# Wildlife friendly agriculture: which factors do really matter? genetic study on the

Chiara Marchi<sup>1,2</sup>, Liselotte W. Andersen<sup>2</sup>, Christian F. Damgaard<sup>3</sup>, Kent Olsen<sup>4</sup>, Thomas S. Jensen<sup>4</sup> & Volker Loeschcke

Ecology and Genetics, Department of Biological Sciences, Aarhus University Ny Munkegade 114, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark <sup>2</sup>Department of Wildlife Ecology and Biodiversity, National Environmental Research Institute Aarhus University, Grenåvej 14, DK-8410 Rønde, Denmark Department of Terrestrial Ecology, National Environmental Research Institute Vejlsøvej 25, 8600 Silkeborg, Denmark <sup>4</sup>Natural History Museum, Universitetsparken 210, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

# Introduction

The impact of landscape structure and land management on the dispersal of populations of wild species inhabiting the agricultural landscape was investigated by determining the genetic diversity and gene flow of field vole (Microtus agrestis) in three different areas. The main hypotheses were: I) organic farms act as genetic sources and diversity reservoirs for species living in agricultural areas, II) gene flow and genetic structuring in the agricultural landscape are influenced by the degree of landscape complexity and connectivity and III) the effective population sizes of the populations are determined by the available habitat.

It is well known that organic farming generally improves the biodiversity and abundance of species in the agricultural landscape (Hole et al., 2005). However, it has recently been shown that the benefits of organic farming are evident only at the landscape scale Gabriel et al., 2010). Thus, to protect species living in the agricultural environment it is of extreme importance to investigate which landscape factors control their distribution and movements.

## Landscape factors

The following landscape factors were determined for each sampling site:sampling site size; size of the undisturbed area within the sampling site; sampling site perimeter ("Perimeter"); core area perimeter ("Core Perimeter"); management (conventional or organic, "Management"); percentage of perimeter usable for dispersal (defined as the percentage of perimeter free from roads and water bodies, "% free perimeter"); connectivity index between sampling sites ("Connectivity"); permeability index ("Permeability") and side of the road ("Road"). Each factor was tested against the pattern of gene flow and genetic differentiation.



### **Results**

The analysis of genetic structure performed with GENELAND (Figure 1) showed a higher degree of sub-structuring in the agricultural areas (five and four clusters in the two agricultural areas compared to only one cluster for the undisturbed area). The results by STRUCTURE analysis yield a lower number of clusters (Figure 2), but nonetheless showing a higher number of clusters in the agricultural areas. The analysis of landscape factors affecting genetic differentiation and gene flow showed no clear effect of management, instead the prevailing effect was due to landscape factors given in Table 1. The population size was influenced mainly by the size of un-disturbed habitat (Figure 3), but this tendency should be further investigated.

us al

# Conclusion

The distribution of genetic differentiation and the directions of gene flow were determined mainly by landscape factors: thus the expectation that organic fields act as genetic reservoir was not met. The fact that agricultural area presented more sub-populations than the undisturbed one, together with the importance of connectivity and habitat size in shaping gene flow and genetic differentiation, shows that switching to organic farming might not be enough to ensure the conservation of species in the agricultural environment. These results emphasise the need to include landscape structure in management policies.



160000 Factors affecting: 120000 Gene flow Habitat size  $R^2 = 0.6297$ Distance 80000. Genetic Distance Management differentiation 40000 Connectivity Size of Effective Size of undisturbed population size 0 habitat Table 1: Test of the relationship between -40000 gene flow/genetic diversity and landscape 200 400 600 800 factors using BIMr (Faubet and Gaggiotti, Ne 2008) and a simple Mantel test, respectively. The effective population size was Figure 3: Correlation between estimated effective population size and undisturbed

Figure 1: Sampling locations for the field vole (*Microtus agrestis*), samples were collected in year 2007 and 2008. Clusters based on GENELAND (50,000/200,000 iterations, max K = 8, coordinates as priors; Guillot et al., 2005) analyses are shown: each circle represents a genetic cluster, orange = the cluster showing conventional fields, green= the cluster showing organic fields

#### Acknowledgements

This is a part of a PhD project that is funded by the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries under the Finance and Appropriation Act, Sections 24.33.02.10 and by AGSoS (Aarhus Graduate School of Science).

calculated using LDNe (Waples and Do 2008) and the correlation with habitat and un-disturbed habitat size was investigated.

References

agricultural areas).

habitat size (for each sampling site in the

Faubet, P., Waples, R.S. & Gaggiotti, O.E. (2007): Eva logy 16, 114 iabriel, D., Sait, S.M., Hodgson, J.A., Schmutz, U., Kunin, W.E. & Benton, T.G. (2010): Scale matters: he impact of organic farming on iodi ettlers. Doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01481.X.

G., Mortier, F. & Estoup, A. (2005): Geneland: a computer package for landscape genetics. – Molecular Ecology Notes 5, 712–715 Hole, D.G., Perkins, A.J., Wilson, J.D., Alexander, I.H., Grice, P.V. & Evans, A.D. (2005): Does organic farming benefit biodiversity2 – Biological Co Pritchard, I.K., Stephens, M. & Donnelly, P. (2000): Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data. – Genetics 155, 945–959 Biological Con tes, R.S. & Do, C. (2008): LDNE: A program for estimating effective population size from data on linkage disequilibrium - Moecular Ecology Notes 8, 753-756.