

PeerJ

# Development and characterization of microsatellite loci for the haploid–diploid red seaweed *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*

Nicole M. Kollars<sup>1,5,\*</sup>, Stacy A. Krueger-Hadfield<sup>1,\*</sup>, James E. Byers<sup>2</sup>, Thomas W. Greig<sup>3</sup>, Allan E. Strand<sup>1</sup>, Florian Weinberger<sup>4</sup> and Erik E. Sotka<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Grice Marine Laboratory and the Department of Biology, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, USA

<sup>2</sup> Odum School of Ecology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

<sup>3</sup> Center for Coastal Environmental Health and Biomolecular Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Charleston, SC, USA

<sup>4</sup> Helmholtz-Zentrum für Ozeanforschung Kiel (GEOMAR), Kiel, Germany

<sup>5</sup> Current affiliation: Center for Population Biology, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

\* These authors contributed equally to this work.

## ABSTRACT

Microsatellite loci are popular molecular markers due to their resolution in distinguishing individual genotypes. However, they have rarely been used to explore the population dynamics in species with biphasic life cycles in which both haploid and diploid stages develop into independent, functional organisms. We developed microsatellite loci for the haploid–diploid red seaweed *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*, a widespread non-native species in coastal estuaries of the Northern hemisphere. Forty-two loci were screened for amplification and polymorphism. Nine of these loci were polymorphic across four populations of the extant range with two to eleven alleles observed. Mean observed and expected heterozygosities ranged from 0.265 to 0.527 and 0.317 to 0.387, respectively. Overall, these markers will aid in the study of the invasive history of this seaweed and further studies on the population dynamics of this important haploid–diploid primary producer.

**Subjects** Ecology, Evolutionary Studies, Genetics, Marine Biology

**Keywords** Complex life cycles, Biological invasions, Seaweed, Microsatellites, Haploid-diploid, *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*

Submitted 6 May 2015

Accepted 16 July 2015

Published 11 August 2015

Corresponding author

Erik E. Sotka, [sotkae@cofc.edu](mailto:sotkae@cofc.edu)

Academic editor

Rita Castilho

Additional Information and  
Declarations can be found on  
page 7

DOI [10.7717/peerj.1159](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1159)

© Copyright  
2015 Kollars et al.

Distributed under  
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

**OPEN ACCESS**

## INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, genetic approaches to answering evolutionary and ecological questions have become less expensive and more easily applied to non-model species (*Allendorf, Hohenlohe & Luikart, 2010; Guichoux et al., 2011*). Microsatellites, or tandem repeats of two to six nucleotides, are popular molecular markers due to their resolution in distinguishing individual genotypes (*Selkoe & Toonen, 2006*) and their ability to describe patterns of population connectivity across landscapes (*Manel et al., 2003*) and seascapes (*Galindo, Olson & Palumbi, 2006*). Much of the literature focuses on organisms with single free-living diploid stages (i.e., animals and higher plants). Yet, there are many species with both

**Table 1** Studies in which both the haploid and diploid stages of seaweeds and mosses were investigated to reveal patterns in genetic structure and mating system.

	Phylum	Species	Marker	Type of study
<i>Sosa et al. (1998)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Gelidium arbuscula</i>	Isozymes	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Sosa et al. (1998)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Gelidium canariensis</i>	Isozymes	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Engel et al. (1999)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Gracilaria gracilis</i>	Microsatellites	Paternity analyses and dispersal
<i>van der Velde et al. (2001)</i>	Bryophyta	<i>Polytrichum formosum</i>	Microsatellites	Paternity analyses and dispersal
<i>van der Strate et al. (2002)</i>	Chlorophyta	<i>Cladophoropsis membranacea</i>	Microsatellites	Shorescape structure and mating system
<i>Engel, Destombe &amp; Valero (2004)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Gracilaria gracilis</i>	Microsatellites	Shorescape structure and mating system
<i>Guillemin et al. (2008a)</i> and <i>Guillemin et al. (2008b)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Gracilaria chilensis</i>	Microsatellites	Genetic structure, mating system and comparisons between natural and farmed populations
<i>Szövényi, Ricca &amp; Shaw (2009)</i>	Bryophyta	<i>Sphagnum lescurii</i>	Microsatellites	Paternity analyses and dispersal
<i>Alström-Rapaport, Leskinen &amp; Pamilo (2010)</i>	Chlorophyta	<i>Ulva intestinalis</i>	Microsatellites	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Krueger-Hadfield et al. (2011)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Chondrus crispus</i>	Microsatellites	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Krueger-Hadfield et al. (2013)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Chondrus crispus</i>	Microsatellites	Shorescape structure and mating system
<i>Couceiro et al. (2015)</i>	Ochrophyta	<i>Ecotarpus crouaniorum</i>	Microsatellites	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Couceiro et al. (2015)</i>	Ochrophyta	<i>Ectocarpus siliculosus</i>	Microsatellites	Genetic structure and mating system
<i>Krueger-Hadfield et al. (2015)</i>	Rhodophyta	<i>Chondrus crispus</i>	Microsatellites	Paternity analyses and dispersal

haploid and diploid stages in the same life cycle in which both ploidies undergo somatic development and live as independent, functional organisms.

While theory predicts that selection should favor either diploidy or haploidy (*Mable & Otto, 1998*), *Hughes & Otto (1999)* demonstrated the maintenance of both haploid and diploid stages when the two stages occupy different ecological niches. However, there are relatively few empirical tests of these alternative hypotheses (but see *Destombe et al., 1992*; *Thornber & Gaines, 2004*; *Guillemin et al., 2013*), and for isomorphic species in which ploidy is not easily identified through morphological traits, molecular markers will be essential to advance research in this field. These same markers can additionally be used to understand connectivity and demographic history in haploid–diploid populations. Among marine haploid–diploid macroalgae, relatively few microsatellites have been developed to address any of these issues (but see [Table 1](#)).

Understanding the consequences of biphasic life cycles and land- or seascape features on population structure is particularly relevant in light of the increasing frequency of biological introductions. There are numerous examples of widespread, and putatively invasive species, that have free-living haploid and diploid stages, including macroalgae (e.g., *Asparagopsis* spp.; [Andreakis et al., 2007](#)), ferns (e.g., *Lygodium* spp.; [Lott et al., 2003](#)) and mosses (e.g., *Campylopus introflexus*; [Schirmel, Timler & Buchholz, 2010](#)). Macroalgae, or seaweeds, account for approximately 20% of the world's introduced marine species ([Andreakis & Schaffelke, 2012](#)) and a subset of these invasions are by species that are exploited in their native range, either for the phycocolloid industry or as food products ([Williams & Smith, 2007](#)).

The red seaweed *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* (Omhi) Papenfuss is native to the northwest Pacific and, in the last 30–40 years, has spread throughout high to medium salinity estuaries of the eastern North Pacific ([Saunders, 2009](#)), the western North Atlantic ([Byers et al., 2012](#)) and the eastern North Atlantic ([Weinberger et al., 2008](#); [Guillemin et al., 2008a](#)). *G. vermiculophylla* transforms the ecosystems into which it is introduced through negative impacts on native species (e.g., direct competition, [Hammann et al., 2013](#)), the addition of structural complexity to soft-bottom systems (e.g., [Nyberg, Thomsen & Wallentinus, 2009](#); [Wright et al., 2014](#)) and the alteration of community structure, species interactions and detrital pathways (e.g., [Byers et al., 2012](#)). Previous studies of the population genetics of *G. vermiculophylla* focused on the mitochondrial gene *cytochrome b oxidase I* ([Kim, Weinberger & Boo, 2010](#); [Gulbransen et al., 2012](#)), but mitochondrial genetics do not necessarily predict the population genetics of the nuclear genome and cannot assess patterns of ploidy and mating system. Thus, we developed nine polymorphic microsatellite loci for *G. vermiculophylla*.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A library of contigs for *G. vermiculophylla* was generated using the 454 next-generation sequencing platform (Cornell University Life Sciences Core Laboratory Center) from a single individual collected from Charleston, South Carolina, USA. For library preparation, DNA was extracted using CTAB ([Eichenberger, Gugerli & Schneller, 2000](#)) and library construction followed [Hamilton et al. \(1999\)](#). Dimeric to hexameric microsatellite repeats were identified with the program MSATCOMMANDER, ver 1.0.8 ([Faircloth, 2008](#)) and primers were designed using PRIMER 3 ([Rozen & Skalesty, 2000](#)) for contigs with at least four sequences present in the library. Bioinformatics of these sequences was facilitated by the APE package ([Paradis, Claude & Strimmer, 2004](#)) in R ([R Development Core Team, 2014](#)).

Total genomic DNA was isolated using 120  $\mu$ L of a 10% Chelex solution (BioRad Laboratories, Hercules, California, USA) in which approximately 1 cm of dried algal tissue was heated at 95 °C for 30 min and vortexed intermittently ([Walsh, Metzger & Higuchi, 1991](#)). Loci were amplified on a thermocycler (BioRad) as follows: 10  $\mu$ L final volume, 2  $\mu$ L of stock DNA template, 0.5 units of GoTAQ Flexi-DNA Polymerase (Promega, Madison, Wisconsin, USA), 1X buffer, 250  $\mu$ M of each dNTP, 1.5 nM of MgCl<sub>2</sub>,

**Table 2** Characteristics of nine polymorphic microsatellite loci developed for *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*. Acc. No., GenBank accession number; locus; motif; primer sequences; allele range; avg. error: TANDEM (Matschiner & Saltzburger, 2009) rounding errors for each microsatellite locus (the authors of TANDEM suggest that good loci have an average rounding error which is below 10% of the repeat size);  $N_{\text{tall}}$ , total number of alleles. All loci showed one-locus genetic determinism.

Locus	Acc. No.	Motif	Primer sequence	Allele range	Avg. Error	$N_{\text{tall}}$
Gverm_5276	KT232089	(AC) <sub>10</sub>	F: GGAGAGCAGCACGTTTTAGG R: CTGCTTAGTTCCACGATCGAC	282–316	0.14	11
Gverm_6311	KT232090	(AG) <sub>9</sub>	F: GCGTCATTCCACTGAATGTG R: GATGAACCTCAATGCCTCGT	203–223	0.17	6
Gverm_8036	KT232091	(AC) <sub>12</sub>	F: GCCCTTTTAAGGATGCAACA R: GGGGTAAACGACCACAGAGA	213–251	0.14	5
Gverm_3003	KT232092	(AG) <sub>11</sub>	F: CATCTTGCTTCCTTGCTTCC R: TTGAAAGCCGGAATTTATCG	198–230	0.11	4
Gverm_1203	KT232093	(AAG) <sub>8</sub>	F: CTCCTGGTGCACAAGCAATA R: ACATTCTGCGCACCTTTCTT	284–308	0.12	4
Gverm_1803	KT232094	(AC) <sub>11</sub>	F: GCGTGCACGATGTCTACACT R: GACAGCAACAAGTGGGGTTT	352–356	0.07	3
Gverm_804	KT232095	(AAG) <sub>8</sub>	F: TGTAGGATTGCTCTCTGGTG R: CAGGCTGGCCAAAATAACAT	182–188	0.16	3
Gverm_10367	KT232096	(AG) <sub>8</sub>	F: GCTGAGAAATGAAGCGAAGG R: GCAAACCTGCCTTGTTTGT	198–200	0.07	2
Gverm_2790	KT232097	(AATGC) <sub>5</sub>	F: GAACAATGCGGGAAAACATT R: GGAAGAGGCTCAAAAGCAGA	262–267	0.16	2

150 nM of fluorescently-labeled forward primer, 100 nM of unlabeled forward primer and 250 nM of unlabeled reverse primer. The PCR program included 2 min at 95 °C, 30 cycles of 30 s at 95 °C, 30 s at 55 °C and 30 s at 72 °C, and a final 5 min at 72 °C. One  $\mu\text{L}$  of each PCR product was added to 10  $\mu\text{L}$  of loading buffer containing 0.35  $\mu\text{L}$  of size standard (GeneScan500 Liz; Applied Biosystems, Foster City, California, USA). Samples were electrophoresed on an ABI 3130xL genetic analyzer equipped with 36 cm capillaries (Applied Biosystems). Alleles were scored manually using GENEMAPPER ver. 4 (Applied Biosystems) and allele sizes were binned with TANDEM ver. 1.08 software (Matschiner & Saltzburger, 2009; Krueger-Hadfield et al., 2013).

We screened a total of 42 primer pairs for amplification and polymorphism in *G. vermiculophylla* (Table 2, Table S1). For the amplifiable loci that also showed polymorphism (nine total, see “Results and Discussion”), we verified single locus genetic determinism (SGLD). Loci were in SGLD if known haploids produced a single allele and diploids produced either one or two alleles in their homozygous or heterozygous state, respectively. We verified SGLD in a subset of known haploid gametophytes ( $n = 28$ ) and diploid tetrasporophytes ( $n = 30$ ) collected at Elkhorn Slough, California, USA (Table 3, Fig. S1). Elkhorn Slough was the only population for which ploidy was determined by reproductive structures and for which we had known haploids and diploids for genotyping.

The frequency of null alleles was estimated in the haploid subpopulation from Elkhorn Slough as well as diploid tetrasporophytes for each of the four populations (Table 3). It is possible to calculate the null allele frequency directly in the haploids based on the

**Table 3** Location of the four populations used to test for polymorphism in newly characterized microsatellite loci in *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*. The region, range (native or non-native), latitude, longitude, sampling date, collector\* and ploidy determination (using reproductive phenology or microsatellite genotype) are provided.

Population	Region	Range	Latitude	Longitude	Date	Collector	Ploidy determination
Akkeshi, Japan	NW Pacific	Native	43.04774	144.9498	25 Aug 10, 31 Jul 12	NMK, KH, KM, AP, MS	Genotype
Elkhorn Slough California, USA	NE Pacific	Non-native	36.50447	-121.4513	3 Nov 13	SAKH, BFK, TDK, BH	Genotype, phenology
Fort Johnson SC, USA	NW Atlantic	Non-native	32.7513	-79.900	11 Dec 13	CEG	Genotype
Nordstrand, Germany	North Sea	Non-native	54.454571	8.874846	24 Mar 10	MH	Genotype

**Notes.**

Collector abbreviations: NMK, NM Kollars; KH, K Honda; KM, K Momota; AP, A Pansch; MS, M Sato; SAKH, SA Krueger-Hadfield; BFK, BF Krueger; TDK, TD Krueger; BH, B Hughes; CEG, CE Gerstenmaier; MH, M Hammann.

number of non-amplification events, after discounting technical errors. For diploid tetrasporophytes, we used a maximum likelihood estimator (ML-NullFreq; [Kalinowski & Taper, 2006](#)).

Next, we screened loci for short allele dominance ([Wattier et al., 1998](#)). The presence of short allele dominance is rarely tested during microsatellite development, even though it can result in artificial heterozygote deficiencies. In contrast to null alleles, primer binding is successful, but the larger allele is not amplified due to the preferential amplification of the smaller allele. [Wattier et al. \(1998\)](#) demonstrated an analytical method to detect short allele dominance using linear models. If a regression of allele-specific  $F_{is}$  (inbreeding coefficient) statistics on allele size reveals a significant negative slope, then short allele dominance may be expected. We determined three to four allele size classes per locus and performed linear regressions using the STATS package in R ([R Development Core Team, 2014](#)).

To provide preliminary assessment of the genotypic and genetic diversity one can gain from these loci, we genotyped diploid tetrasporophytes from one native and three non-native populations of *G. vermiculophylla* ([Table 3](#)). Diploids were identified based either on reproductive phenology (Elkhorn) or microsatellite genotype (after assuring SGLD) if at least one locus was heterozygous (Akkeshi, Fort Johnson and Nordstrand, [Table 3](#)).

We calculated expected allelic richness using rarefaction in order to account for differences in sample size (HP-Rare; [Kalinowski, 2005](#)). Observed ( $H_O$ ) and expected heterozygosities ( $H_E$ ) were calculated using GenAlEx, ver. 6.501 ([Peakall & Smouse, 2006](#); [Peakall & Smouse, 2012](#)). Tests for Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium and  $F$ -statistics were performed in FSTAT, ver. 2.9.3.2 ([Goudet, 1995](#)).  $F_{is}$  was calculated for each locus and over all loci according to [Weir & Cockerham \(1984\)](#) and significance (at the adjusted nominal level of 0.001) was tested by running 1,000 permutations of alleles among individuals within samples. We also tested for linkage disequilibrium in each population using GENEPOP, ver. 4.2.2 ([Rousset, 2008](#)), with 1,000 permutations followed by Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons ([Sokal & Rohlf, 1995](#)).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of the 42 loci screened, 16 did not amplify for *G. vermiculophylla* even after several PCR modifications (Table S1). Of the remaining 26 loci, four loci exhibited multi-peak profiles and were discarded from further use, 13 loci were considered monomorphic (Table S1), and nine loci showed polymorphism (Table 2). The nine polymorphic loci exhibited SLGD in which known haploids always exhibited one allele. The low number of polymorphic loci revealed from this screening process is consistent with previous efforts to develop microsatellite loci for some seaweeds (e.g., *Varlea-Álvarez et al., 2011*; *Arnaud-Haond et al., 2013*).

The frequency of null alleles was zero at all loci except Gverm\_1803 and Gverm\_2790 in which the frequencies were both 0.019 in the haploids at Elkhorn Slough (Table S2). The only evidence of null alleles in the diploids from Elkhorn Slough was at locus Gverm\_1803, with a maximum likelihood estimated frequency of 0.115. The discrepancy between the haploid and diploid estimates is likely due to assumptions underlying the maximum likelihood estimators implemented in software like HP-Rare (*Kalinowski, 2005*), such as random mating. *Krueger-Hadfield et al. (2013)* demonstrated a strong bias in the estimates of null allele frequency when using these maximum likelihood estimators in macroalgal populations that have undergone non-random mating. The higher frequencies of null alleles (0.115–0.207) in the Akkeshi diploid subpopulation were most likely driven by a violation of these assumptions as well, though empirical estimates in haploid subpopulations are warranted. Nevertheless, the low frequency of null alleles and lack of evidence for short-allele dominance (all regression  $p$ -values were  $>0.2$ , Table S3), suggest that observed heterozygote deficiencies using these loci will be due to the mating system or spatial substructuring (*Guillemin et al., 2008b*; *Krueger-Hadfield et al., 2011*; *Krueger-Hadfield et al., 2013*).

Previous studies have used microsatellite loci to distinguish among individual clones and to describe the genetic diversity and the mating systems of seaweed populations despite low levels of polymorphism (e.g., *Guillemin et al., 2008b*; *Arnaud-Haond et al., 2013*). In the current study, the nine polymorphic markers described genetic variability in four populations sampled across the extant distribution of *G. vermiculophylla*. Overall, there was little evidence for linkage disequilibrium after Bonferroni correction (Table S4). Additionally, allelic diversity was comparable among the one native and three non-native sites we sampled, but  $F_{is}$  varied considerably (summary in Table 4; per locus statistics in Table S5). Together, these results suggest that unique demographic and evolutionary processes could be operating between native and non-native ranges and within each population, but more detailed sampling is needed to address these patterns.

In summary, we have developed and characterized microsatellite markers for the haploid–diploid red seaweed *G. vermiculophylla*. These loci have the resolution to distinguish individual thalli and will aid studies on the invasive history of *G. vermiculophylla*, as well as the evolutionary ecology of rapidly spreading populations and mating system shifts in organisms that have biphasic life cycles with free-living haploid and diploid stages (i.e., macroalgae, ferns, mosses and some fungi).

**Table 4** Genetic features of four populations of *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*. These include: the sample size,  $N$ ; the diploid genotypic richness,  $N_A$ , + standard error (SE); mean allelic richness,  $A_E$ , based on the smallest sample size of 46 alleles (23 diploid individuals) + SE; mean observed heterozygosity,  $H_O$ , + SE; mean expected heterozygosity,  $H_E$ , + SE; inbreeding coefficient,  $F_{is}$ , multilocus and per locus estimates.

Statistics	Akkeshi	Elkhorn slough	Fort Johnson	Nordstrand
$N$	31	30	38	23
$N_A$	3.2 ± 0.5	2.2 ± 0.4	2.0 ± 0.2	1.9 ± 0.2
$A_E$	3.1 ± 0.4	2.2 ± 0.3	2.0 ± 0.2	1.9 ± 0.2
$H_O$	0.265 ± 0.060	0.311 ± 0.089	0.520 ± 0.110	0.527 ± 0.125
$H_E$	0.374 ± 0.079	0.317 ± 0.084	0.387 ± 0.077	0.352 ± 0.079
$F_{is}$	0.294*	0.017	-0.350*	-0.512*
<b><math>F_{is}</math> per locus</b>				
Gverm_5276	0.484*	0.120	-0.209	-0.492
Gverm_6311	0.435*	0.140	-0.267	-0.048
Gverm_8036	0.334	NA	-0.445*	-0.217
Gverm_3003	0.529	-0.121	-0.138	-0.553
Gverm_1203	-0.15	-0.206	-0.310	-0.508
Gverm_1803	0.569*	0.460	-0.696*	NA
Gverm_804	-0.278	-0.206	-0.310	-0.508
Gverm_10367	-0.017	NA	NA	NA
Gverm_2790	NA	NA	NA	-0.913*

**Notes.**

\*  $p < 0.001$ , adjusted nominal value.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to TM Bell, E Buchanan, CE Gerstenmaier, M Hammann, K Honda, B Hughes, BF Krueger, TD Krueger, K Momota, M Nakaoka, A Pansch, T Roth and M Sato for field and laboratory support.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

### Funding

This project was supported by NSF OCE-1057707 to JEB, OCE-1057713 to EES and OCE-1357386 to EES, SAKH and AES, as well as College of Charleston Graduate Research Grants, a Phycological Society of America Grants-in-Aid-of-Research Fellowship, and the Zostera Experimental Network Graduate Research Fellowship (NSF OCE-1031061 to JE Duffy) to NMK. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

### Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:

College of Charleston Graduate Research.

National Science Foundation: OCE-1057707, OCE-1057713, OCE-1357386.

Phycological Society of America Grants-in-Aid-of-Research Fellowship.

Zostera Experimental Network Graduate Research Fellowship: NSF OCE-1031061.

## Competing Interests

The scientific results and conclusions, as well as any opinions expressed herein, are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA or the Department of Commerce. The mention of any commercial product is not meant as an endorsement by the Agency or Department. We have no competing interest.

## Author Contributions

- Nicole M. Kollars conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables.
- Stacy A. Krueger-Hadfield performed the experiments, analyzed the data, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables.
- James E. Byers and Allan E. Strand conceived and designed the experiments, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Thomas W. Greig contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Florian Weinberger contributed samples and reviewed the paper.
- Erik E. Sotka conceived and designed the experiments, wrote the paper.

## DNA Deposition

The following information was supplied regarding the deposition of DNA sequences: GenBank accession numbers can be found in [Table 2](#).

## Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1159#supplemental-information>.

## REFERENCES

- Allendorf FW, Hohenlohe PA, Luikart G. 2010. Genomics and the future of conservation genetics. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 11:697–709 DOI 10.1038/nrg2844.
- Alström-Rapaport C, Leskinen E, Pamilo P. 2010. Seasonal variation in the mode of reproduction of *Ulva intestinalis* in a brackish water environment. *Aquatic Botany* 93:244–249 DOI 10.1016/j.aquabot.2010.08.003.
- Andreakis N, Procaccini G, Maggs C, Kooistra WHCF. 2007. Phylogeography of the invasive seaweed *Asparagopsis* (Bonnemaisoniales, Rhodophyta) reveals cryptic diversity. *Molecular Ecology* 16:2285–2299 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03306.x.
- Andreakis N, Schaffelke B. 2012. Invasive marine seaweeds: pest or prize? In: *Ecological studies*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 235–262.
- Arnaud-Haond S, Candeias R, Serrão EA, Teixeira SJL. 2013. Microsatellite markers developed through pyrosequencing allow clonal discrimination in the invasive alga *Caulerpa taxifolia*. *Conservation Genetics* 5:667–669 DOI 10.1007/s12686-013-9878-8.
- Byers JE, Gribben PE, Yeager C, Sotka EE. 2012. Impacts of an abundant introduced ecosystem engineer within mudflats of the southeastern US coast. *Biological Invasions* 149:2587–2600 DOI 10.1007/s10530-012-0254-5.



- Couceiro L, Le Gac M, Hunsperger HM, Mauger S, Destombe C, Cock JM, Ahmed S, Coelho SM, Valero M, Peters AF. 2015. Evolution and maintenance of haploid–diploid life cycles in natural populations: the case of the marine brown alga *Ecotocarpus*. *Evolution* **69**(7):1808–1822 DOI 10.1111/evo.12702.
- Destombe C, Godin J, Lefèvre CM, Dehorter O, Vernet P. 1992. Differences in dispersal abilities of haploid and diploid spores of *Gracilaria verrucosa* (Gracilariales, Rhodophyta). *Botanica Marina* **35**:93–98 DOI 10.1515/botm.1992.35.2.93.
- Eichenberger K, Gugerli F, Schneller JJ. 2000. Morphological and molecular diversity of Swiss common bean cultivars (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L., Fabaceae) and their origin. *Botanica Helvetica* **110**:61–77.
- Engel CR, Destombe C, Valero M. 2004. Mating system and gene flow in the red seaweed *Gracilaria gracilis*: effect of haploid–diploid life history and intertidal rocky shore landscape on fine-scale genetic structure. *Heredity* **92**:289–298 DOI 10.1038/sj.hdy.6800407.
- Engel CR, Wattier RA, Destombe C, Valero M. 1999. Performance of non-motile male gametes in the sea: analysis of paternity and fertilization success in a natural population of a red seaweed, *Gracilaria gracilis*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **266**:1879–1886 DOI 10.1098/rspb.1999.0861.
- Faircloth BC. 2008. MSATCOMMANDER: detection of microsatellite repeat arrays and automated, locus-specific primer design. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **8**:92–94 DOI 10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01884.x.
- Galindo HM, Olson DB, Palumbi SR. 2006. Seascape genetics: a coupled oceanographic-genetic model predicts population structure of Caribbean corals. *Current Biology* **16**:1622–1626 DOI 10.1016/j.cub.2006.06.052.
- Goudet J. 1995. FSTAT (version 1.2): a computer program to calculate F-Statistics. *Journal of Heredity* **86**:485–486.
- Guichoux E, Lagache L, Wagner S, Chaumeil P, Leger P, Lepais O, Lepoittevin C, Malausa T, Revardel E, Salin F, Petit RJ. 2011. Current trends in microsatellite genotyping. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **11**:591–611 DOI 10.1111/j.1755-0998.2011.03014.x.
- Guillemin ML, Akki SA, Givernaud T, Mouradi A, Valero M, Destombe C. 2008a. Molecular characterisation and development of rapid molecular methods to identify species of Gracilariaceae from the Atlantic coast of Morocco. *Aquatic Botany* **89**:324–330 DOI 10.1016/j.aquabot.2008.03.008.
- Guillemin ML, Faugeron S, Destombe C, Viard F, Correa JA, Valero M. 2008b. Genetic variation in wild and cultivated populations of the haploid–diploid red alga *Gracilaria chilensis*: how farming practices favor asexual reproduction and heterozygosity. *Evolution* **62**:1500–1519 DOI 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00373.x.
- Guillemin ML, Sepúlveda RD, Correa JA, Destombe C. 2013. Differential ecological responses to environmental stress in the life history phases of the isomorphic red alga *Gracilaria chilensis* (Rhodophyta). *Journal of Applied Phycology* **25**:215–224 DOI 10.1007/s10811-012-9855-8.
- Gulbransen DJ, McGlathery KJ, Marklund M, Norris JN, Gurgel CFD. 2012. *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* (Rhodophyta, Gracilariales) in the Virginia coastal bays, USA: COX1 analysis reveals high genetic richness of an introduced macroalga. *Journal of Phycology* **48**:1278–1283 DOI 10.1111/j.1529-8817.2012.01218.x.
- Hamilton MB, Pincus EL, Di-Fiore A, Fleischer RC. 1999. Universal linker and ligation procedures for construction of genomic DNA libraries enriched for microsatellites. *Biotechniques* **27**:500–507.
- Hammann M, Buchholz B, Karez R, Weinberger F. 2013. Direct and indirect effects of *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* on native *Fucus vesiculosus*. *Aquatic Invasions* **8**:121–132 DOI 10.3391/ai.2013.8.2.01.

- Hughes JS, Otto SP. 1999.** Ecology and the evolution of biphasic life cycles. *The American Naturalist* **154**:306–320 DOI [10.1086/303241](https://doi.org/10.1086/303241).
- Kalinowski ST. 2005.** HP-RARE 1.0: a computer program for performing rarefaction on measures of allelic richness. *Molecular Ecology Notes* **5**:187–189 DOI [10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00845.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2004.00845.x).
- Kalinowski ST, Taper ML. 2006.** Maximum likelihood estimation of the frequency of null alleles at microsatellite loci. *Conservation Genetics* **7**:991–995 DOI [10.1007/s10592-006-9134-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-006-9134-9).
- Kim SY, Weinberger F, Boo SM. 2010.** Genetic data hint at a common donor region for invasive Atlantic and Pacific populations of *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* (Gracilariales, Rhodophyta). *Journal of Phycology* **46**:1346–1349 DOI [10.1111/j.1529-8817.2010.00905.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-8817.2010.00905.x).
- Krueger-Hadfield SA, Collen J, Daguin-Thiébaud C, Valero M. 2011.** Genetic population structure and mating system in *Chondrus crispus* (Rhodophyta). *Journal of phycology* **47**:440–450 DOI [10.1111/j.1529-8817.2011.00995.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-8817.2011.00995.x).
- Krueger-Hadfield SA, Roze D, Correa JA, Destombe C, Valero M. 2015.** O father where art thou? Paternity analyses in a natural population of the haploid–diploid seaweed *Chondrus crispus*. *Heredity* **114**:185–194 DOI [10.1038/hdy.2014.82](https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2014.82).
- Krueger-Hadfield SA, Roze D, Mauger S, Valero M. 2013.** Intergametophytic selfing and microgeographic genetic structure shape populations of the intertidal red seaweed *Chondrus crispus*. *Molecular Ecology* **22**:3242–3260 DOI [10.1111/mec.12191](https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12191).
- Lott MS, Volin JC, Pemberton JM, Austin DF. 2003.** The reproductive biology of the invasive ferns *Lygodium microphyllum* and *L. japonicum* (Schizaeaceae): implications for invasive potential. *American Journal of Botany* **90**:1144–1152 DOI [10.3732/ajb.90.8.1144](https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.90.8.1144).
- Mable BK, Otto SP. 1998.** The evolution of life cycles with haploid and diploid phases. *BioEssays* **20**:453–462 DOI [10.1002/\(SICI\)1521-1878\(199806\)20:6<453::AID-BIES3>3.0.CO;2-N](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1521-1878(199806)20:6<453::AID-BIES3>3.0.CO;2-N).
- Manel S, Schwartz MK, Luikart G, Taberlet P. 2003.** Landscape genetics: combining landscape ecology and population genetics. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **18**:189–197 DOI [10.1016/S0169-5347\(03\)00008-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00008-9).
- Matschiner M, Saltzburger W. 2009.** TANDEM: integrating automated allele binning into genetics and genomics workflows. *Bioinformatics Applications Note* **25**:1982–1983 DOI [10.1093/bioinformatics/btp303](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp303).
- Nyberg CD, Thomsen MS, Wallentinus I. 2009.** Flora and fauna associated with the introduced red alga *Gracilaria vermiculophylla*. *European Journal of Phycology* **44**:395–403 DOI [10.1080/09670260802592808](https://doi.org/10.1080/09670260802592808).
- Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K. 2004.** APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics* **20**:289–290 DOI [10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412).
- Peakall R, Smouse PE. 2006.** GENALEX 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research. *Molecular Ecology Notes* **6**:288–295 DOI [10.1111/j.1471-8286.2005.01155.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2005.01155.x).
- Peakall R, Smouse PE. 2012.** GenALEX 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics Applications Note* **28**:2537–2539 DOI [10.1093/bioinformatics/bts460](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts460).
- R Development Core Team. 2014.** R version 2.15.1. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available at <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rousset F. 2008.** GENEPOP'007: a complete re-implementation of the GENEPOP software for Windows and Linux. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **8**:103–106 DOI [10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01931.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01931.x).

- Rozen S, Skalesty HJ. 2000.** Primer3 on the WWW for general users and for biologist programmers. In: Krawetz SMS, ed. *Bioinformatics methods and protocols: methods in molecular biology*. Totowa: Human Press, 365–386.
- Saunders GW. 2009.** Routine DNA barcoding of Canadian Gracilariales (Rhodophyta) reveals the invasive species *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* in British Columbia. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 9:140–150 DOI 10.1111/j.1755-0998.2009.02639.x.
- Schirmel J, Timler L, Buchholz S. 2010.** Impact of the invasive moss *Campylopus introflexus* on carabid beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae) and spiders (Araneae) in acidic coastal dunes at the southern Baltic Sea. *Biological Invasions* 13:605–620 DOI 10.1007/s10530-010-9852-2.
- Selkoe KA, Toonen RJ. 2006.** Microsatellites for ecologists: a practical guide to using and evaluating microsatellite markers. *Ecology Letters* 9:615–629 DOI 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00889.x.
- Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ. 1995.** *Biometry: the principles and practice of statistics in biological research*. New York: WH Freeman and Company.
- Sosa PA, Valero M, Batista F, Gonzalez-Perez MA. 1998.** Genetic variation and genetic structure of natural populations of *Gelidium* species: a re-evaluation of results. *Journal of Phycology* 10:279–284 DOI 10.1023/A:1008092023549.
- Szövényi P, Ricca M, Shaw AJ. 2009.** Multiple paternity and sporophytic inbreeding depression in a dioicous moss species. *Heredity* 103:394–403 DOI 10.1038/hdy.2009.82.
- Thornber CS, Gaines S. 2004.** Population demographics in species with biphasic life cycles. *Ecology and Evolution* 85:1661–1674.
- van der Strate HJ, van de Zande L, Stam WT, Olsen JL. 2002.** The contribution of haploids, diploids and clones to fine-scale population structure in the seaweed *Cladophoropsis membranacea* (Chlorophyta). *Molecular Ecology* 11:329–345 DOI 10.1046/j.1365-294X.2002.01448.x.
- van der Velde M, During HJ, van de Zande L, Bijlsma RK. 2001.** The reproductive biology of *Polytrichum formosum*: clonal structure and paternity revealed by microsatellites. *Molecular Ecology* 10:2423–2434 DOI 10.1046/j.0962-1083.2001.01385.x.
- Varlea-Álvarez E, Glenn TC, Serrão EA, Duarte CM, Martínez-Daranas B, Valero M, Marbá N. 2011.** Dinucleotide microsatellite markers in the genus *Caulerpa*. *Journal of Applied Phycology* 23:715–719 DOI 10.1007/s10811-010-9568-9.
- Walsh PS, Metzger DA, Higuchi R. 1991.** Chelex 100 as a medium for simple extraction of DNA for PCR-based typing from forensic material. *BioTechniques* 10:506–513.
- Wattier RA, Engel CR, Saumitou-Laprade P, Valero M. 1998.** Short allele dominance as a source of heterozygote deficiency at microsatellite loci: experimental evidence at the dinucleotide locus Gv1CT in *Gracilaria gracilis* (Rhodophyta). *Molecular Ecology* 7:1569–1573 DOI 10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00477.x.
- Weinberger F, Buchholz B, Karez R, Wahl M. 2008.** The invasive red alga *Gracilaria vermiculophylla* in the Baltic Sea: adaptation to brackish water may compensate for light limitation. *Aquatic Biology* 3:251–264 DOI 10.3354/ab00083.
- Weir BS, Cockerham CC. 1984.** Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of population structure. *Evolution* 38:1358–1370 DOI 10.2307/2408641.
- Williams SL, Smith JE. 2007.** A global review of the distribution, taxonomy, and impacts of introduced seaweeds. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 38:327–359 DOI 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.38.091206.095543.
- Wright JT, Byers JE, DeVore JL, Sotka EE. 2014.** Engineering or food? Mechanisms of facilitation by a habitat-forming invasive seaweed. *Ecology* 95:2699–2706 DOI 10.1890/14-0127.1.