote and Fuerteventura; (4) S. sublaevis (Bolivar, 1908) from Gran Canaria; (5) S. guanchus (Johnsen, 1985) from Gran Canaria; (6) S. picteti (Krauss, 1892) from coastal Tenerife; and (7) S. willemsei Mistschenko, 1937 from subalpine Tenerife (Cañadas). Two further species, S. savignyi (Saussure 1884) and S. rubescens (Walker, 1870) are widely distributed from north-western Africa to Central Asia (Hochkirch and Husemann, 2008). In the Mediterranean, the genus Sphingonotus is known to comprise two recent radiations, which differ in their stridulatory organs (Husemann et al., 2013b). The Sphingonotus caerulans-group possesses the plesiomorphic Oedipodinae type of stridulatory mechanisms (a serrated intercalary vein on the elytra), while the Sphingonotus azurescens-group belongs to the subgenus Neosphingonotus, which has an apomorphic stridulatory organ (thickened cross-veinlets between radius and media). Sphingonotus species typically inhabit xeric habitats with scarce vegetation and a high cover of bare ground, such as deserts, semi-deserts, river gravel, dunes or rocky habitats. All Sphingonotus species are fully winged and known to be good flyers (Nachtilgart, 1998). They have colonized several oceanic islands, including the Galapagos archipelago, the Caribbean and all Mediterranean islands (Husemann et al., 2012, 2013b; Eades et al., 2014).

Due to the high species richness and the highly variable courtship displays, including melodious songs, hind leg flagging, mid leg drumming, courtship flights with wing crepitation (Garcia et al., 1997; Hochkirch, 2003; Husemann and Hochkirch, 2007; Larrosa et al., 2010), Sphingonotus represents a particularly interesting taxon for phylogenetic studies. Here, we investigate the phylogeny of Canarian Sphingonotus species and relatives on the European and African mainland in order to reconstruct the colonization history and speciation processes of the genus. We hypothesized that the endemic Sphingonotus species of the Canary Islands differ in their colonization history from flightless species due to their high dispersal abilities. We thus expected to reveal a complex intra- and inter-island colonization history with a strong influence of the prevailing wind direction and ocean currents and the geological history of the islands.

2. Methods

2.1. DNA sequencing

A total of 136 specimens of Canarian, NW African and European Sphingonotus species as well as some other Oedipodinae have been collected from 2002 to 2012 (Table S1). The specimens were stored either in 99% ethanol p.a. or frozen. We chose the Schistocerca gregaria Forskål, 1775, Oedipoda caerulescens (Linnaeus, 1758), Vossellarianica arabica (Mishchenko, 1937), Helioscirtus capstinos (Bonnet, 1884) and three species of the genus Thalpomena (T. coeruleus (Uvarov, 1923), T. rungisi (Dirsh, 1949), T. algeriana (Lucas, 1849)) and Sphingoderus carinatus (Saussure, 1888) as outgroups. These taxa represent different divergence levels to Sphingonotus as has been demonstrated in previous studies (Fries et al., 2007; Chapo and Contreras, 2011; Husemann et al., 2012, 2013b). The DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) was used for DNA extraction from femoral or thoracic muscle tissue following the manufacturer’s protocol. Four gene fragments (three mitochondrial, one nuclear) were amplified: (1) NADH dehydrogenase subunit 5 (NDS, 1050 bp), (2) 12s rRNA (12s, 350 bp), (3) a fragment containing parts of 16s rRNA, tRNA-Leu and NADH dehydrogenase subunit 1 (NDS, 537 bp), (4) internal transcribed spacer 2 (ITS2, 308 bp). Primer information is given in Table 1. PCR conditions are provided elsewhere (Husemann et al., 2012; Husemann et al., 2013a,b). The 5Prime HotMasterMix (5Prime, Hilden, Germany) and the HotStarTaq Master Mix Kit (Qiagen) were used for amplification. The PCR product was purified using either the Qiaex II Gel Extraction Kit (Qiagen) or the Roche PCR product purification kit (Roche, Risch, Switzerland) according to the manufacturer’s protocols. Sequencing was performed with the Big Dye sequencing kit (Perkin Elmer, Cheshire, UK) for sequencing reactions on a Perkin–Elmer ABI automated sequencer or with the DYEnamic ET Terminator Cycle Sequencing Premixkit (GE Healthcare, Munich, Germany) for the MEGAbace 1000 automated sequencer (GE Healthcare). Sequences, which have been published before (Hochkirch and Husemann, 2008; Husemann et al., 2012, 2013b) were included in the analysis. All sequences were aligned with the MAFFT v.7.017 (Katoh et al., 2002) algorithm as included in Geneious v.6.1.7 (Kearse et al., 2012) to test for congruence of the genes. We ran the analyses with 100 homogeneity replicates and 10 addition-sequence replicates. We then used PartitionFinder v.1.1.1 (Lanfear et al., 2012) to test for the best partitioning scheme and estimated the appropriate models of evolution; the NDS gene was subdivided in its 16s, the tRNA for Leucin (trnL) and ND1 components; coding genes (ND1, ND5) were further subdivided in codon positions. The program divided the data into four partitions: the HKY + I + G model was chosen for ITS2 which represented the first partition; the second partition was the 3rd codon positions of ND1 as well as the 3rd codon positions for ND5 for which the
same model (HKY + I + G) was chosen; the program chose this model also for the third partition which consisted of 12s, 16s, and the 1st codon positions of ND1 and NDS. The last partition was the tRNA for Leucin, and the 2nd codon positions of ND1 and ND5, The last partition model also for the third partition which consisted of 12s, 16s, and NDs-16s Mitochondrial 136 108 9 27 15 25.0 2 HKY + I + G
12sai Mitochondrial 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDS ND1 16s rRNA 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – His ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – Phe ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – 270N ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – 400N ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – 4000N ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – 850N ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G
NDV – 8500N ND5 136 350 9 83 39 23.7 2 HKY + I + G

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nr of seq. (bp)</th>
<th>Max. length (bp)</th>
<th>Indels</th>
<th>Polymorphic sites (excluding gaps)</th>
<th>Parsimony informative sites</th>
<th>% Variability (excluding gaps)</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>Substitution model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS1</td>
<td>Autosomal</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HKY + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12s</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HKY + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS-16s</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HKY + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS-16s</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HKY + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS-ND1</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>TrN + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>TrN + I + G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2245
ment ITS2 was 308 bp (Table 2). Due to the larger amount of data we acknowledge that the phylogeny is strongly driven by the mitochon- 
drial sequences. Indels were found in most genes (ITS2 – 20, 12s – 8, 16s – 9, trnL – 5) besides the two coding genes (ND1, ND5). Most indels were found between Schistocerca gregaria and the other taxa. Translation of the coding genes did not show any internal stop codons suggesting that no pseudo-genes were sequenced. The most variable gene fragments were ND5 (36%, 378 polymorphic sites) and ND1 (35.2%, 126 polymorphic sites), whereas trnL was the least variable (7%, 5 polymorphic sites). The other genes ranged in between with 15.3% variable sites for ITS2 (58 polymorphic sites), and 23.7% (9 sites) and 25% (27 sites) for 12s and 16s, respectively (Table 2). The partition homogeneity test yielded no significant difference between the partitions suggest-
ing that they could be combined for subsequent analyses (p = 0.82). The likelihood ratio test rejected clock-likeness of our data set (p < 0.05).

The phylogenetic analyses were largely consistent across the three methods. All analyses split Sphingonotus in two large groups: the first group contained mainly the taxa belonging to the Sphingonotus azurescens-group (sensu Husemann et al., 2013b) as well as some sister taxa to this group (Fig. 1). The following species belonged to this clade: the widespread species S. azurescens, S. savignyi, S. canariensis, and S. cf. morini, the Northern African endemic S. trinctus, the Canarian endemics S. pachecoi (Lanzarote), S. sublaevis (Gran Canaria), and S. fuerteventurae (Fuerteventura), as well as the Iberian endemics S. nudolusus, S. imitans and S. almeriense. In addition, several taxa belonged to this clade which split basally from the S. azurescens-group: the Canarian endemic S. rugosus (Lanzarote, Fuerteventura), the Northern African endemics S. voseleri, S. lucasi and S. radioserratus and the Sahelian S. femoralis.

The second group contained all members of the S. caerulans-group (sensu Husemann et al., 2013b): the two widespread species S. rubescens and S. caerulans, the Corsican endemic S. corsicus, the Canarian endemic S. willemsei (Tenerife: Cañadas), and S. lliocap-
omaresi from the Iberian Peninsula (Fig. 1). S. uvarovi and S. candidus branched off as the sister clade to this group (both are endemic to Corse and Sardinia). The Canarian S. picteti (Tenerife) and S. guan-
chus (Gran Canary) split basally to this clade. The only close relation-
ship of Canarian endemics was found between S. pachecoi and S. sublaevis which occur on Lanzarote and Gran Canaria, respec-

tively. The other endemics, including those found on the same island, were not closely related or even belonged to different clades.

The rate dated tree suggested that the split into the two major clades occurred about 4.6 mya (Fig. 2). The major radiation events within the two groups occurred within the last 1.1 my, whereas some of the island endemics appear to be relatively old. The Canar-
ian S. guanchus was one of the oldest species in the group with an age of ~3.5 my. Similarly, S. picteti with ~2.5 my and S. rugosus with almost 1.4 my represent rather old taxa compared to the young age of many of the more widespread species like S. azurescens, S. savignyi and S. caerulans, which likely split within the last 1 my from their sister clades. The ancestral area reconstruction revealed a high likelihood for an African origin of the S. azurescens-group (Fig. 1). For the S. caerulans group the situation was less clear; the RASP analysis suggested the greatest likelihood for a Canarian or European origin of the group depending on the inclusion of the basal Canarian taxa (Fig. 1).

4. Discussion

4.1. Colonization pattern

Our results are in conflict with the hypothesis of a step-wise colonization pattern with subsequent within-island radiations. Except for the species pair S. pachecoi (Lanzarote)/S. sublaevis (Gran Canaria), no endemic species pair from the Canary Islands had a close genetic relationship. Even morphologically very similar species, such as S. picteti from coastal Tenerife, S. guanchus from Gran Canaria and S. rugosus from Fuerteventura and Lanzarote (which have formerly been placed in a separate genus Wernerella Karmy, 1907 based upon their similar appearance) do not seem to have a close genetic relationship. In fact, they even represent rather old lineages without any closely related species. Other endemics are nested within recent radiations, such as S. willemsei (subalpine Tenerife) which belongs to the poorly differentiated S. caerulans-

group, or S. pachecoi (Lanzarote), S. sublaevis (Gran Canary) and S. fuerteventurae (Fuerteventura) which belong to the S. azurescens-group. The most parsimonious explanation for this pattern is a process of multiple independent colonization without subsequent radiation. The lack of radiations within or between the islands sug-

gests that Sphingonotus grasshoppers were able to reach the island group several times, but were not able to subsequently colonize adjacent islands. On the other hand, the dispersal capability seems to have been strong enough to maintain gene flow within each island, so that within-island differentiation did not occur. This lack of within-island differentiation might have been further promoted by niche conservatism with relatively broad niches: all Sphingonotus species prefer habitats with a large cover of bare ground (Bland and Gangwere, 1998; Bland, 2001; Hochkirch, 2003; Husemann and Hochkirch, 2007), which are abundant and well-connected on most islands, particularly in the coastal zone. Only on Tenerife a second desert-like situation is found in the subalpine zone, which has recently been colonized by S. willemsei, which is a sister species to S. caerulans, which occurs also at high altitudes in Morocco (Atlas Mountains).

The lack of inter-island colonization events is more difficult to explain, particularly as Sphingonotus grasshoppers are believed to be very good flyers (Nachtiaggall, 1998). However, this interpretation is mainly based upon the escape flights of a few well-studied species (e.g. S. caerulans, S. savignyi) and the overall wide distribution of the genus Sphingonotus, which represents one of the most widespread grasshopper genera. In fact, the two most widespread Canarian Sphingonotus species (S. savignyi, S. rubescens) are good flyers, whereas smaller Sphingonotus species (e.g. S. picteti, S. guan-
chus, S. rugosus) usually fly only very short distances (AH personal observation). It might thus be that passive wind dispersal was more important for the original colonization of the Canary Islands (e.g. by storms from the African continent), whereas active disper-
sal capabilities of most species are too low for subsequent second-

dary between-island colonization events. Multiple passive wind dispersal from the African continent may thus explain the unusual phylogenetic relationships of the Canarian endemics.

4.2. Taxon ages and range extension

Another interesting finding of our analyses is that the wide-
spread species on the Canary Islands belong to species-rich radia-
tions, whereas many of the endemics split rather basally and do not have any closely related sister species. The widespread S. rubescens and S. savignyi both represent rather young taxa and must have colonized their vast range in a very short period of time, while the oldest Canarian taxa (S. guanchus, S. picteti and S. rugosus) re-
present rather old Sphingonotus lineages and must have survived on the islands for a very long time. Some younger endemics have col-

onized the Canary Islands later, but apparently show a similar pat-
tern (no closely related sister species on the Canaries). This suggests that the strong dispersal ability of the two widespread taxa is a trait that has evolved recently in both lineages. Interestingly, the molecular clock analysis suggests a fairly recent age of all endemics, much later than the emergence of the
Fig. 1. Phylogenetic reconstruction of the genus Sphingonotus using two Bayesian approaches and a Maximum Likelihood approach. The tree represents the 50% majority rule consensus tree from the BEAST analyses; posterior probabilities and bootstrap support are given as branch support (pp from BEAST/bootstrap values from RaxML/pp from MrBayes). The branch for Sphingonotus azurescens includes the close relatives S. tricinctus and S. morini. Endemic species are shaded in grey, widespread species occurring on the Canary Islands in striped grey. The circles at internal nodes represent the ancestral distribution with the highest likelihood from S-DIVA analysis in RASP.
islands (Fig. 2). While we have to acknowledge that these dating estimates, in the absence of good fossil calibration points, are very crude estimates, the estimates are much younger than the ages of the islands and the confidence intervals do not overlap with island origins. These young ages support the hypothesis that passive colonization events are scarce and probably rarely successful. Further-
more, the volcanic activity of the islands might have led to extinctions, which remain a major obstacle to phylogenetic reconstructions (Jau et al., 2000; Hochkirch and Görgiz, 2009). The lack of information on extinctions probably also influences the reconstruction of refuges. While, the RASP analysis revealed a North African origin of the S. azurescens-group, it also suggested a Canarian origin of the extended S. caerulans group. We hypothesize that this is an artifact of the different speciation/extinction dynamics on the archipelago compared to the mainland. The rather stable climatic history of the Canary Islands (Meco et al., 2002) might have promoted a higher survival of taxa, whereas on the climatically more dynamic mainland, old Sphingonotus lineages might have become extinct, so that the true sister species of ancient Canarian species may be missing.

5. Conclusions

Colonization histories of archipelagos have frequently been studied in the past (Gillespie et al., 1994b; Emerson, 2002, 2008; Shaw, 2002) and many island radiations stem from single or few colonization events with subsequent inter- and intra-island radiations (Emerson et al., 1999, 2000a; Contreras-Díaz et al., 2003; Hochkirch and Görgiz, 2009). The case of the winged grasshopper genus Sphingonotus on the Canary Islands deviates from this classic island radiation pattern. Except for one species group (S. pachecoï/S. sublaevis) all taxa colonized the Canary Islands independently without any intra- or inter-island speciation and only two widespread species (S. rubescens/S. savignyi) subsequently colonized the complete archipelago. Our study shows that despite superficially resembling a typical island radiation species groups might differ in their evolutionary history and only detailed phylogeographic studies can reveal these new patterns.
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