

ResearchOnline@JCU

This file is part of the following reference:

Peck, Darren Rodney (2006) *Local adaptation in the wedge-tailed shearwater (Puffinus pacificus)*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/1348/>

If you believe that this work constitutes a copyright infringement, please contact ResearchOnline@jcu.edu.au and quote <http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/1348/>

Local adaptation in the wedge-tailed shearwater
(*Puffinus pacificus*).

Thesis submitted by

Darren Rodney PECK BSc (Hons) J.C.U.

in January 2006

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Tropical Biology
James Cook University

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and;

I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

Signature

Date

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education.

Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

Signature

Date

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have completed this work without the patience, love, blood, sweat and tears of my wife [REDACTED]. To her I am forever grateful. Thanks [REDACTED]. My parents and sister supported and encouraged me throughout the project making the periods when motivation was low, easier to get through. To them I will always be indebted. A number of friends also encouraged and supported me especially Nilla, Michael, Will, Brett, Anthony, Melinda, Sallam and Jacki.

This research involved a lot of fieldwork and therefore required logistical support from a range of organisations and people. In this regard, I would like to sincerely thank the following people and institutions: Lord Howe Island; Terry Wilson, Sean Thompson, Ian Hutton, Dean Wilcox and the Lord Howe Island Board. Heron Island; all the staff of the Heron Island Research Station, and Carol Erwin (J.C.U.). Raine Island; the crew of the QPWS research vessel Kerra Lyn, and the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service Cairns.

Thanks also to Janice Lough (A.I.M.S) for providing SST data, and Dr Eric Van der Werf (U.S. Fish and Wildlife) for Hawaiian wedge-tailed shearwater tissue samples. Thank you to Gary Werren and Dr Jill Landsberg; both graciously took the time to read through manuscripts and provide comments.

Lynne Jones, Matt Pye, Pramana Yuda and Mark Harrington (molecular biology lab) all offered help in the form of past experiences and information that made my journey through the 'molecular jungle' easier.

Dr Andrew Krockenberger (my co-supervisor) always had the time to discuss ideas with me. Thanks Andrew for your time and the inevitable good humour that came with it.

Finally, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Dr Brad Congdon. Brad, your enthusiasm, integrity, patience and kind nature constantly inspired me both academically and personally throughout my candidature. I thank you for that.



“I may not have gone where I intended to go, but I think I have ended up where I needed to be.”

Douglas Adams
(1952 - 2001)

| | |
|--|-----------|
| LIST OF TABLES | 10 |
| LIST OF FIGURES | 11 |
| PAPERS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS..... | 13 |
| SUMMARY | 14 |
| CHAPTER 1 | 17 |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 17 |
| 1.1 <i>Non-allopatric speciation</i> | 18 |
| 1.1.1 Conditions that favour non-allopatric speciation | 18 |
| 1.1.2 Models of non-allopatric of speciation | 19 |
| 1.1.3 Bushs' Model..... | 19 |
| 1.1.4 Empirical evidence for non-allopatric divergence | 20 |
| 1.2 <i>Divergence in pelagic seabirds</i> | 21 |
| 1.3 <i>Thesis structure and aims</i> | 21 |
| CHAPTER 2 | 24 |
| 2.0 GENERAL METHODS..... | 24 |
| 2.1 <i>Study locations and experimental design</i> | 24 |
| 2.2 <i>Study species</i> | 25 |
| 2.3 <i>Laboratory Methods and Materials</i> | 25 |
| 2.3.1 Sample Collection..... | 25 |
| 2.3.2 DNA Extraction | 26 |
| 2.3.3 Population Genetic Markers and Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) | 26 |
| 2.3.3.1 Mitochondrial control region | 27 |
| 2.3.3.2 Microsatellites | 28 |
| 2.3.3.3 Introns..... | 30 |
| 2.3.3.3.1 Intron sequencing..... | 31 |
| 2.3.3.3.2 Intron allele assignment | 32 |
| 2.3.4 Molecular sexing | 32 |
| 2.3.5 Statistical Analysis | 33 |
| 2.3.5.1 Tests of assumptions..... | 33 |
| 2.3.5.2 Population genetic structure..... | 35 |
| 2.3.5.3 Isolation by distance | 36 |
| CHAPTER 3 | 38 |
| 3.0 INTRODUCTION | 38 |
| 3.1 <i>METHODS</i> | 40 |
| 3.1.1 Study sites..... | 40 |
| 3.1.2 Sensitivity to SST | 40 |
| 3.1.3 Primary productivity: Heron Island vs. Lord Howe Island..... | 40 |
| 3.1.4 Foraging behaviour and chick growth: Heron Is. vs. Lord Howe Is..... | 41 |
| 3.1.5 Data collection and statistical analyses: Raine Is..... | 43 |
| 3.2 RESULTS..... | 44 |
| 3.2.1 Sensitivity to SST | 44 |
| 3.2.2 Primary productivity: Heron Is. vs. Lord Howe Is. | 45 |
| 3.2.3 Foraging behaviour: Heron Is. vs. Lord Howe Is. | 46 |
| 3.2.4 Foraging behaviour during incubation: Raine Is..... | 51 |
| 3.3 DISCUSSION..... | 53 |
| 3.3.1 SST sensitivity and Primary productivity | 53 |
| 3.3.2 Divergent foraging strategies..... | 54 |
| 3.3.3 Chick growth and local adaptation | 54 |
| 3.3.4 Foraging behaviour: Raine Is..... | 56 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 59 |
| 4.0 INTRODUCTION | 59 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.1 METHODS..... | 61 |
| 4.1.2 Statistical analysis..... | 62 |
| 4.2 RESULTS..... | 63 |
| 4.2.1 Sex-specific foraging patterns and dive-depths..... | 63 |
| 4.2.2 Sex-specific food provisioning, nest attendance and foraging efficiency..... | 66 |
| 4.3 DISCUSSION..... | 68 |
| 4.3.1 Population differences in sex-specific foraging/provisioning behaviour..... | 70 |
| CHAPTER 5..... | 72 |
| 5.0 INTRODUCTION..... | 72 |
| 5.1 METHODS..... | 74 |
| 5.1.1 Study sites..... | 74 |
| 5.1.2 Data collection..... | 74 |
| 5.1.3 Statistical analysis..... | 75 |
| 5.2 RESULTS..... | 76 |
| 5.2.1 Sexual and geographic variation in morphology..... | 76 |
| 5.2.2 Relative differences between populations..... | 83 |
| 5.2.2.1 Relative wing length..... | 83 |
| 5.2.2.2 Relative tail length..... | 83 |
| 5.2.2.3 Relative culmen length..... | 83 |
| 5.2.2.4 Relative bill depth..... | 83 |
| 5.2.2.5 Relative bill width..... | 84 |
| 5.2.3 Multivariate analyses..... | 87 |
| 5.2.4 Differences in the degree of SSD among populations..... | 89 |
| 5.2.5 Assortative mating..... | 91 |
| 5.2.6 Heritability estimates..... | 92 |
| 5.3 DISCUSSION..... | 93 |
| 5.3.1 Variation in body size (CV1 and tarsus)..... | 93 |
| 5.3.2 Variation wing and tail..... | 95 |
| 5.3.3 Variation in culmen..... | 96 |
| 5.3.4 Sexual selection and variation in SSD..... | 97 |
| 5.3.5 Conclusions: Morphological variation..... | 100 |
| CHAPTER 6..... | 101 |
| 6.0 INTRODUCTION..... | 101 |
| 6.1 METHODS..... | 102 |
| 6.1.1 Study sites..... | 102 |
| 6.1.2 Genetic population structure..... | 102 |
| 6.1.3 Morphological and genetic divergence..... | 102 |
| 6.1.4 Matrix correlations..... | 103 |
| 6.2 RESULTS..... | 104 |
| 6.2.1 Patterns of Variation: Introns..... | 104 |
| 6.2.2 Tests of Assumptions..... | 108 |
| 6.2.3 Population Genetic Structure..... | 113 |
| 6.2.3.1 Phylogenetic analyses..... | 113 |
| 6.2.3.2 Analysis of molecular variance..... | 113 |
| 6.2.4 Patterns of variation: Microsatellites..... | 115 |
| 6.2.5 Combined Analyses: Introns + Microsatellites..... | 117 |
| 6.2.6 Relationships between morphology, environment, genetics and distance..... | 119 |
| 6.3 DISCUSSION..... | 123 |
| 6.3.1 Reconciling morphological divergence and patterns of gene flow..... | 124 |
| 6.3.2 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS..... | 125 |
| REFERENCES..... | 128 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1. Empirical studies of taxa where dispersal ability and/or behavioural characteristics make non-allopatric divergence possible..... | 23 |
| Table 2. Data collected during the course of this project..... | 25 |
| Table 3. Primer trials for wedge-tailed shearwaters..... | 29 |
| Table 4. Foraging and provisioning parameters of wedge-tailed shearwaters breeding at two locations in eastern Australian waters (mean \pm SE). Significant pairwise comparisons are indicated..... | 58 |
| Table 5. Differences in sex-specific patterns of foraging and provisioning behaviour in wedge-tailed shearwaters breeding at Heron and Lord Howe Islands..... | 64 |
| Table 6. Results from two-factor ANCOVA examining the impact of chick condition on adult foraging/provisioning at Heron Island (two years) and Lord Howe Island... | 67 |
| Table 7. Results from a 2-factor ANOVA examining morphological differentiation among four wedge-tailed shearwater colonies..... | 78 |
| Table 8. Means and CV values for morphological traits in wedge-tailed shearwaters from four breeding colonies..... | 79 |
| Table 9. Geographic variation in sexual dimorphism for individual morphometric characters of wedge-tailed shearwaters. Positive values represent a male bias and negative values equate to a female bias in sexual dimorphism. | 89 |
| Table 10. Slope and constant obtained by reduced major axis (RMA) regression of bill traits versus tarsus in wedge-tailed shearwaters. None of the slopes deviated significantly from the expected value under isometry (1/3) in either sex..... | 90 |
| Table 11. Correlation coefficients and significance levels among measurements of forty-five known pairs of wedge-tailed shearwater breeding at Heron Island (n = 25) and Lord Howe Island (n=20)..... | 92 |
| Table 12. Neutrality and diversity indices for the three Introns used in this study. Significant values ($P < 0.05$) are in bold..... | 109 |
| Table 13. AMOVA results for three intron loci across five wedge-tailed shearwater populations. <i>P</i> - value is based on 5000 permutations..... | 114 |
| Table 14. Matrix of pairwise comparisons of Φ_{ST} (upper figure) and <i>p</i> values (lower figure)(Wright 1978) for five wedge-tailed shearwater populations. Asterisks indicate significant comparisons at $p = < 0.05$ | 114 |
| Table 15. Estimates of the number of alleles per locus (<i>N_a</i>), private alleles (<i>PA</i>) and the expected (<i>H_E</i>) and observed (<i>H_O</i>) heterozygosities for three microsatellite loci from wedge-tailed shearwaters. | 115 |
| Table 16. AMOVA results from three microsatellite loci across four wedge-tailed shearwater populations. <i>p</i> - value is based on 5000 permutations..... | 116 |
| Table 17. AMOVA results from all six loci across four wedge-tailed shearwater populations. <i>p</i> - value is based on 5000 permutations. | 117 |
| Table 18. Maximum likelihood estimates and approximate 95% confidence intervals (parentheses) for migration rates calculated with MIGRATE from introns (normal font) and microsatellites (bold font) across four populations of wedge-tailed shearwater (Hawaiian samples omitted because microsatellite data was unavailable. | 118 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|--|----|
| Fig. 1. Map showing the location of wedge-tailed shearwater breeding colonies sampled in this study. A small number of samples for genetic analyses were also obtained from Hawaii (Oahu)(not shown). | 37 |
| Fig. 2. Relative change in wedge-tailed shearwater chick mass (g) in relation to sea surface temperature (SST °C) from Heron Island (○) and Lord Howe Island (●). The solid line represents the regression line for Heron Island chicks and the dashed line that for Lord Howe Island chicks..... | 45 |
| Fig. 3. Variation among years (mean ± SE) in chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration at Heron Island, southern Great Barrier Reef (unshaded) and Lord Howe Island, south-west Pacific Ocean (shaded). | 46 |
| Fig. 4. Mean (± 2 SE) proportion of time spent on foraging trips of different lengths by individual wedge-tailed shearwaters at (a) Heron Island and (b) Lord Howe Island. Different letters indicate means that are significantly different..... | 47 |
| Fig. 5. Relative change in wedge-tailed shearwater chick mass (g) in relation to meal mass (g) (a) and relative change in chick tarsus (mm) in relation to meal mass (g) (b) from Heron Island (○) and Lord Howe Island (●). The solid line represents the regression line for Heron Island chicks and the dashed line that for Lord Howe Island chicks. | 50 |
| Fig. 6. Foraging trip length frequency distribution of wedge-tailed shearwaters during the incubation/burrow prospecting period at Raine Island 2002. | 51 |
| Fig. 7. Minimum assimilate food (g) in relation to foraging trip length (days) for wedge-tailed shearwaters at Raine Island during the prospecting period (2001/2002). | 52 |
| Fig. 8. Maximum dive depths during foraging bouts of male and female wedge-tailed shearwaters during the chick-rearing period at Heron Island during 2005 (a) and at Lord Howe Island during 2004 (b). | 65 |
| Fig. 9. Geographic variation in mean morphometric characters, and in the extent of sexual dimorphism among four breeding colonies of wedge-tailed shearwater; (a) tarsus, (b) wing, (c) tail, (d) culmen..... | 81 |
| Fig. 10. Geographic variation in; (a) mean bill depth and (b), mean bill width, and in the extent of sexual dimorphism among three breeding colonies of wedge-tailed shearwater. | 82 |
| Fig. 11. Geographic variation in morphology relative to body size (tarsus), and in the extent of sexual dimorphism among wedge-tailed shearwater breeding colonies; (a) wing, (b) tail, (c) culmen, (d) bill depth, (e) bill width..... | 86 |
| Fig. 12. Discriminant functions analysis of wedge-tailed shearwater morphology. (a) Loadings for four morphological variables. (b) Mean discriminant function scores (± SE)..... | 88 |
| Fig. 13. Bill-width of males plotted against that of females in known pairs of wedge-tailed shearwater breeding at Heron Island (open circles) and Lord Howe Island (filled circles)..... | 91 |
| Fig. 14. The relationship between skeletal body size (tarsus) of offspring and parents among wedge-tailed shearwaters breeding at Lord Howe Island in 2004. The relationship was still significant after the removal of the upper right outlier (Outlier removed; $h^2 = 0.41$, $F_{1,8} = 7.43$, $p = 0.02$)..... | 92 |
| Fig. 15. Median joining networks for (a) Gapd, (b) Lamin and (c) Adolase in wedge-tailed shearwaters sampled across five populations. The size of each haplotype is proportional to its frequency (Table.). Dotted lines represent potential homoplasies | |

and dots represent median vectors, which are extant un-sampled haplotypes or extinct ancestral haplotypes (Bandelt et al. 1999). 106

Fig. 16. Base changes (and positions) for the three intron loci sequenced from wedge-tailed shearwaters. Positions are numbered relative to those in Congdon et al. (2000). 108

Fig. 17. Pairwise mutation differences in wedge-tailed shearwaters (dashed line) and expectation (solid line) under a population expansion in three introns; Gapd (a), Lamin (b) and Aldolase (c). 111

Fig.18. Pairwise mutation differences in wedge-tailed shearwaters (dashed line) and expectation (solid line) for a stable population (equilibrium) in three introns; Gapd (a), Lamin (b) and Aldolase (c). 112

Fig. 19. Distance tree (UPGMA) based on pairwise modified coancestry coefficients (Reynolds et al. 1983) among wedge-tailed shearwater populations showing relative genetic distances. All bootstrap values were >80% except for the Raine Is. Vs. Heron Is. node. 113

Fig. 20. Principal coordinate analysis of three microsatellite loci from wedge-tailed shearwaters. Coordinate 1 accounted for 83.38% of the total inertia. 116

Fig. 21. Pairwise comparisons of logarithm gene flow (M) versus logarithm geographic distance between pairs of wedge-tailed shearwater colonies using (a) introns and (b) microsatellites. The outlier (open circle) to the null model is the Lord Howe Island vs. Heron Island comparison. When this outlier is removed, the isolation by distance analysis is significant in both cases. 120

Fig. 22. Pairwise gene flow (M) estimates versus morphological distance (Mahalanobis D2) using (a) introns and (b) microsatellites among four wedge-tailed shearwater populations. 121

Fig. 23. Pairwise gene flow (M) estimates versus pairwise differences in SST (o C) among wedge-tailed shearwater populations. SST relationships are presented for both (a) intron and (b) microsatellite estimates of M. 122

PAPERS ARISING FROM THIS THESIS

Chapter 3

Peck, D. R., Smithers, B. V., Krockenberger, A. K. & Congdon, B. C. (2004) Sea-surface temperature constrains wedge-tailed shearwater foraging success within breeding seasons *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 281, 259-266.

Peck, D. R. & Congdon, B. C. (2005) Colony-specific foraging behaviour and co-ordinated divergence of chick development in the wedge-tailed shearwater *Puffinus pacificus* *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 299, 289-296.

Chapter 4

Peck, D. R. & Congdon, B. C. (2006) Sex-specific chick provisioning and diving behaviour in the wedge-tailed shearwater *Journal of Avian Biology* 37, 1-7.

Chapter 5

Peck, D. R., Bancroft, W. & Congdon, B. C. (in review) Disassortative mate choice, bill morphology and sexual dimorphism in wedge-tailed shearwaters (*Puffinus pacificus*)

Chapter 6

Peck, D. R., Bancroft, W. & Congdon, B. C. (in review) Morphological and molecular variation within an ocean basin in wedge-tailed shearwaters (*Puffinus pacificus*).

SUMMARY

Models of speciation that involve adaptation to local environmental conditions rather than physical barriers have rarely been examined in vertebrate taxa. Seabirds offer a unique opportunity to test such models because they have the potential to disperse widely. This means that large-scale geographical barriers to gene flow are less likely. In addition, breeding colonies are constrained to forage locally, thus promoting the optimisation of life history and fitness-related morphological traits among colonies. Ultimately, these changes may lead to a reduction in gene flow and genetic divergence may ensue: the first step towards speciation. To explore adaptive models of speciation, the role of local foraging conditions in promoting molecular, morphological (including physiological) and behavioural divergence among breeding colonies of the wedge-tailed shearwater (*Puffinus pacificus*) was examined.

To this end levels of variation in morphology and neutral genetic markers were measured among four spatially disjunct breeding colonies located in Australian waters (Rottnest Island, Raine Island, Heron Island and Lord Howe Island). In addition, data on foraging behaviour, chick developmental patterns and sensitivity to background environmental conditions (sea surface temperature) were obtained from two of these colonies representing climatic and oceanographic extremes for this species: the subtropical ‘reef’ colony (Heron Island) and Lord Howe Island, a temperate ‘oceanic’ colony.

Results from the foraging behaviour and chick developmental component of this research suggests that wedge-tailed shearwaters are sensitive to fluctuations in sea surface temperature, and consistently use different foraging strategies during the chick rearing period in accordance with where they breed. Specifically, at Heron Island, birds use a ‘dual-foraging’ strategy involving alternative ‘short’ and ‘long’ trips. This strategy is consistent with adults self-provisioning from distant locations and chick-provisioning from near colony locations. However, at Lord Howe Island, a dual foraging strategy was not observed, suggestive of a more productive environment.

As an indirect result of divergent oceanographic regimes, chick developmental patterns between the two locations also differed; chicks at Lord Howe Island grow faster than those at Heron. However, when the differences in meal mass per night were accounted for, Heron Island chicks were consistently heavier than those at Lord Howe Island.

Overall, the foraging and chick development data suggest that; (1) chick developmental patterns and foraging behaviour are coordinated in wedge-tailed shearwaters, (2) the foraging environment experienced by wedge-tailed shearwaters at Heron Island is less productive than at Lord Howe Island and (3) chicks at Heron Island appear to 'store' mass as an adaptation to consistently poor provisioning rates (driven by poor foraging conditions experienced by adults). The chick developmental pattern is likely to be driven by an obligate rather than a facultative mechanism because it is doubtful chicks can react to changing provisioning rates over the (small) period of time that the response took place.

Within the general patterns of foraging, sex-specific differences were also evident. Females spent more time at sea resulting in a lower provisioning rate compared to males. The average maximum dive depth also differed according to sex, with males diving consistently deeper than females. The most parsimonious explanation for the differences is that competition has led to niche partitioning at the foraging grounds, although direct evidence will be required to substantiate this hypothesis. Subtle differences in the extent of sex-specific foraging between Heron Island and Lord Howe Island could promote a barrier to gene flow via reinforcement if inter-colony pairings result in lower provisioning to chicks. Again, further evidence will be required to test this idea.

Morphological analyses highlighted significant variation within (sex-specific) and among breeding colonies. A canonical discriminant functions analysis was conducted using four traits: wing, tarsus, culmen and tail. Discriminant function 1 (CV1) explained 57.46 % of the variation among groups and was correlated most strongly with tarsus (a measure of skeletal size) followed by tail. CV2 explained a further 38.30 % and was strongly correlated with culmen. In general, birds from Rottnest

Island are significantly larger in overall body size compared to east-coast colonies, however Raine Island birds have significantly longer culmens than elsewhere.

Within colonies males are subtly larger than females, but relative to overall size, only bill morphology was significantly larger. A novel form of mate choice (disassortative) based on bill width was also observed at both Heron and Lord Howe Islands. Patterns of morphological variation and pair formation do not fit with those expected if environmental conditions alone (i.e. plasticity) are responsible. Instead, the results suggest that morphological diversity is more likely to involve selection.

Finally, levels of gene flow were gauged and compared to morphological variation to determine if gene flow constrains morphological divergence among colonies. Three intron and three microsatellite loci were used. Gene flow estimates differed according to the type of marker. Introns suggest substantial inter-colony movement whereas microsatellites imply that gene flow is restricted. The different estimates reflect differences in the mutation rates of the two markers. Consequently, introns (evolving more slowly) likely reveal historical connections during the Pleistocene, with microsatellites representing more contemporary patterns. A lack of congruence between the amount of morphological and genetic differentiation suggests that genetic drift alone can not explain all of the observed morphological diversity in wedge-tailed shearwaters.

Taken together, the results from this study clearly suggest that oceanographic/environmental regimes have an important function in the development and maintenance of seabird diversity and can substantially influence the direction of micro-evolutionary change. This has important implications from a management perspective, as some colonies will need to be considered independently. Future work should focus on assessing the role of selection in causing the observed patterns by evaluating the relationship of behavioural, morphological and physiological (chick development) traits to fitness in alternative habitats.