

Demographic expansions in conifer and human populations characterized by linked microsatellite data

Concetta Burgarella, Miguel Navascués

► **To cite this version:**

Concetta Burgarella, Miguel Navascués. Demographic expansions in conifer and human populations characterized by linked microsatellite data. Annual Meeting of the Society for Molecular Biology and Evolution, Jun 2008, Barcelona, Spain. 2008. hal-02755475

HAL Id: hal-02755475

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02755475>

Submitted on 1 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Human and conifer demographic expansions from linked microsatellites



Concetta Burgarella^{1,2} & Miguel Navascués²



¹Équipe Éco-évolution mathématique, CNRS UMR 7625 Écologie et Évolution, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France

²Unidad de Genética Forestal, Dpto. de Sistemas y Recursos Forestales, Instituto Nacional para la Investigación Agraria y Alimentaria (CIFOR-INIA), Madrid, Spain

We extended the method for demographic inference based on the distribution of pairwise differences (i.e. mismatch distribution) between individuals of a sample (Schneider & Excoffier, 1999) to linked microsatellites by assuming the stepwise mutation model. The proposed method allows for the estimation of initial and final population sizes and time of expansion by a maximum pseudolikelihood approach. Confidence intervals have been estimated by parametric bootstrap.

The interest on linked microsatellites comes from their application in chloroplast and mammal Y-chromosome genetic evolutionary studies. The application of the method is illustrated with microsatellite data of the chloroplast genome from the Canary Island pine (*Pinus canariensis*) and of the human Y-chromosome. In both cases the distribution of the pairwise differences are unimodal, as expected under a demographic expansion (Figures 2 and 3).




Figure 1

Human Y-chromosome population data for five microsatellite loci (DYS19, DYS390, DYS391, DYS392 and DYS393) have been obtained from published works. For the estimates of the time of expansion (\hat{t}) populations have been grouped according to the geographical areas identified by Li *et al.*, 2008 (Figure 1). Estimates for expansion time (Table 1) are comparable with estimates from other studies using Bayesian statistics: 18000 (7000-41000) years in Pritchard *et al.*, 1999; 7400 (4300-14000) years in Wilson *et al.*, 2003. The differences among regions cannot be considered significant as their confidence intervals largely overlap.

Table 1

Group	# individuals	# populations	\hat{t} (95%CI)	\hat{t} years (95%CI) ^a
Sub-Saharan-Africa	1183	23	12.53 (1.29-26.18)	17612 (2672-36811)
N-Africa	694	13	13.69 (0.10-24.51)	19247 (441-34463)
Europe	2150	14	9.40 (5.00-12.81)	13213 (7030-18012)
East-Asia	2621	16	11.51 (8.18-15.75)	16182 (11502-22146)
Oceania	293	7	12.04 (6.76-17.45)	16924 (9505-23552)
America	422	8	8.70 (5.10-15.42)	12231 (7171-21682)
World ^b	9182	94	12.85 (9.25-14.41)	18061 (13006-20262)

^a Includes samples not classified in previous groups

^b mutation rate per generation over the five loci, $\mu = 0.89 \times 10^{-2}$ (www.ystr.org); generation time: 25 years




Figure 3

Table 2

Island	# individuals	\hat{t} (90%CI)	\hat{t} MYA (90%CI) ^a	geological age	weevil colonization ^b
Gran Canaria	145	1.98 (1.22-2.30)	1.65 (1.02-1.92)	5.5-3 MYA ^b	>2.56 MYA
Tenerife	280	3.11 (1.69-7.14)	2.60 (1.41-5.95)	3.5-0.2 MYA ^b	1.89-2.56 MYA
La Palma	48	0.49 (0.14-0.99)	0.41 (0.11-0.83)	2 MYA	1.58-2.00 MYA
El Hierro	24	1.61 (0.60-2.55)	1.34 (0.50-2.13)	1 MYA	1.00 MYA

^a mutation rate per year and locus, $\mu = 10^{-5}$ (Provan *et al.*, 2000)

^b Juan *et al.*, 2000

^c Emerson *et al.*, 2000

Figure 4

Canary Island pine populations (Figure 4) have been analysed with six microsatellite loci (Pt15169, Pt30204, Pt71936, Pt87268, Pt26081 and Pt36480). Expansion time estimates (Table 2) are consistent with the geological history of the archipelago and have the same order of magnitude than the estimated colonization time of *Brachyderes rugatus* (specific parasite weevil of the Canary Island pine).

REFERENCES

Schneider & Excoffier 1999. *Genetics* 152: 1079-1089; Li et al. 2008. *Science* 319: 1100-1104; Pritchard et al. 1999. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 16(12): 1791-1798; Wilson et al. 2003. *J. R. Statist. Soc. A.* 166: 155-201; Provan et al. 1999. *Genetics* 153: 943-947; Juan et al. 2000. *TREE* 15: 104-109; Emerson et al. 2000. *Evolution* 54: 911-923.

Source of Human data

Alexander et al. 2005. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 150(2): 126-133
 Anwar et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 170(2): 290-295
 Ayala et al. 2008. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 184(2-3): 249-253
 Banaś et al. 2003. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 138(1-3): 127-133
 Bonner et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 168(2-3): 414-419
 Bosted et al. 2004. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 152(2): 208-222
 Blanco-Casado et al. 2003. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 138(2-3): 247-250
 Caporaso et al. 2003. *Hum. Biol.* 75(2): 209-222
 Cavalli-Sforza et al. 2003. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 134(1): 29-35
 Chagnac et al. 2002. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 130(1): 70-76
 Chertk et al. 2005. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 152(1): 95-99
 Cizek et al. 2004. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 18(2): 67-67
 Debernardi et al. 2004. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 21(9): 1673-1682

Source of Canary Island pine data

Cizek et al. 2004. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 18(2): 67-67
 Debernardi et al. 2004. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 21(9): 1673-1682
 Figli et al. 2006. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 160(1): 80-81
 Foster et al. 1998. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 15(10): 1114
 Garcia et al. 2004. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 145(1): 65-68
 Hu 2006. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 158(1): 85-85
 Kasper et al. 2001. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 68(4): 890-918
 Khoshdel et al. 2005. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 149(2-3): 211-216
 Kung'u et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 171(1): 78
 Lauer et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 168(2-3): 154-161
 Liang et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 172(1): 213-215
 Liang et al. 2008. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 159(1): 71-78
 Litalien et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 172(1): 213-215
 Park et al. 2005. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 152(2): 133-147
 Pavoni et al. 2005. *Ann. Hum. Genet.* 69: 389-398
 Quintana-Murci et al. 2004. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 140(1): 113-115

Source of

Rosset et al. 2007. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7(1): 124
 Subramanian et al. 2007. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 168(1): 47
 Soudani et al. 2006. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 158(2): 203-203
 Tenevski et al. 2001. *Am. Hum. Genet.* 68(2): 271-283
 Vassilov et al. 2009. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 178(2-3): 252-258
 Xirri et al. 2008. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 178(2-3): 244-248
 Zhang et al. 2008. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 178(2-3): 244-248
 Zhu et al. 2005. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 153: 205-205

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Olivier Hardy and Frantz Depaulis for useful discussions and suggestions. C.B. has been funded by a postdoctoral grant of the Mairie de Paris and M.N. by a ESF ConGen Exchange Grant 1142.