

Title	Fine-scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in European waters and implications for conservation
Authors	Nykänen, Milaja;Louis, Marie;Dillane, Eileen;Alfonsi, Eric;Berrow, Simon;O'Brien, Joanne;Brownlow, Andrew;Covelo, Pablo;Dabin, Willy;Deaville, Rob;de Stephanis, Renaud;Gally, François;Gauffier, Pauline;Ingram, Simon N.;Lucas, Tamara;Mirimin, Luca;Penrose, Rod;Rogan, Emer;Silva, Mónica A.;Simon-Bouhet, Benoit;Gaggiotti, Oscar E.
Publication date	2019
Original Citation	Nykänen, M., Louis, M., Dillane, E., Alfonsi, E., Berrow, S., O'Brien, J., Brownlow, A., Covelo, P., Dabin, W., Deaville, R. and de Stephanis, R. (2019) 'Fine#scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in European waters and implications for conservation', Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 29, pp.197-211. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3139
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3139
Rights	© 2019, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Nykänen, M., Louis, M., Dillane, E., Alfonsi, E., Berrow, S., O'Brien, J., Brownlow, A., Covelo, P., Dabin, W., Deaville, R. and de Stephanis, R. (2019) 'Fine#scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in European waters and implications for conservation', Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 29, pp.197-211, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3139. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.
Download date	2024-05-09 09:30:05



University College Cork, Ireland Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh



## Fine-scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in European waters and implications for conservation

Journal:	Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems
Manuscript ID	AQC-18-0314.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Supplement Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Louis, Marie; Scottish Oceans Institute; Sea Mammal Research Unit; Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chize Nykänen, Milaja; University College Cork School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences Dillane, Eileen; University College Cork School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences Alfonsi, Eric; Océanopolis; BioGeMME, UFR Sciences et Techniques, Université de Brest Berrow, Simon; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Galway, IE; Irish Whale and Dolphin Group O'Brien, Joanne; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Galway, IE; Irish Whale and Dolphin Group O'Brien, Joanne; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Brownlow, Andrew; SAC Wildlife Unit Covelo, Pablo; CEMMA (Coordinadora para o Estudo dos Mamíferos Mariños) Dabin, Willy; Observatoire PELAGIS, UMS 3462 CNRS/Université La Rochelle Deaville, Rob; Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London de Stephanis, Renaud; CIRCE, Conservation, Information and Research on Cetaceans; Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC) Gally, François; GECC (Groupe d'Etude des Cétacés du Cotentin), Gauffier, Pauline; e) CIRCE (Conservation, Information and Research on Cetaceans), Cabeza de Manzaneda 3, Pelayo, 11390 Ingram, Simon; University of plymouth, School of Marine Science and Engineering Lucas, Tamara; LIENSs (Littoral Environnement et Sociétés), UMR 7266 CNRS/Université de La Rochelle Mirimin, Luca; Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Department of Life & Physical Sciences Galway, IE Penrose, Rod; Marine Environmental Monitoring Rogan, Emer; University of Cork, Zoology, Ecology adn Plant Science Silva, Monica; Center of the Institute of Marine Research (IMAR) & Department of Oceanography and Fisheries, University of the Azores; Laboratory of Robotics and Systems in Engineering and Science (LARSyS); Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Simon-Bouhet, Benoit; Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chize

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
1/	
15	
16	
10	
1/	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
40 47	
די ⊿Ω	
0ד 10	
49 50	
50	

	Gaggiotti, Oscar; Scottish Oceans Institute
Broad habitat type (mandatory) select 1-2:	coastal < Broad habitat type, ocean < Broad habitat type
General theme or application (mandatory) select 1-2:	genetics < General theme or application, Special Area of Conservation < General theme or application
Broad taxonomic group or category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1-2:	mammals < Broad taxonomic group or category
Impact category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1- 2:	
	·

## SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

1	Fine-scale population structure and connectivity of bottlenose
2	dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in European waters and implications
3	for conservation
4	Milaja Nykänen <sup>1</sup> *, Marie Louis <sup>2,3,4</sup> *, Eileen Dillane <sup>1</sup> , Eric Alfonsi <sup>5,6</sup> , Simon
5	Berrow <sup>7,8</sup> , Joanne O'Brien <sup>7,8</sup> , Andrew Brownlow <sup>9</sup> , Pablo Covelo <sup>10</sup> , Willy Dabin <sup>11</sup> ,
6	Rob Deaville <sup>12</sup> , Renaud de Stephanis <sup>13,14</sup> , François Gally <sup>15</sup> , Pauline Gauffier <sup>14</sup> ,
7	Simon N. Ingram <sup>16</sup> , Tamara Lucas <sup>17</sup> , Luca Mirimin <sup>8</sup> , Rod Penrose <sup>18</sup> , Emer Rogan <sup>1</sup> ,
8	Mónica A. Silva <sup>19,20,21</sup> , Benoit Simon-Bouhet <sup>4</sup> , Oscar E. Gaggiotti <sup>2</sup>
9	
10	*these authors contributed equally
10	these authors contributed equally
11	Correspondence: Milaja Nykänen: milaja.ny@gmail.com - Marie Louis:
12	marielouis17@hotmail.com
13	
14	(1) School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College
15	Cork, North Mall, Cork, Ireland
16	(2) Scottish Oceans Institute, Gatty Marine Laboratory, East Sands, St Andrews
17	KY16 8LB, Scotland, UK
18	(3) Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews,
19	Gatty Marine Laboratory, East Sands, St Andrews KY16 8LB, Scotland, UK
20	(4) Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, UMR 7372, Université de La Rochelle,
21	France.
22	(5) Océanopolis, Brest, France.
23	(6) BioGeMME, UFR Sciences et Techniques, Université de Brest, France.
24	(7) Irish Whale and Dolphin Group, Kilrush, Co Clare, Ireland.
25	(8) Marine and Freshwater Research Centre, Department of Natural Sciences,
26	School of Science and Computing, Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Dublin
27	Road, H91 T8NW Galway, Ireland,
28	(9) SAC Wildlife Unit, Inverness, Scotland.
29	(10) CEMMA (Coordinadora para o Estudo dos Mamíferos Mariños), Gondomar,
30	Spain.
	1

1		
3 3	31	(11) Observatoire PELAGIS, UMS 3462 CNRS/Université La Rochelle, France.
4 5 3	32	(12) Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, England.
6 7 3	33	(13) Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC),
8 3	34	Sevilla. Spain
9 10 3	35	(14) CIRCE (Conservation Information and Research on Cetaceans) Pelavo Spain
11	36	(14) CFCC (Groups d'Etude des Cétacés du Cotentin). Cherbourg Octaville
12 J		(15) GECC (Groupe à Elude des Celuces du Colemin), Cherbourg-Ocleville,
14 <sup>3</sup>	5/	France.
16 3	38	(16) School of Marine Science and Engineering, Plymouth University, Plymouth PL4
17 <u>3</u>	39	8AA, UK,
19 4	40	(17) LIENSs (Littoral Environnement et Sociétés), UMR 7266 CNRS/Université de
20 21 4	41	La Rochelle, France.
22 4	42	(18) Marine Environmental Monitoring, Cardigan, Wales, United Kingdom.
23 24 4	43	(19) Center of the Institute of Marine Research (IMAR) & Department of
25 26 4	14	Oceanography and Fisheries. University of the Azores, Horta, Azores, Portugal.
20 27	15	(20) Laboratory of Robotics and Systems in Engineering and Science (LARSyS)
28	16	Linhog, Portugal
30	+0	
31 4 32	47	(21) Biology Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole,
33 4	48	Massachusetts, United States of America.
34 4 35	49	
36	-0	
37 D 38	50	Abstract
39 5	51	1. Protecting species often involves the designation of protected areas, wherein
40 41	50	suitable more compart strategies are emplied either at the tower or econstant level
42 S	52	suitable management strategies are applied either at the taxon of ecosystem level.
44 5	53	Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) have been created in European waters under
45 46 5	51	the Habitate Directive to protect bettleness delphing. Tursions transatus, which
47	94	the Habitats Directive to protect bothenose dolphinis, <i>Turstops truncatus</i> , which
48 49 5	55	forms two ecotypes, pelagic and coastal.
50		
51 5 52 5	56	2. The SACs have been designated in coastal waters based on photo-identification
53 5	57	studies that have indicated that bottlenose dolphins have relatively high site fidelity.
55		r
56 57	58	However, individuals can carry out long-distance movements which suggest
58 5	59	potential for demographic connectivity between the SACs as well as with other areas.
59 60		2

3
4
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
25
22
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
<u>/</u> 2
رب ۸۸
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
52
22
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 2

60	3. Connectivity can be studied using genetic markers. Previous studies on the species
61	in this area used different sets of genetic markers and therefore inference on the fine-
62	scale population structure and demographic connectivity has not yet been made at a
63	large scale. A common set of microsatellite markers was used in this study to provide
64	the first comprehensive estimate of genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins in
65	European Atlantic waters.
66	4. As in previous studies, a high level of genetic differentiation was found between
67	coastal and pelagic populations. Genetic structure was defined at an unprecedented
68	fine-scale level for coastal dolphins leading to identification of five distinct coastal
69	populations inhabiting the following areas: Shannon estuary, west coast of Ireland,

70 English Channel, coastal Galicia, east coast of Scotland, and Wales/West Scotland.

71 Demographic connectivity was very low among most populations with less than 10%

72 migration rate suggesting no demographic coupling among them. Each local

73 population should therefore be monitored separately.

74 Keywords: coastal, ocean, population genetics, Special Area of Conservation,

75 mammals, bottlenose dolphins

7	7	Introc	luction

Protecting species and their habitats is the goal of conservation biology, and this often includes the designation of protected areas, wherein suitable management strategies are applied either at the taxon or ecosystem level. According to the definition by the World Conservation Union (IUCN), a Marine Protected Area (MPA) is "any area of intertidal or subtidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora, fauna, historical and cultural features, which has been reserved by law or other effective means to protect part or all of the enclosed environment" (Kelleher & Phillips, 1999, 18). The usefulness of static MPAs to preserve biodiversity or to protect a particular species or population has been debated (e.g., Agardy, di Sciara, & Christie, 2011; Hartel, Constantine, & Torres, 2015; Hooker & Gerber, 2004; Wilson, 2016), but they remain the primary spatial conservation unit worldwide and are key components of various conservation plans (e.g., the United Nations Plan for Biodiversity (2011–2020), the IUCN Worlds Parks Congress and the European Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (European Commission, 2011)). In European waters, the Member States of the European Union are required to designate Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) for species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive (European Economic Community, 1992), which includes two cetacean species; the harbour porpoise, Phocoena phocoena, and the common bottlenose dolphin, Tursiops truncatus. These SACs, which are part of the European Natura 2000 strategy, should represent areas essential for the species' life and reproduction. In addition to the protection under the Habitats Directive, as top predators, bottlenose dolphins are considered as one of the indicator species for 'good environmental status' (GES) in coastal waters by the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD, Council of the European Communities, 2008). The aim of MSFD is to protect the European marine 

environment by applying a comprehensive ecosystem-based approach to the
management of human activities, and by maintaining or restoring the favourable
conservation status of a number of species.

Previous research using photo-identification has shown that most coastal bottlenose dolphin populations in Europe comprise between 30 and 400 resident individuals with strong site fidelity to their respective coastal site (e.g., Cheney et al., 2013; Ingram & Rogan, 2002; Louis et al., 2015). However, also based on photo-identification studies, some of these individuals are highly mobile travelling distances of hundreds of kilometres around the UK and Ireland (Cheney et al., 2013; Ingram, Englund, & Rogan, 2001; Ingram & Rogan, 2003; O'Brien et al., 2009; Robinson et al., 2012). Nonetheless, the high site-fidelity and the preferential use of some geographical areas indicate that coastal bottlenose dolphins may be very sensitive to changes in local environmental conditions, ecological factors, or anthropogenic disturbance. The sensitivity of bottlenose dolphins to these threats is exacerbated by their position as an apex predator and also by their low reproductive rates (Connor, Wells, Mann, & Read, 2000; Quick et al., 2014). The main threats in coastal environments include pollutants such as xenobiotic chemicals (Jepson et al., 2016; Reif, Schaefer, Bossart, & Fair, 2017), reduced prev availability, habitat degradation, disturbance from vessel traffic (Lusseau, Bain, Williams, & Smith, 2009; Pirotta, Merchant, Thompson, Barton, & Lusseau, 2015; Williams, Bain, Smith, & Lusseau, 2009), entanglement and incidental bycatch, direct hunting, marine construction and anthropogenic noise (Hammond et al., 2012; Meissner et al., 2015; Pirotta et al., 2015). The increased risks of demographic perturbation of dolphin populations due to human activities highlights the need for the design and management of protected areas ensuring that dolphin 

habitat remains favourable and does not deteriorate. A careful investigation of the population structure and quantification of the genetic and demographic connectivity is also necessary as small isolated populations may require more protection due to their reduced genetic resilience.

An important step towards the conservation of bottlenose dolphins was taken under the Habitats Directive by designating SACs across the European North-east Atlantic and Mediterranean coastal waters. These designations were based on photo-identification and habitat use surveys showing long-term site-fidelity (Anon, 2012). Another important step towards their conservation is to evaluate population structure and connectivity of populations between the protected areas as well as with other areas. This is particularly important because of the propensity for some individuals to carry out long-distance movements, which suggests potential demographic connectivity between the populations. It is unclear if such movements can result in migration rates that could lead to correlated population dynamics. There is a paucity of studies assessing the level of migration that will lead to demographic coupling (Waples & Gaggiotti, 2006); a process by which changes in population size in one population are influenced by changes taking place in another population (Hastings, 1993). However, a simulation study by Hastings (1993) indicated that under a simple two-population density-dependent model, a migration rate of 10% or more can lead to coupled dynamics, which would require monitoring the populations as a single management/conservation unit. Thus, a threshold of 10% migration above which two local populations are considered independent management units can be used as an operational criterion to address conservation problems.

The most cost-effective approach to evaluate demographic connectivity and fine-scale

150	population subdivision is based on the use of genetic markers and population genetics
151	principles. Thus, a recent workshop on bottlenose dolphin conservation (December
152	2016; Ó Cadhla & Marnell, 2017) concluded that one of the main priorities for
153	implementing the afore-mentioned EU directives for this species was a fine-scale
154	population genetics analysis of dolphins inhabiting European waters. This will allow
155	the definition of meaningful management units (MUs), which is essential when setting
156	up strategies for conservation and monitoring, including the estimation of population
157	trends and the evaluation of the impacts of anthropogenic activities. Note that in the
158	past, MUs were frequently defined in genetic terms as genetic management units
159	(GMUs), following Moritz (1994, 374): "populations with significant divergence of
160	allele frequencies at nuclear or mitochondrial loci, regardless of the phylogenetic
161	distinctiveness of the alleles". However, it is now accepted that MUs comprise
162	demographically independent populations, thus estimating migration rates forms a
163	central part of the assessment of suitable MUs (Allendorf, Luikart, & Aitken, 2013;
164	Palsbøll, Berube, & Allendorf, 2007). Furthermore, the criterion underlying GMUs is
165	not entirely appropriate from a demographic point of view because migration rates $(m)$
166	well below 10% can still lead to an absence of significant allelic differentiation (e.g.,
167	if local population size is 100, $m > 0.01$ will lead to absence of genetic differentiation;
168	c.f. Waples & Gaggiotti, 2006). Nevertheless, population genetics principles can be
169	used to estimate migration rates to implement the 10% migration threshold criterion.
170	In addition, other measures can be used in order to define MUs, such as ecological
171	tracers (e.g., Giménez et al., 2018) or analyses of population viability (Olsen et al.,
172	2014).

173	Previous genetic studies on bottlenose dolphins worldwide have identified a clear
174	population structuring based on nuclear microsatellites and mitochondrial markers
175	with varying geographical scales (e.g., Allen et al., 2016; Hoelzel, Potter, & Best,
176	1998; Rosel, Hansen, & Hohn, 2009; Vollmer & Rosel, 2017). The same has been
177	found in European waters (Gaspari et al., 2015; Louis, Viricel et al., 2014; Mirimin et
178	al., 2011; Natoli, Peddemors, & Hoelzel, 2003; Nichols et al., 2007; Nykänen et al.,
179	2018; Quérouil et al., 2007), and in some areas this structuring is present even between
180	geographically adjacent populations (e.g., between the Shannon estuary and the rest of
181	the west coast of Ireland, Mirimin et al., 2011; Nykänen et al., 2018). Recently, Louis,
182	Viricel et al. (2014) determined that coastal and pelagic bottlenose dolphins in
183	European waters were genetically and ecologically distinct from each other and that
184	further structuring within the two ecotypes existed; the coastal ecotype was divided
185	into the Coastal South population, which included individuals from Normandy and
186	Galicia, and the Coastal North population, consisting of coastal bottlenose dolphins
187	around the UK and Ireland. However, these authors did not have sufficient sample
188	sizes from each local coastal population to fully investigate fine-scale structuring and
189	no samples were available from the population occupying the Shannon Estuary in
190	Ireland. Therefore, it remained unclear whether further fine-scale population structure
191	in coastal waters exists and whether the movement of mobile individuals maintains
192	connectivity between the local populations. Furthermore, the previous studies on
193	bottlenose dolphin population structure (Fernandez et al., 2011; Louis, Viricel et al.,
194	2014; Mirimin et al., 2011; Natoli et al., 2003; Nykänen et al., 2018) have all employed
195	different sets of microsatellite markers, preventing the comparison between studies,
196	and thus giving a fragmented vision of population structure. The purpose of this study,
197	therefore, was to evaluate the population structure of bottlenose dolphins in European
	0

Atlantic waters at a fine-scale level, including samples from the Shannon Estuary and a larger number of samples from west of Ireland and using a common set of microsatellite markers between the studies by Louis, Viricel et al. (2014), Mirimin et al. (2011) and Nykänen et al. (2018). The demographic dispersal between the populations was estimated, and the findings are discussed in light of the conservation of the species in European waters.

204 Materials and methods

Ninety-six samples from Nykänen et al. (2018), were genotyped at 14 microsatellites loci used in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) (Tut02, Ttr34, Ttr58, Ttr04, Ttr63, Tut01, Ttr19, Tut05, TtrFF6, Tut09, Ttr11, Ttr48, EV37, TexVet7, see characteristics and amplification conditions in Table S1 and Supplementary text S2 of Louis, Viricel et al. (2014). This dataset included 13 samples from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) which were known to be duplicates based on their sample ID. Additionally, three samples previously genotyped in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) were used as a scale, or controls, to define allele size. Nine samples from Corsica from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) were excluded from this study as they are out of the area of interest. Further two samples from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) and two samples from Nykänen et al. (2018), were excluded as they had less than eight loci genotyped out of 14 loci. The overall dataset used in the present study thus consists of 425 individuals; 344 samples from Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) and 81 samples (excluding the 13 duplicate samples) from Nykänen et al. (2018), with the latter originating mainly from the Shannon and West Ireland populations. The 425 samples include 228 biopsy samples and 197 samples from stranded animals.

221	The biopsy samples were taken in coastal Normandy (English Channel, France,
222	N=90), West Ireland (Connemara-Mayo-Donegal area, N=30), Cork harbour (Ireland,
223	N=4) and Shannon Estuary (Ireland, N=45), offshore Ireland (on the shelf edge, see
224	Figure 1, N=1), the Azores (Portugal, N=19), Gibraltar and Cadiz (Spain, N=39).
225	Fifteen samples of stranded dolphins were matches to photo-identification catalogues
226	of coastal animals from East Scotland (N=10), Normandy (N=2), and the Arcachon
227	estuary (Bay of Biscay, France, N=3). The rest of the stranded animals came from
228	Ireland (N=31), Wales (N=26), Scotland (N=34), France (N=58) and Spain (N=33).
229	The coastal or pelagic origin of all stranded animals was identified using genetic
230	assignments to the same cluster as biopsied individuals (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).
231	Ecotype assignment was further confirmed for some of the individuals using photo-
232	identification catalogues of known coastal animals as detailed above (N=15), stable
233	isotopes (N=40, Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014) and/or drift prediction models (N=66,
234	Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). For example, all samples of stranded animals from East
235	Scotland were predicted to have died close to shore (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).
236	Individuals stranded in the English Channel in France were predicted to originate from
237	coastal waters while individuals stranded in the Bay of Biscay were predicted to come
238	both from the shelf and the shelf-edge (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014).

239 Microsatellite marker quality

The 13 identified duplicate samples between the two studies were used to calculate genotyping error rate by dividing the number of inconsistent genotypes among the duplicates (three) by the total number of genotypes (364 minus six missing genotypes, therefore 358).

All individuals were successfully amplified for at least eight loci and there was 1.80% of missing values in the dataset. Microchecker 2.2.3 was used to check for null alleles and scoring errors (Van Oosterhout, Hutchinson, Wills, & Shipley, 2004). Departures from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) and linkage equilibrium were tested using 10 000 dememorizations, 1 000 batches and 10 000 iterations per batch in GENEPOP on the web version 4.2 (Raymond & Rousset, 1995; Rousset, 2008). Tests were conducted for the whole dataset and for the finest level of population structure identified by the clustering methods (see below).

## *Genetic population structure*

Population delimitation and assignment of individuals was done using three genetic clustering methods, which were applied to: (i) the full microsatellite dataset (N=425), and (ii) a subset comprising only coastal individuals (N=269). The clustering methods include: two Bayesian methods implemented in STRUCTURE (Pritchard, Stephens, & Donnelly, 2000) and TESS (Durand, Chen, & Francois, 2009) and a multivariate method, Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components (DAPC) (Jombart, Devillard, & Balloux, 2010). TESS was also run considering only the pelagic individuals (N=156). For the coastal dolphins, if any cluster included several sampling locations, TESS was re-run considering only those sampling areas to determine if there was further genetic structuring among them.

The three different approaches were used to ensure the robustness of the inferred
results, as determining the most likely number of clusters can be challenging (Guillot,
Leblois, Coulon, & Frantz, 2009). STRUCTURE assigns individuals to clusters by
minimizing HWE and linkage disequilibria (Pritchard et al., 2000). TESS implements
a probabilistic model similar to STRUCTURE but is spatially explicit as it incorporates

<ul> <li>et al., 2009). In contrast to these two Bayesian approaches that use the full data, D</li> <li>uses genetic similarity to cluster individuals and does not make any population generation.</li> </ul>	APC
270 uses genetic similarity to cluster individuals and does not make any population gen	
	netic
271 model assumptions, i.e., it does not assume clusters are in HWE (Jombart et al., 20	)10).
272 TESS was run using the conditional auto-regressive (CAR) admixture model was	ith a
burn-in of 20 000 steps followed by 120 000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCI	MC)
274 steps. The number of clusters $(K)$ tested varied between two and ten when conside	ring
the whole data set and the coastal samples only, and between two and six w	vhen
analysing the pelagic samples only. In these cases, ten replicate runs for each value	ie of
277 <i>K</i> were performed but six replicates were used in the analyses that excluded clo	sely
278 related individuals. The spatial interaction parameter was left at the default value (	(0.6)
279 with a linear degree trend. To select the most likely number of clusters, the Devia	ance
280 Information Criterion (DIC) values were plotted against K and plots of indivi	dual
281 membership proportions were examined. Consistency across runs was also check	ed.
282 STRUCTURE was run using the admixture models with correlated and indepen	dent
283 allele frequencies, without <i>a priori</i> information. Ten independent runs for number	er of
clusters ranging from one to ten were carried out with a burn-in of 100 000 iterat	ions
followed by 500 000 MCMC steps. Convergence of each run was confirmed visu	ıally
286 by inspecting the $\alpha$ -parameter and likelihood chains, and the consistency across	runs
287 was examined using pophelper (Francis, 2017), a package that implements	the
288 functions from software CLUMPP (Jakobsson & Rosenberg, 2007) in R (R G	Core
289 Team, 2018). If the results between replicate runs differed (a sign of MCMC	non-
290 convergence across all runs), STRUCTURE was re-run increasing the number	r of

MCMC steps to 500 000 burn-in followed by 1 000 000 samples. To determine the

most likely *K*, the likelihood (L(*K*)), the rate of change in the likelihood (L'(*K*) and L''(*K*)) and  $\Delta K$  (Evanno, Regnaut, & Goudet, 2005) were calculated and plotted for each *K* using pophelper (Francis, 2017), and individual membership proportion plots for the run with the highest likelihood were plotted for the most likely values of *K*, following Pritchard et al., (2000).

The DAPC analysis was performed using the package adegenet 2.1.1 (Jombart, 2008) in R following the recommendations in Jombart (2012). The most likely number of clusters was determined with the K-means method using the decrease in Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value and, in the absence of an "elbow" (a clear drop followed by a sharp increase) in the BIC curve, by plotting and inspecting the membership proportions for the values of K with the lowest BIC values. Maximum number of clusters tested was set to ten, and the linear discriminant analysis was performed on 80% of the retained principal components. Scatter-plots were produced for varying K. The membership proportion plots were checked for concordance with the number of estimated clusters and whether membership proportions to those clusters were high (>80%). 

308 Results of analyses characterizing population structure presented in the main text are 309 based on TESS because they were the most consistent between runs, and importantly, 310 were more concordant with photo-identification studies (see details in the Results 311 section) than those of the two other genetic clustering methods.

The inclusion of closely related individuals can affect population structure analyses (Anderson & Dunham, 2008). Therefore the Queller and Goodnight's (Queller & Goodnight, 1989) relatedness coefficient (*R*) was estimated among individuals using COANCESTRY (Wang, 2011) within each population identified by TESS. TESS was

316 re-run after removing one individual from each pair of individuals showing a317 relatedness coefficient larger or equal to 0.45 as in Rosel et al. (2009).

318 Nuclear genetic differentiation and diversity

Genetic differentiation, i.e., pairwise  $F_{ST}$  (Weir & Cockerham, 1984) and Jost's D (Jost, 2008), between the populations inferred by TESS, were estimated using the R-package diveRsity (Keenan, McGinnity, Cross, Crozier, & Prodöhl, 2013). The level of significance was assessed using 1 000 bootstrap samples. For each population, the mean number of alleles (NA), allelic richness (AR), inbreeding coefficient ( $F_{IS}$ ), observed heterozygosity (Ho) and expected heterozygosity (He), were calculated, also in diveRsity. Program CONVERT (Glaubitz, 2004) was used to count private alleles. Diversity indices were also calculated separately for each locus.

#### *Recent migration rates*

Recent migration rates (i.e., within the last two generations) between the populations identified by TESS at the finest level of genetic structuring were estimated using BayesAss (Wilson & Rannala, 2003). Following Rannala (2013), preliminary runs were first performed to tune up MCMC parameters ensuring proposal acceptance rates around 30%. Ten runs were performed with a burn-in of 1 x  $10^6$  iterations followed by 2 x 10<sup>7</sup> MCMC iterations and a sampling frequency of 1 000. Trace files were plotted using Tracer (Rambaut & Drummond, 2007) to check for convergence and mixing. Consistency of the results between the runs was also checked.

#### 337 Results

The genotyping error rate between the two datasets was 0.0084. Significant departures from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) were detected for loci EV37 and Ttr34 in one population each (Appendix S1). As deviation was significant in only one out of seven populations for each locus, these loci were kept in the analyses. Linkage disequilibrium was not significant for any of the pairwise comparisons within each population. No null alleles or scoring errors were found.

## 344 Individual assignment methods

The most likely number of clusters when running TESS on the whole dataset was six. The delimitation of the six clusters (see Figure 2, Appendices S2a and S2b) and the whole data set (i.e., including both coastal and pelagic individuals) is as follows. The first cluster was mainly composed of coastal dolphins from East Scotland (ten of which were identified as resident based on photo-identification catalogue). Wales and a few individuals from West Scotland and Galicia. The second cluster consisted of individuals biopsy sampled in the Connemara-Mayo-Donegal area on the west coast of Ireland (i.e., the West Ireland population). The third cluster included coastal biopsies from the Shannon Estuary and four biopsy samples from dolphins sampled in Cork harbour, Ireland (i.e., the Shannon population). The fourth cluster was composed of coastal dolphins sampled in the English Channel, in particular in the Gulf of Saint-Malo, three stranded dolphins previously photo-identified as part of a small group that used to reside in the Arcachon estuary (Bay of Biscay, France) and a few individuals from Galicia (i.e., the English Channel population). The fifth cluster included stranded samples from the west coasts of the United Kingdom, Ireland, France and northern Spain, and biopsy samples from the Northeast Atlantic and around the Azores (i.e. the

361	Pelagic Atlantic population). The last cluster was composed of individuals sampled in
362	the Strait of Gibraltar and the Gulf of Cadiz (i.e., the Gibraltar-Cadiz population).
363	When considering $K=2$ , populations (e) and (f) (in Figure 2), were grouped together in
364	one cluster and all remaining populations in the other (TESS, results not shown). This
365	result highlights the hierarchical structuring of the species into coastal (populations (a)
366	to (d)) and pelagic (populations (e) and (f)). Indeed, populations (e) and (f) consist of
367	biopsies from individuals sampled in deep waters of the Azores, North Atlantic and
368	Strait of Gibraltar (plus some samples from the Gulf of Cadiz) as well as samples from
369	stranded animals from the West coasts of Scotland, Ireland, France and Spain.

In order to study in more detail the structuring among the coastal individuals, TESS was re-run with coastal samples only. In this case, the most likely number of clusters was five (Figure 3A). The DIC plot indicated a plateau at K=5 or K=6 (Appendix S3a) but examination of membership proportions indicated that there were actually only five clusters in all of the replicate runs with K=6 (Figure 3A, Appendix S3b). Thus, this finer scale analysis uncovered an additional cluster among the coastal dolphins. More precisely, the cluster comprising individuals sampled in Scotland, Wales and Galicia (Figure 2a) was divided into two clusters: one comprising individuals from Scotland and Wales (Figure 3A(a)) and another including individuals from Galicia (i.e., the Galicia population, Figure 3A(e)). All remaining coastal individuals (Figure 2b-d) were clustered as before (see Figure 3A(b-d)).

To further explore fine-scale structuring, TESS was re-run for only the individuals of the Scotland–Wales cluster (Figure 3A(a)), as this population encompassed several geographical areas. Further population structure was found within this area (see Figure 384 3B and Appendices S4a and S4b) with the first cluster including individuals from

Wales and a few individuals from West Scotland (Wales–West Scotland population,
Figure 3B(a)) and a second cluster consisting of individuals from East Scotland (East

387 Scotland population, Figure 3B(b)).

When running TESS on the pelagic samples only, no further genetic structuring was found but the best number of clusters was two, corresponding to the Pelagic Atlantic and the Gibraltar-Cadiz populations (Appendices S5a and S5b), inspection of the admixture plots for K=2 to K=6 also indicated that there were only two clusters, results shown for K=2 and K=3 in S5b.

Additional analyses with STRUCTURE and DAPC provide general support for TESS results but were either less stable due to convergence problems (STRUCTURE) or were not completely congruent with results of photo-identification studies. When all samples (N=425) were included in STRUCTURE runs, the Evanno-method ( $\Delta K$ , Evanno et al., 2005) detected only the uppermost hierarchical structure i.e., the division into coastal and pelagic at K=2 (Appendix S9d). Nevertheless, using the L(K) criterion proposed by Pritchard et al. (2000), the most likely K was six (Appendix S9a), in concordance with TESS. Beyond this, no new genetic clusters emerged in the membership proportion plots (Appendix S10). The full description of STRUCTURE results when including all samples and only the coastal samples is given in Appendices S7 and S11, respectively. In contrast to TESS, STRUCTURE could not detect the samples from Galicia as a separate cluster when only coastal samples were included.

405 When all samples were included in the DAPC analyses, the best number of clusters 406 was found at K=6 (Appendices S15-S16). The clusters were almost identical to those 407 found with TESS and STRUCTURE, dividing the Irish samples into Shannon and 408 West coast populations and separating the biopsy samples from Cadiz-Gibraltar from

409	the Azores biopsies and stranded samples thought to be from a pelagic origin.
410	However, in contrast to TESS, DAPC also failed to delineate the samples from Galicia
411	into a separate cluster when only coastal samples were included. The full description
412	of results when including only the coastal samples is given in Appendix S17.
413	As mentioned previously (Methods), the inclusion of closely related individuals can
414	bias results of genetic clustering methods. The presence of related individuals varied
415	among the geographic areas considered in this study. They were almost inexistent
416	among pelagic samples as no closely related individuals (with a relatedness coefficient
417	of $\geq 0.45$ ) were found in the Gibraltar-Cadiz population and only three pairs were found
418	in the pelagic Atlantic population. In contrast, relatedness among coastal individuals
419	varied from 1.15% in the English Channel population to 5.13% in the Galicia
420	population. Therefore, TESS was re-run for the coastal populations only taking out
421	one individual from each close kin pair (N=79). The results were similar to the runs

422 including close relatives and also indicated five clusters corresponding to the Shannon, 423 the West Ireland, the English Channel, the East and West Scotland–Wales and the 424 Galicia populations (Appendices S6a and S6b). As the results with and without 425 including close relatives were similar, we conclude that the results from TESS 426 presented in Figures 2 and 3 are highly reliable and can be used to draw inferences on 427 migration rates.

Results from genetic clustering methods such as TESS can be used as a first approach
to study migration. More precisely, individuals assigned to a population different from
the geographical area where they were sampled can be considered as likely migrants.
One individual sampled in Galicia had a high assignment probability to the English
Channel population (0.75), another individual sampled in the English Channel was

assigned to the West Ireland population (with 0.86 probability) and a third individual
sampled in the Shannon estuary was assigned to the West Ireland population (with
0.77 probability). These results suggest that there is some connectivity between
dolphin populations and further analyses with BayesAss are warranted.

437 Nuclear genetic differentiation and diversity

All nuclear  $F_{ST}$  and Jost's D pairwise comparisons between the eight populations identified with TESS were significant. The highest level of differentiation was between pelagic and coastal populations (Table 1). When considering  $F_{ST}$ , the lowest level of differentiation was detected between the two pelagic populations. In terms of Jost's *D* the lowest differentiation was between Wales and East Scotland. The Shannon population was the most differentiated from the pelagic populations followed by the West Ireland population for both indices.

Nuclear genetic diversity (Allele Richness (AR) and Observed Heterozygosity (Ho)) was significantly lower in most coastal populations than in the pelagic populations, with Kruskal-Wallis P<0.01 in all AR coastal-pelagic comparisons except between English Channel and Gibraltar-Cadiz (P=0.07), and P<0.05 in all Ho comparisons except between Gibraltar-Cadiz and English Channel (P=0.12), Gibraltar-Cadiz and Galicia (P=0.18) and Pelagic Atlantic and Galicia (P=0.09) (Table 2, Appendix S20 for values per loci per populations). Among the coastal populations, allele richness was highest in the English Channel population and lowest in the Shannon population, between which the difference was significant (Kruskal-Wallis P < 0.05). The highest number of private alleles was found in the pelagic Atlantic population (N=26), two private alleles were found in the Gibraltar/Cadiz and the English Channel populations and one private allele in the East Scotland and in the West Scotland-Wales

457 populations. A significant heterozygote deficiency was detected in the Shannon, West458 Ireland and Galicia populations (Table 2).

*Recent migration rates* 

Estimates of recent migration rates were highly consistent between runs; therefore, the results presented here are based on a randomly chosen run (Table 3). Estimated migration rates were very low between most populations, around <1% per generation, with an upper bound for the 95% credibility interval of less than 10% and a lower bound of 0 (Table 3). The only exceptions were mean migration rate of 18.1% between Galicia and East Scotland, and mean rate of 25.7% from East Scotland to Wales-West Scotland. However, these higher migration rates need to be interpreted with caution as individuals from Scotland, Wales and Galicia consisted of stranded animals. As mentioned before, although a portion of the East Scotland individuals were matched to photo-identification catalogues of known coastal animals, there is uncertainty about the origin of strandings in Wales and West Scotland.

#### **Discussion**

This study presents, to date, the most comprehensive analysis of the genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins in the North-east Atlantic as it includes samples collected from an unprecedentedly wide geographical area, which unlike previous studies, were analysed using a common set of microsatellite markers. The results of this study, therefore, have the potential to be used to identify management units in this area and thus offer a significant contribution to the conservation of the species in European waters.

Y.C.

A first level of genetic differentiation was found between coastal and pelagic populations, as in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). The results from TESS in terms of assignments to coastal and pelagic ecotypes were identical to that of Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) with only one exception. One individual that stranded in the Bay of Biscay which belonged to the Pelagic Mediterranean population in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014) clustered with the coastal English Channel population in this study. No further genetic structure was found within the two pelagic populations (i.e., Pelagic Atlantic and Gibraltar-Cadiz).

Fine-scale population structure among coastal bottlenose dolphins from different geographical locations corresponded to the different local populations that inhabit the Shannon estuary, west of Ireland, the English Channel, Galicia, East Scotland, and Wales/West Scotland. Previous studies only identified large-scale population structure in coastal waters due to uneven sampling of each local coastal population (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014) or fine-scale population structure in small geographic regions (Fernandez et al., 2011; Mirimin et al., 2011, Nykänen et al., 2018). Thus, the results of this study highlight the need for and the power of broad scale collaboration when working on the conservation of highly mobile species that can move across national borders. The level of resolution was only possible thanks to broad international collaborations, sample sharing and careful calibration of allele scoring to overcome the difficulties of comparing genotypes across studies.

Although results of all three genetic clustering methods were generally consistent, their comparison with independent results from photo-identification studies highlighted differences in performance among them. More explicitly, the coastal population assignments inferred with TESS were concordant with photo-identification studies

504	indicating geographically isolated populations with site fidelity. This was not always
505	the case for STRUCTURE and DAPC results. This highlights the power of clustering
506	methods using a priori spatial information to infer complex population structure.
507	Indeed, although STRUCTURE was able to identify the same six clusters as TESS
508	when all samples were considered, it was unable to identify further fine-scale
509	structuring among coastal samples. Comparing the two approaches to infer the number
510	of clusters using STRUCTURE, supports the idea that Evanno's method is well
511	adapted to identify the first level of structuring under hierarchical scenarios (Waples
512	& Gaggiotti 2006) such as those observed in bottlenose dolphins. DAPC also supports
513	the subdivision of bottlenose dolphins into six management units but assignment of
514	individuals to populations was less consistent with those of the two other methods. In
515	particular, one of the genetic clusters was composed of individuals sampled from many
516	different geographic locations. As Jombart et al. (2010) indicate, DAPC uses a purely
517	statistical criterion aimed at identifying the minimum number of groups that best
518	explain total observed variation while at the same time maximising between group
519	variation. Thus, as opposed to TESS and STRUCTURE, it does not take into
520	consideration Hardy-Weinberg and linkage equilibrium, which explains the observed
521	differences with the two other methods in the individual assignments to populations.
522	The use of stranded animals could be considered as a limitation of this study. However,
523	we are relatively confident in the inferences made, even though strandings constitute
524	almost half of all samples. Firstly, a drift-prediction model (Peltier et al., 2012) was
525	applied in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014), to estimate the most likely area

genetic results separating coastal and pelagic bottlenose dolphins (Louis, Viricel et al., 

of death. The estimated origin with the drift prediction model was consistent with the

2
2
4
5
6
7
, Q
0
9
10
11
12
13
11
14
15
16
17
18
10
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
26
27
28
29
30
21
51
32
33
34
35
36
20
37
38
39
40
41
 د/
42
43
44
45
46
47
10
40
49
50
51
52
52
55
54
55
56
57
58
50
שר

1

528 2014). For example, in East Scotland, all individuals were estimated to have died very 529 close to shore. The coastal and pelagic assignments of a subset of the samples were 530 confirmed using stable isotopes (Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014). In addition, 15 stranded 531 animals were known to be part of the resident coastal populations and their genetic assignments matched photo-identification studies (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). 532 533 Nevertheless, we acknowledge that there is uncertainty in the origin of the stranded 534 animals when there is no further evidence such as photo-identification and drift 535 modelling. This is the case for the coastal populations of Galicia and Wales/West 536 Scotland and caution is therefore required when interpreting these results.

537 The fine-scale population structure likely results from natal philopatry, possibly driven 538 by vertically (mother to offspring) and horizontally (between non-filial conspecifics) 539 learned foraging behaviours during the juvenile life stage, site fidelity and social 540 structure (Foote et al., 2016; Kopps et al., 2014; Whitehead, 2017; see further 541 discussion in Louis, Viricel et al., 2014; Louis, Fontaine et al., 2014; Nykänen et al., 542 2018). Photo-identification studies indicated site fidelity to relatively restricted 543 geographical areas (Cheney et al., 2014; Ingram & Rogan, 2002; Louis et al., 2015), 544 however, individuals can undertake movements of a few hundreds of kilometres, i.e., 545 around Ireland (O'Brien et al., 2009) and the East coast of Scotland (Cheney et al., 546 2013) but these movements can still be considered occurring at a relatively small scale. 547 There is also some evidence of larger scale movements between the North Sea and the 548 Atlantic, as reported in Robinson et al. (2012), and this provides further potential for 549 genetic and demographic connectivity between the populations; seven transient 550 dolphins were first sighted in the Moray Firth, East Scotland and later re-sighted in the 551 Hebrides, West Scotland. Five of these animals were later recorded in coastal Irish

waters and some of these movements represent travelled distances of over 1 200 km (Robinson et al., 2012). These individuals are believed to be part of the West Ireland population based on photo-identification catalogue kept on the coastal Irish dolphins. However, photo-identification fieldwork mainly occurs during the summer in most areas. Therefore, movements outside this season may be overlooked. Despite the above-mentioned movements, our results are consistent with a very low degree of connectivity among the studied populations. In other words, the different populations are relatively isolated from each other. Estimated migration rates among

populations were very low, and less than 1% per generation for most of the pairwise comparisons. Although there is no consensus on the level of migration that leads to demographic coupling (Waples & Gaggiotti, 2006; Palsboll et al., 2007), the estimated migration rates are well below the rate of 10%, which according to a simulation study can lead to coupled dynamics (Hastings, 1993). Demographic connectivity is therefore very low among local populations. The only exceptions are the migration rates of 18% from East Scotland to Galicia and 26% from East Scotland to Wales, the latter of which could be explained by the relatively short distance between the two sites. However, as these populations included only stranded dolphins and although all the East Scotland samples were estimated to originate from the North Sea according to a drift-prediction model used in a previous study (Louis, Viricel et al., 2014), there is some uncertainty about the origin of the individuals sampled in Wales and Galicia. As migration rate estimates have been shown to be dependent on the number of clusters chosen to best represent the population structure and thus the number of individuals in each cluster (Olsen et al., 2014), great care has to be taken that the sampling strategy used is robust and the samples are representative of each population. The present study is based on

576 the most comprehensive set of genetic samples available but there is still a need for 577 more biopsy samples from Wales and Scotland to further support our results.

The different populations were characterised in terms of genetic diversity, differentiation and migration rates. This information and existing estimates of abundance will help to evaluate the conservation status and vulnerability of the populations. Indeed, small isolated population are at risk of losing heterozygosity and genetic resilience due to genetic drift (Lacy, 1987) and are thus more vulnerable to stochastic environmental changes or anthropogenic stressors than larger populations. Genetic diversity was higher in the pelagic populations than coastal populations as in previous studies (Hoelzel et al., 1998; Louis, Viricel et al., 2014). This is consistent with higher abundance of the pelagic populations compared to the coastal populations. The Gibraltar-Cadiz population included around 700 photo-identified individuals (Giménez et al., 2018) and the Pelagic Atlantic abundance estimates (from Scotland to Spain) are several tens of thousands of individuals (Hammond et al., 2013, 2009) while the abundances of coastal dolphins do not exceed ~400 individuals (see below).

Genetic diversity indices for the coastal populations were concordant with abundance estimates using mark-recapture methods. The population of the English Channel, which is the largest coastal population with abundance estimates of around 400 individuals (Louis et al., 2015), had the highest genetic diversity. The Shannon population had the lowest genetic diversity and is the smallest with abundance estimated between 110 and 140 dolphins (Berrow, 2012; Englund, Ingram, & Rogan, 2008; Ingram & Rogan, 2002, 2003; Rogan, Gkarakouni, Nykänen, Whitaker, & Ingram, 2018). Abundance estimates were around 200 individuals in East Scotland

600	(Cheney et al., 2013), ca. 190 for the West Irish population (Nykänen, 2016) and 150
601	to 250 individuals in Wales (Pesante, Evans, Baines, & McMath, 2008). Any local
602	perturbation or global change could thus have drastic negative effects on these coastal
603	populations due to their small size, low genetic diversity and low connectivity
604	uncovered in this study.

This study filled a major knowledge gap on the fine-scale population structure of bottlenose dolphins in European Atlantic waters, which was considered as the main research priority for the protection of this species (Ó Cadhla & Marnell, 2017). As previously found in Louis, Viricel et al. (2014), coastal and pelagic populations are distinct and should be monitored separately. In terms of the coastal populations, the high genetic differentiation and negligible migration rates found in this study highlight the need to separately monitor each local population (the English Channel, the Shannon, the West Ireland, the East Scotland, the Galicia and the Wales-West Scotland populations) as they correspond to different management units. However, we cannot rule out further fine-scale population division in Wales and West Scotland due to the small sample sizes (N=16 and N=5, respectively), and the fact that all came from stranded dolphins as the use of samples of stranded animals only may lead to under-estimated population structure (Bilgmann, Möller, Harcourt, Kemper, & Beheregaray, 2011).

The small population sizes of the coastal populations and their isolation may render them vulnerable to anthropogenic impacts. These results highlight the need to protect their habitat through protected areas such as the SACs where anthropogenic activities are appropriately managed, ensuring their ecological suitability to the populations utilizing them. Regular monitoring of population dynamics (e.g., abundance, survival,

calving rate) using photo-identification, as undertaken in some of the areas, is therefore
recommended to evaluate population trends. Population viability analyses, as applied
to harbour seals, *Phoca vitulina*, in Southern Scandinavia in Olsen et al. (2014), could
also help inform whether the populations are of sufficient size for long-term population
viability in the absence of immigration.

In this study, management units were identified by first clustering individuals into putative populations based on individuals' genotypes and then by estimating their connectivity. Populations not sampled in this study (i.e., the Sado Estuary, Portugal, and the Iroise Sea, France) could be genotyped in the future using the same set of markers as in this study to further clarify their connectivity with the other European Atlantic populations. The Atlantic pelagic population showed no genetic differentiation over a large geographical range from West Scotland to the Azores. However, pelagic bottlenose dolphin populations may show ecological differences even in the absence of genetic divergence and this should be considered when allocating management units. For example, the bottlenose dolphins of the Gibraltar Strait and of the Gulf of Cadiz, although potentially presenting no genetic structure, showed differences in ecology detected using different ecological tracers (i.e., stable isotopes and contaminant loads) and individual monitoring through photo-identification, leading to the delineation of two ecological, management units (Giménez et al., 2018). This type of ecological differentiation may be detected using next generation sequencing data covering the whole genome of the species, which would allow testing for adaptive differentiation (Funk, McKay, Hohenlohe, & Allendorf, 2012). We recommend combining genetic data with ecological data (e.g., the use of stable isotopes) and individual monitoring, where available, to determine

648	the geographical scales most relevant to monitoring and the protection of populations
649	of any species.
650	
651	Data accessibility: The data are available on dryad at the following link: (to be
652	uploaded at the revisions stage).
653	
654	Acknowledgments
655	We thank Andrew Foote for advice and comments. Amélia Viricel, Hélène Peltier
656	and Christophe Guinet for their help during ML's PhD study. We also thank
657	everyone involved in data collection: Conor Ryan (GMIT, IWDG). Nigel Monaghan
658	and Ruth Carden (National Museum of Ireland), Barry McGovern (SAC Inverness)
659	and Julie Béesau, Gill Murray-Dickson and Paul Thompson (University of
660	Aberdeen), GECC and Réseau National Echouages volunteers, Fabien Demaret,
661	Ghislain Doremus, Vincent Ridoux and Olivier Van Canneyt (Pelagis), Sami Hassani
662	(Océanopolis), Angela Llavona, Ruth Fernandez (CEMMA) and Paula Mendez-
663	Fernandez (CEMMA and LIENSs), Philippe Verborgh and Ruth Esteban (CIRCE),
664	Joan Giménez (EBD-CSIC) and all volunteers involved in sample collection from all
665	the organisations. All samples were taken under the relevant permits. UK samples
666	were collected under the aegis of the UK Cetacean Strandings Investigation
667	Programme, which is funded by Defra and the Devolved Administrations of Scotland
668	and Wales. Data from offshore Irish waters were collected on the Cetaceans on the
669	Frontier cruise thanks to National Marine Research Vessels Ship-Time Grant Aid
670	Programme 2010 funded under the Science Technology and Innovation Programme
671	of National Development Plan 2007-2013. Biopsy samples taken in Ireland were
672	carried out under licence from the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) Nos.
673	C104/2011 and DER/Dolphin2012-10 (licence numbers C111/2013 and C043/2014)
674	and the Health Products Regulatory Authority (licence number: AE19130/P014),
675	with biopsy sampling funded by the NPWS and by a grant to ER from Science
676	Foundation Ireland. Samples from Galicia were obtained with the support of
677	Dirección Xeral de Conservación da Natureza-Xunta de Galicia, cofinanced with

European Regional Development Funds (ERDF/FEDER). Southern Spain samples were collected thanks to LIFE 'Conservación de Cetáceos y tortugas de Murcia y Andalucía' (LIFE 02 NAT/E/8610). MAS was supported by an FCT postdoctoral grant (SFRH/BPD/29841/2006). Data collection in the Azores was funded by projects TRACE (PTDC/MAR/74071/2006) and MAPCET (M2.1.2/F/012/2011). Funding for sample collection in France and analyses was provided by Fondation Total, Agence de l'Eau Seine-Normandie, Fonds de Dotation pour la Biodiversité, Agence des Aires Marines Protégées, Association Nationale de la Recherche et de la Technologie, Direction Régionale de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement et du Logement, Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement Durable et de l'Energie and Conseil Général de la Manche. ML was supported by a Fyssen post-doctoral fellowship, Fondation Total, a bridge funding from the School of Biology of the University of St Andrews and People's Trust for Endangered Species. MN was supported by NPWS, the Crawford-Hayes Fund, MASTS (Marine Alliance for Science and Technology for Scotland) and Project FishKosm that is funded by the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine's Competitive Research Funding programmes. We would also like to thank the editors, Morten Tange Olsen and two unnamed reviewers for helpful comments, which helped improve this manuscript.

#### **References**

Agardy, T., di Sciara, G. N., & Christie, P. (2011). Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy*, 35(2), 226–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.006 Allen, S. J., Bryant, K. A., Kraus, R. H. S., Loneragan, N. R., Kopps, A. M., Brown, A. M., ... Krützen, M. (2016). Genetic isolation between coastal and fishery-impacted, offshore bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops spp.) populations. Molecular Ecology, 25(12), 2735–2753. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13622

706	Allendorf, F. W., Luikart, G., & Aitken, S. N. (2013). Conservation and the genetics
707	of populations (2nd ed). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
708	Anderson, E. C., & Dunham, K. K. (2008). The influence of family groups on
709	inferences made with the program STRUCTURE. Molecular Ecology
710	Resources, 8(6), 1219-1229. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-
711	0998.2008.02355.x
712	Anon. (2012). Notice of intention to designate The West Connacht Coast SAC (Site
713	code: 002998) as Special Area of Conservation. Department of Arts, Heritage
714	and the Gaeltacht, Ireland.
715	http://www.nwwac.org/_fileupload/Image/Description_Sites_Marine_SACs_
716	Ireland_Dec2012_EN.pdf [July 27 2018]
717	Berrow, S. (2012). Abundance Estimate of Bottlenose Dolphins ( <i>Tursiops truncatus</i> )
718	in the Lower River Shannon candidate Special Area of Conservation, Ireland.
719	Aquatic Mammals, 38(2), 136–144.
720	https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.38.2.2012.136
721	Bilgmann, K., Möller, L. M., Harcourt, R. G., Kemper, C. M., & Beheregaray, L. B.
722	(2011). The use of carcasses for the analysis of cetacean population genetic
723	structure: a comparative study in two dolphin species. <i>Plos One</i> , $6(5)$ ,
724	e20103. https://doi.org/e20103 10.1371/journal.pone.0020103
725	Cheney, B., Corkrey, R., Durban, J. W., Grellier, K., Hammond, P. S., Islas-
726	Villanueva, V., Thompson, P. M. (2014). Long-term trends in the use of a
727	protected area by small cetaceans in relation to changes in population status.
728	Global Ecology and Conservation, 2, 118–128.

3
4
5
6
7
0
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
2/
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
77 79
40 40
49 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
50
20
59
60

729	Cheney, B., Thompson, P. M., Ingram, S. N., Hammond, P. S., Stevick, P. T.,
730	Durban, J. W., Wilson, B. (2013). Integrating multiple data sources to
731	assess the distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphins Tursiops
732	truncatus in Scottish waters: Abundance of bottlenose dolphins around
733	Scotland. Mammal Review, 43(1), 71-88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
734	2907.2011.00208.x
735	Connor, R. C., Wells, R. S., Mann, J., & Read, A. J. (2000). The bottlenose dolphin:
736	social relationships in a fission-fusion society. In J. Mann, R. C. Connor, P.
737	L. Tyack, & H. Whitehead (Eds.), Cetacean societies: field studies of
738	dolphins and whales. (pp. 91–126). London, United Kingdom: The
739	University of Chicago Press.
740	Council of the European Communities (2008). Directive 2008/56/EC of the
741	European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a
742	framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy
743	(Marine Strategy Framework Directive). Official Journal (L164), pp. 19-40.
744	Durand, E., Chen, E., & Francois, O. (2009). Tess version 2.3 - Reference Manual.
745	Englund, A., Ingram, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2008). An updated population status report
746	for bottlenose dolphins using the Lower River Shannon SAC in 2008. Final
747	Report to the National Parks and Wildlife Service (p. 34). University College
748	Cork, Ireland.
749	European Commission (Ed.) (2011). The EU biodiversity strategy to 2020.
750	Luxembourg: Publ. Off. of the Europ. Union.

751	European Economic Community (1992). Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21st May
752	1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.
753	Official Journal (L206), pp. 7-50.
754	Evanno, G., Regnaut, S., & Goudet, J. (2005). Detecting the number of clusters of
755	individuals using the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. Molecular
756	Ecology, 14(8), 2611–2620. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
757	294X.2005.02553.x
758	Fernandez, R., Santos, M. B., Pierce, G. J., Llavona, A., Lopez, A., Silva, M. A.,
759	Piertney, S. B. (2011). Fine-scale genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins,
760	Tursiops truncatus, in Atlantic coastal waters of the Iberian Peninsula.
761	<i>Hydrobiologia</i> , 670(1), 111–125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0669-5
762	Foote, A. D., Vijay, N., Ávila-Arcos, M. C., Baird, R. W., Durban, J. W., Fumagalli,
763	M., Wolf, J. B. W. (2016). Genome-culture coevolution promotes rapid
764	divergence of killer whale ecotypes. Nature Communications, 7(1).
765	https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11693
766	Francis, R. M. (2017). pophelper: An R package and web app to analyse and
767	visualise population structure. <i>Molecular Ecology Resources</i> , 17(1), 27–32.
768	https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12509
769	Funk, W. C., McKay, J. K., Hohenlohe, P. A., & Allendorf, F. W. (2012).
770	Harnessing genomics for delineating conservation units. Trends in Ecology &
771	Evolution, 27(9), 489-496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.05.012
772	Gaspari, S., Holcer, D., Mackelworth, P., Fortuna, C., Frantzis, A., Genov, T.,
773	Ciofi, C. (2015). Population genetic structure of common bottlenose dolphins
774	(Tursiops truncatus) in the Adriatic Sea and contiguous regions: implications

775	for international conservation. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater
776	Ecosystems, 25(2), 212-222. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2415
777	Giménez, J., Louis, M., Barón, E., Ramírez, F., Verborgh, P., Gauffier, P., de
778	Stephanis, R. (2018). Towards the identification of ecological management
779	units: A multidisciplinary approach for the effective management of
780	bottlenose dolphins in the southern Iberian Peninsula. Aquatic Conservation:
781	Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 28(1), 205–215.
782	https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2814
783	Glaubitz, J. C. (2004). CONVERT: A user-friendly program to reformat diploid
784	genotypic data for commonly used population genetic software packages.
785	Molecular Ecology Notes, 4(2), 309–310. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-
786	8286.2004.00597.x
787	Guillot, G., Leblois, R., Coulon, A., & Frantz, A. C. (2009). Statistical methods in
788	spatial genetics. Molecular Ecology, 18(23), 4734–4756.
789	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04410.x
790	Hammond, P. S., Bearzi, G., Bjørge, A., Forney, K. A., Karczmarski, L., Kasuya, T.,
791	Wilson, B. (2012). Tursiops truncatus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened
792	Species 2012: e.T22563A17347397.
793	http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2012.RLTS.T22563A17347397.en. [21
794	July 2018].
795	Hammond, P. S., Macleod, K., Berggren, P., Borchers, D. L., Burt, L., Cañadas, A.,
796	Vázquez, J. A. (2013). Cetacean abundance and distribution in European
797	Atlantic shelf waters to inform conservation and management. Biological
798	<i>Conservation</i> , <i>64</i> , 107–122.

7	99 Hamn	nond, P. S., Macleod, K., Gillespie, D., Swift, R., Winship, A., Burt, M. L.,
8	00	Castro, R. (2009). Cetacean Offshore Distribution and Abundance in the
8	01	European Atlantic (CODA). Final report to the European Commission. St
8	02	Andrews.
8	03 Hartel	, E. F., Constantine, R., & Torres, L. G. (2015). Changes in habitat use patterns
8	04	by bottlenose dolphins over a 10-year period render static management
8	05	boundaries ineffective: Changes in habitat use render management
8	06	boundaries ineffective. Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater
8	07	Ecosystems, 25(5), 701-711. https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2465
8	08 Hastir	ngs, A. (1993). Complex interactions between dispersal and dynamics - lessons
8	09	from couple logistic equations. <i>Ecology</i> , 74(5), 1362–1372.
8	10	https://doi.org/10.2307/1940066
8	11 Hoelz	el, A. R., Potter, C. W., & Best, P. B. (1998). Genetic differentiation between
8	12	parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of the bottlenose dolphin.
8	13	Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences,
8	14	265(1402), 1177–1183.
8	15 Hooke	er, S. K., & Gerber, L. R. (2004). Marine reserves as a tool for ecosystem-based
8	16	management: the potential importance of megafauna. Bioscience, 54(1), 27-
8	17	39. Retrieved from http://bioscience.oxfordjournals.org/content/54/1/27.short
8	18 Ingrar	n, S. N., Englund, A., & Rogan, E. (2001). An extensive survey of bottlenose
8	19	dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) on the west coast of Ireland. Heritage Council
8	20	Report no. WLD/2001/42. (p. 17). University College Cork, Ireland.
8	21 Ingrar	n, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2002). Identifying critical areas and habitat preferences
8	22	of bottlenose dolphins Tursiops truncatus. Marine Ecology Progress Series,

823	244, 247–255. Retrieved from http://www.int-
824	res.com/abstracts/meps/v244/p247-255/
825	Ingram, S. N., & Rogan, E. (2003). Bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in the
826	Shannon Estuary and selected areas of the west-coast of Ireland. Report to
827	the National Parks and Wildlife Service (p. 28). University College Cork,
828	Ireland.
829	Jakobsson, M., & Rosenberg, N. A. (2007). CLUMPP: a cluster matching and
830	permutation program for dealing with label switching and multimodality in
831	analysis of population structure. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England), 23(14),
832	1801-1806. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btm233
833	Jepson, P. D., Deaville, R., Barber, J. L., Aguilar, À., Borrell, A., Murphy, S.,
834	Law, R. J. (2016). PCB pollution continues to impact populations of orcas
835	and other dolphins in European waters. Scientific Reports, 6, 18573.
836	https://doi.org/10.1038/srep18573
837	Jombart, T. (2008). adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic
838	markers. Bioinformatics, 24, 1403–1405.
839	https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btn129
840	Jombart, T. (2012). A tutorial for Discriminant Analysis of Principal Components
841	(DAPC) using adegenet 1.3-4.
842	Jombart, T., Devillard, S., & Balloux, F. (2010). Discriminant analysis of principal
843	components: a new method for the analysis of genetically structured
844	populations. Bmc Genetics, 11, 94. https://doi.org/9410.1186/1471-2156-11-
845	94

846	Jost, L. (2008). $G_{ST}$ and its relatives do not measure differentiation. <i>Molecular</i>
847	Ecology, 17(18), 4015-4026. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
848	294X.2008.03887.x
849	Keenan, K., McGinnity, P., Cross, T. F., Crozier, W. W., & Prodöhl, P. A. (2013).
850	diveRsity : An R package for the estimation and exploration of population
851	genetics parameters and their associated errors. Methods in Ecology and
852	Evolution, 4(8), 782-788. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12067
853	Kelleher, G., & Phillips, A. (Eds.). (1999). Guidelines For Marine Protected Areas.
854	IUCN Publications Services Unit, 219c Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3
855	ODL, United Kingdom: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
856	https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.1999.PAG.3.en
857	Kopps, A. M., Ackermann, C. Y., Sherwin, W. B., Allen, S. J., Bejder, L., &
858	Krutzen, M. (2014). Cultural transmission of tool use combined with habitat
859	specializations leads to fine-scale genetic structure in bottlenose dolphins.
860	Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 281(1782),
861	20133245-20133245. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3245
862	Lacy, R. C. (1987). Loss of Genetic Diversity from Managed Populations:
863	Interacting Effects of Drift, Mutation, Immigration, Selection, and Population
864	Subdivision. Conservation Biology, 1(2), 143–158.
865	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1987.tb00023.x
866	Louis, M., Fontaine, M. C., Spitz, J., Schlund, E., Dabin, W., Deaville, R., Simon-
867	Bouhet, B. (2014). Ecological opportunities and specializations shaped
868	genetic divergence in a highly mobile marine top predator. Proceedings of the
869	Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 281(1795), 20141558–20141558.
870	https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1558
	36

871	Louis, M., Gally, F., Barbraud, C., Béesau, J., Tixier, P., Simon-Bouhet, B.,
872	Guinet, C. (2015). Social structure and abundance of coastal bottlenose
873	dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, in the Normano-Breton Gulf, English Channel.
874	Journal of Mammalogy, gyv053. Retrieved from
875	http://jmammal.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/04/30/jmammal.gyv05
876	3.abstract
877	Louis, M., Viricel, A., Lucas, T., Peltier, H., Alfonsi, E., Berrow, S., Simon-
878	Bouhet, B. (2014). Habitat-driven population structure of bottlenose dolphins,
879	Tursiops truncatus, in the North-East Atlantic. Molecular Ecology, 23(4),
880	857-874. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12653
881	Lusseau, D., Bain, D., Williams, R., & Smith, J. (2009). Vessel traffic disrupts the
882	foraging behavior of southern resident killer whales Orcinus orca.
883	Endangered Species Research, 6, 211–221. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00154
884	Meissner, A. M., Christiansen, F., Martinez, E., Pawley, M. D. M., Orams, M. B., &
885	Stockin, K. A. (2015). Behavioural Effects of Tourism on Oceanic Common
886	Dolphins, Delphinus sp., in New Zealand: The Effects of Markov Analysis
887	Variations and Current Tour Operator Compliance with Regulations. PLOS
888	ONE, 10(1), e0116962. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116962
889	Mirimin, L., Miller, R., Dillane, E., Berrow, S. D., Ingram, S., Cross, T. F., & Rogan,
890	E. (2011). Fine-scale population genetic structuring of bottlenose dolphins in
891	Irish coastal waters: Population genetic structure of bottlenose dolphins.
892	Animal Conservation, 14(4), 342-353. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-
893	1795.2010.00432.x

3	894	Moritz, C. (1994). Defining evolutionarily significant units for conservation. Trends
5 6	895	in Ecology & Evolution, 9(10), 373-375. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-
7 8 0	896	5347(94)90057-4
9 10 11	897	Natoli, A., Peddemors, V. M., & Hoelzel, A. R. (2003). Population structure and
12 13	898	speciation in the genus Tursiops based on microsatellite and mitochondrial
14 15	899	DNA analyses: Bottlenose dolphin population genetics. Journal of
16 17	900	Evolutionary Biology, 17(2), 363-375. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-
18 19 20	901	9101.2003.00672.x
21 22	902	Nichols, C., Herman, J., Gaggiotti, O. E., Dobney, K. M., Parsons, K., & Hoelzel, A.
23 24 25	903	R. (2007). Genetic isolation of a now extinct population of bottlenose
25 26 27	904	dolphins (Tursiops truncatus). Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
28 29	905	Sciences, 274(1618), 1611-1616. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0176
30 31	906	Nykänen, M. (2016). Phylogeography, population structure, abundance and habitat
32 33	907	use of bottlenose dolphins, Tursiops truncatus, on the west coast of Ireland.
35 36	908	University College Cork, Cork. Retrieved from
37 38	909	https://cora.ucc.ie/handle/10468/3828
39 40	910	Nykänen, M., Dillane, E., Englund, A., Foote, A. D., Ingram, S. N., Louis, M.,
41 42 43	911	Rogan, E. (2018). Quantifying dispersal between marine protected areas by a
44 45	912	highly mobile species, the bottlenose dolphin, Tursiops truncatus. Ecology
46 47	913	and Evolution, 8(18), 9241-9258. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4343
48 49 50	914	O'Brien, J., Berrow, S., Ryan, C., McGrath, D., O'Connor, I., Giovanna, P.,
51 52	915	Whooley, P. (2009). A note on long-distance matches of bottlenose dolphins
53 54	916	(Tursiops truncatus) around the Irish coast using photo-identification.
55 56	917	Journal of Cetacean Research and Management, 11(1), 71–76. Retrieved
57 58 59 60	918	from https://cual.openrepository.com/cual/handle/10759/347018

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20 21	
∠⊺ วา	
22	
∠3 24	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
27	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
57	
52	
55	
54 57	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

919	Ó Cadhla, O., & Marnell, F. (Eds.) (2017). Proceedings of the Transnational
920	Bottlenose Dolphin Conservation Workshop hosted in Dublin, 7-8 December
921	2016. National Parks & Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage,
922	Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, Dublin, Ireland. 391pp.
923	Olsen, M. T., Andersen, L. W., Dietz, R., Teilmann, J., Harkonen, T., & Siegismund,
924	H. R. (2014). Integrating genetic data and population viability analyses for
925	the identification of harbour seal (Phoca vitulina) populations and
926	management units. Molecular Ecology, 23(4), 815-831.
927	https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12644
928	Palsbøll, P. J., Berube, M., & Allendorf, F. W. (2007). Identification of management
929	units using population genetic data. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 22(1),
930	11-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.09.003
931	Peltier, H., Dabin, W., Daniel, P., Van Canneyt, O., Dorémus, G., Huon, M., &
932	Ridoux, V. (2012). The significance of stranding data as indicators of
933	cetacean populations at sea: Modelling the drift of cetacean carcasses.
934	Ecological Indicators, 18, 278–290.
935	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.11.014
936	Pesante, G., Evans, P. G. H., Baines, M. E., & McMath, M. (2008). Abundance and
937	life history parameters of bottlenose dolphin in Cardigan Bay: monitoring
938	2005-2007. CCW Marine Monitoring Report.
939	Pirotta, E., Merchant, N. D., Thompson, P. M., Barton, T. R., & Lusseau, D. (2015).
940	Quantifying the effect of boat disturbance on bottlenose dolphin foraging
941	activity. Biological Conservation, 181, 82-89.
942	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.003

943	Pritchard, J. K., Stephens, M., & Donnelly, P. (2000). Inference of population
944	structure using multilocus genotype data. Genetics, 155(2), 945-959.
945	Queller, D. C., & Goodnight, K. F. (1989). Estimating relatedness using genetic
946	markers. Evolution, 43(2), 258–275. https://doi.org/10.2307/2409206
947	Quérouil, S., Silva, M. A., Freitas, L., Prieto, R., Magalhães, S., Dinis, A., Santos,
948	R. S. (2007). High gene flow in oceanic bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops
949	truncatus) of the North Atlantic. Conservation Genetics, 8(6), 1405–1419.
950	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-007-9291-5
951	Quick, N. J., Cheney, B., Islas-Villanueva, V., Janik, V. M., Thompson, P. M., &
952	Hammond, P. S. (2014). The east coast of Scotland bottlenose dolphin
953	population: Improving understanding of ecology outside the Moray Firth
954	SAC. Report produced as part of the UK Department of Energy and Climate
955	Change's offshore energy Strategic Environmental Assessment programme
956	(OESEA2 Supporting documents No. 14D-086) (p. 87). Department of
957	Energy and Climate Change. Retrieved from
958	https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/fil
959	e/346326/OESEA2_east_coast_of_Scotland_bottlenose_dolphin_population.
960	pdf
961	Rambaut, A., & Drummond, A. J. (2007). Tracer v1.4, Available from
962	http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer.
963	Rannala, B. (2013). BayesAss Edition 3.0 User's Manual. University of California
964	Davis.
965	Raymond, M., & Rousset, F. (1995). GENEPOP (version 1.2) - Population genetics
966	software for exact tests and ecumenicism. Journal of Heredity, 86(3), 248-
967	249.
	40

2
2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
21
∠ I 22
22
23
24
25
25
26
27
28
29
30
20
31
32
33
34
25
55
36
37
38
39
40
40
41
42
43
44
15
43
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
54
55
56
57
58
59
.17

968	R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
969	Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-
970	project.org/.
971	Reif, J., Schaefer, A., Bossart, G., & Fair, P. (2017). Health and Environmental Risk
972	Assessment Project for bottlenose dolphins Tursiops truncatus from the
973	southeastern USA. II. Environmental aspects. Diseases of Aquatic
974	Organisms, 125(2), 155-166. https://doi.org/10.3354/dao03143
975	Robinson, K. P., O'Brien, J., Berrow, S., Cheney, B., Costa, M., Elsfield, S. M.,
976	Whooley, P. (2012). Discrete or not so discrete: Long distance movements by
977	coastal bottlenose dolphins in UK and Irish waters. Journal of Cetacean
978	Research and Management, 12(3), 365–371. Retrieved from
979	http://cual.openrepository.com/cual/handle/10759/560746
980	Rogan, E., Gkarakouni, M., Nykänen, M., Whitaker, A., & Ingram, S. N. (2018).
981	Bottlenose dolphin survey in the Lower River Shannon SAC 2018. Report to
982	the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage,
983	Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (p. 22). Cork: University College
984	Cork.
985	Rosel, P. E., Hansen, L., & Hohn, A. A. (2009). Restricted dispersal in a
986	continuously distributed marine species: common bottlenose dolphins
987	Tursiops truncatus in coastal waters of the western North Atlantic. Molecular
988	Ecology, 18(24), 5030-5045. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
989	294X.2009.04413.x

990	Rousset, F. (2008). GENEPOP'007: a complete re-implementation of the GENEPOP
991	software for Windows and Linux. Molecular Ecology Resources, 8(1), 103-
992	106. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01931.x
993	Van Oosterhout, C., Hutchinson, W. F., Wills, D. P. M., & Shipley, P. (2004).
994	MICRO-CHECKER: software for identifying and correcting genotyping
995	errors in microsatellite data. Molecular Ecology Notes, 4(3), 535–538.
996	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00684.x
997	Vollmer, N. L., & Rosel, P. E. (2017). Fine-scale population structure of common
998	bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus) in offshore and coastal waters of the
999	US Gulf of Mexico. Marine Biology, 164(8). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-
1000	017-3186-x
1001	Wang, J. (2011). coancestry: a program for simulating, estimating and analysing
1002	relatedness and inbreeding coefficients: COMPUTER PROGRAM NOTE.
1003	Molecular Ecology Resources, 11(1), 141–145.
1004	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02885.x
1005	Waples, R. S., & Gaggiotti, O. (2006). What is a population? An empirical
1006	evaluation of some genetic methods for identifying the number of gene pools
1007	and their degree of connectivity. Molecular Ecology, 15(6), 1419–1439.
1008	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.02890.x
1009	Weir, B. S., & Cockerham, C. C. (1984). Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of
1010	population structure. Evolution, 38(6), 1358–1370.
1011	https://doi.org/10.2307/2408641
1012	Whitehead, H. (2017). Gene-culture coevolution in whales and dolphins.
1013	Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(30), 7814–7821.
1014	https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1620736114
	10

Williams, R., Bain, D., Smith, J., & Lusseau, D. (2009). Effects of vessels on

Wilson, B. (2016). Might marine protected areas for mobile megafauna suit their

Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems, 26(1), 3–8.

Wilson, G. A., & Rannala, B. (2003). Bayesian inference of recent migration rates

using multilocus genotypes. Genetics, 163(3), 1177–1191.

, gen.

https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2619

behaviour patterns of individual southern resident killer whales Orcinus orca.

Endangered Species Research, 6, 199–209. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00150

proponents more than the animals?: MPAs for megafauna or people? Aquatic

2	
3	1015
4	1010
5 6	1016
7 8	1017
9	
10 11	1018
12 13	1019
14 15	1020
16 17	1021
18	1021
19 20	1022
21 22	1023
23 24	1024
25 26	1025
27 28	1026
29 30	1020
31	1027
32 33	1028
34 35	1029
36	1029
37 38	1030
39 40	1031
41 42	1032
43 44	1033
45 46	1024
40	1034
48 49	1035
50 51	1036
52 53	1037
54 55	1038
56 57	1039
58 59	
60	

1040	Tables
1041	
1042	Table 1. Pairwise fixation indices based on 14 microsatellite loci (given as average
1043	with 95% Highest Probability Density Interval (HPDI)) between the different
1044	populations. The samples were divided into populations based on results from TESS.
1045	Values above the diagonal are $F_{\rm ST}$ -values and values below the diagonal are Jost's D
1046	values.

		Shanno n	Wales/W est Scotland	East Scotlan d	West Ireland	English Channel	Galicia	Gibralta r/Cadiz	Pelagic Atlantic
			0.136	0.164	0.129	0.090	0.226	0.232	0.227
	Shannon	-	(0.096-	(0.130-	(0.104-	(0.079-	(0.178-	(0.215-	(0.212-
			0.180)	0.200)	0.153)	0.103)	0.283)	0.249)	0.241)
	Wales/W	0.090		0.066	0.128	0.082	0.125	0.173	0.178
	est	(0.061-	-	(0.037-	(0.092-	(0.058-	(0.083-	(0.154-	(0.159-
	Scotland	0.121)		0.103)	0.169)	0.111)	0.176)	0.197)	0.198)
	Fact	0.141	0.036		0.149	0.090	0.091	0.150	0.164
	Easi Scotland	(0.104-	(0.010-	-	(0.119-	(0.067-	(0.062-	(0.129-	(0.147-
	Scotianu	0.176)	0.075)		0.183)	0.114)	0.131)	0.172)	0.183)
	Wost	0.074	0.089	0.115		0.115	0.178	0.208	0.190
	Iroland	(0.056-	(0.064-	(0.086-	-	(0.099-	(0.132-	(0.190-	(0.177-
	Ileianu	0.095)	0.116)	0.148)		0.131)	0.234)	0.227)	0.206)
	Englich	0.065	0.082	0.081	0.104		0.094	0.134	0.146
	Channel	(0.052-	(0.054-	(0.054-	(0.085-		(0.065-	(0.122-	(0.136-
		0.079)	0.115)	0.110)	0.125)		0.134)	0.146)	0.157)
		0.174	0.098	0.054	0.111	0.093		0.140	0.139
	Galicia	(0.123-	(0.042-	(0.027-	(0.067-	(0.060-	-	(0.115-	(0.116-
		0.234)	0.164)	0.090)	0.164)	0.142)		0.173)	0.170)
	Gibraltar	0.386	0.289	0.260	0.347	0.286	0.259		0.034
	/Cadiz	(0.346-	(0.246-	(0.220-	(0.308-	(0.254-	(0.214-	-	(0.026-
	/ Caulz	0.426)	0.331)	0.310)	0.388)	0.320)	0.312)		0.043)
	Delagic	0.457	0.359	0.345	0.379	0.351	0.335	0.097	
	Atlantic	(0.423-	(0.318-	(0.310-	(0.347-	(0.324-	(0.281-	(0.072-	-
		0.492)	0.398)	0.384)	0.414)	0.377)	0.401)	0.126)	
	1047								

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	1048
17 18	
19	
20	1049
21	1050
23	1051
24 25	1051
26	1052
27	1053
28 29	1054
30 31	1001
32	
33 24	
34 35	
36	
37 38	
39	
40	
41 42	
43	
44	
45	

)48	Table 2. Nuclear	diversities over	er all loci f	or each population	inferred by TESS.
-----	------------------	------------------	---------------	--------------------	-------------------

Population	N (mean)	А	%	AR	Но	Не	HWE	$F_{\rm IS}$	$F_{\mathrm{IS}}$ Low	$F_{\mathrm{IS}}$ High	PA
Shannon	52	52	31.19	3.06	0.44	0.42	0.997	-0.0604*	-0.1215	-0.0014	0
Wales/West Scotland	20	57	35.86	3.36	0.46	0.48	0.839	0.0362	-0.0744	0.1386	1
East Scotland	31	54	35.94	3.42	0.52	0.54	0.982	0.0297	-0.0565	0.1067	1
West Ireland	36	53	34.82	3.30	0.51	0.47	1.000	-0.0754*	-0.1358	-0.0204	0
English Channel	111	93	57.45	4.75	0.60	0.60	0.971	0.0115	-0.0244	0.0470	2
Galicia	13	58	36.90	3.76	0.60	0.55	0.419	-0.0892*	-0.2011	-0.0046	0
Gibraltar/Cadiz	49	113	72.10	6.10	0.73	0.74	0.463	0.0141	-0.0172	0.0462	2
Pelagic Atlantic	106	148	92.43	7.07	0.75	0.77	0.998	0.0266	0.0030	0.0497	26

1049 N=mean number of individuals used for each locus, A=number of alleles observed, %=percentage of total alleles, AR=allelic richness,

1050 *Ho*=observed heterozygosity, *He*=expected heterozygosity, are given as per locus per population sample. Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium

1051 (HWE)=corrected p-values (chi-square test for goodness-of-fit),  $F_{IS}=F_{IS}$  values for each loci and population sample (overall),  $F_{IS}$  Low/High=bias

1052 corrected 0.025% and 92.5% percentiles of the confidence interval. \*denotes significance in  $F_{\rm IS}$  values as the 95% CI does not overlap zero,

1053 PA=number of Private Alleles.

2	
3	
4	
-	

 Table 3. Mean (and 95% Credible Interval) recent migration rates inferred using BayesAss. The migration rate is defined as the proportion of 1057 individuals in a population that immigrated from a source population per generation. Migration rates above 0.10 have been highlighted in bold.

Pppulation \ Source	Shannon	Wales/West Scotland	East Scotland	West Ireland	English Channel	Galicia	Gibraltar/Cadiz	
1 <del>3h</del> annon	0.959 (0.931 - 0.987)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)	0.007 (0.000 - 0.019)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.016)	
13 Wales/West-Scotland	0.012 (0.000 - 0.036)	0.678 (0.657 - 0.700)	0.257 (0.206 - 0.307)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)	0.013 (0.000 - 0.037)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)	0.010 (0.000 - 0.029)	
ffast Scotland	0.010 (0.000 - 0.030)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.025)	0.935 (0.892 - 0.978)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.027)	0.011 (0.000 - 0.030)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.025)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.026)	
Moest Ireland	0.054 (0.000 - 0.112)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	0.009 (0.000 - 0.028)	0.898 (0.833 - 0.964)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.024)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	
127 English Channel	0.008 (0.000 - 0.021)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)	0.007 (0.000 - 0.019)	0.005 (0.000 - 0.013)	0.969 (0.948 - 0.990)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.008)	
18 Galicia	0.015 (0.000 - 0.043)	0.014 (0.000 - 0.041)	0.181 (0.104 - 0.257)	0.015 (0.000 - 0.043)	0.062 (0.000 - 0.127)	0.684 (0.652 - 0.716)	0.014 (0.000 - 0.041)	
∫⊊jbraltar/Cadiz	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.018)	0.006 (0.000 - 0.017)	0.941 (0.902 - 0.981)	
Pelagic Atlantic	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.004 (0.000 - 0.011)	0.003 (0.000 - 0.009)	0.008 (0.000 - 0.022)	
22 1058								
23								
24 1059								
25								
26 10(0								
7 1060								
28								
1061								

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/aqc

#### **Figure legends**

Figure 1. Map of samples used in the study and their origin; stranding - samples collected from stranded bottlenose dolphins, biopsy - samples collected from skin biopsies, and catalogued – samples collected from stranded animals that had been matched to a photo-identification catalogue of known coastal dolphins. The grey contours represent 200m and 1000m depth contours.

Figure 2. Map of individual assignment probabilities per population identified by TESS using the whole dataset (N=425) and K=6. The color scale bar indicates the assignment probabilities, (a) East and West Scotland, Wales and Galicia, (b) West Ireland, (c) Shannon estuary, Ireland, (d) English Channel, France, (e) pelagic Atlantic, (f) Gibraltar-Cadiz.

Figure 3. Results of TESS analyses involving only coastal samples. A) Map of individual assignment probabilities per population using all coastal samples (N= 269) and K=5: (a) East Scotland and Wales (b) West Ireland, (c) Shannon estuary, Ireland, (d) English Channel, France, (e) Galicia, Spain. (B) Map of individual assignment probabilities per population using only the samples from coastal Wales, West and East Scotland (N=53) and K=2: (a) West Scotland and Wales (b) East Scotland. The color scale bar indicates the assignment probabilities.



 for per period







Figure 1. Map of samples used in the study and their origin; stranding - samples collected from stranded bottlenose dolphins, biopsy - samples collected from skin biopsies, and catalogued – samples collected from stranded animals that had been matched to a photo-identification catalogue of known coastal dolphins. The grey contours represent 200m and 1000m depth contours.

208x181mm (300 x 300 DPI)



0.0

- 0.2

- 1.0

- 0.8

- 0.6

- 0.4

## Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems A) Coastal samples - K = 5



# B) Wales and all Scotland coastal samples - K = 2



Page 52 of 51