Evidence from Nuclear DNA Sequences Sheds Light on the Phylogenetic Relationships of Pinnipedia: Single Origin with Affinity to Musteloidea

Jun J. Sato[1*], Mieczysław Wolsan[2], Hitoshi Suzuki[3], Tetsuji Hosoda[4], Yasunori Yamaguchi[1], Kozue Hiyama[1], Mari Kobayashi[5], and Shinji Minami[6]

[1]*Laboratory of Animal Cell Technology, Faculty of Life Science and Technology, Fukuyama University, Higashimura-cho, Aza, Sanzo, 985, Fukuyama 729-0292, Japan*

[2]*Museum and Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Wilcza 64, 00-679 Warszawa, Poland*

[3]*Laboratory of Ecology and Genetics, Graduate School of Environmental Earth Science, Hokkaido University, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

[4]*Taikyu High School, 1985 Yuasa-cho, Arida-gun, Wakayama 643-0004, Japan*

[5]*NPO, Marine Wildlife Center of JAPAN, Kita-ku, Sapporo 001-0021, Japan*

[6]*Asa Zoological Park, Asa-cho, Asakita-ku, Hiroshima, 731-3355, Japan*

RUNNING HEAD: Musteloid Affinity of Pinnipedia

* Corresponding author: Tel. +81-84-936-2112 (ext. 4628);

FAX. +81-84-936-2459.

E-mail: jsato@bt.fubt.fukuyama-u.ac.jp

ABSTRACT—Considerable long-standing controversy and confusion surround the phylogenetic affinities of pinnipeds, the largely marine group of "fin-footed" members of the placental mammalian order Carnivora. Until most recently, the two major competing hypotheses were that the pinnipeds have a single (monophyletic) origin from a bear-like ancestor, or that they have a dual (diphyletic) origin, with sea lions (Otariidae) derived from a bear-like ancestor, and seals (Phocidae) derived from an otter-, mustelid-, or musteloid-like ancestor. We examined phylogenetic relationships among 29 species of arctoid carnivorans using a concatenated sequence of 3228 bp from three nuclear loci (apolipoprotein B, APOB; interphotoreceptor retinoid-binding protein, IRBP; recombination-activating gene 1, RAG1). The species represented Pinnipedia (Otariidae: *Callorhinus*, *Eumetopias*; Phocidae: *Phoca*), bears (Ursidae: *Ursus*, *Melursus*), and Musteloidea (Mustelidae: *Mustela*, *Enhydra*, *Melogale*, *Martes*, *Gulo*, *Meles*; Procyonidae: *Procyon*; Ailuridae: *Ailurus*; Mephitidae: *Mephitis*). Maximum parsimony, maximum likelihood, and Bayesian inference phylogenetic analyses of separate and combined datasets produced trees with largely congruent topologies. The analyses of the combined dataset resulted in well-resolved and well-supported phylogeny reconstructions. Evidence from nuclear DNA evolution presented here contradicts the two major hypotheses of pinniped relationships and strongly suggests a single origin of the pinnipeds from an arctoid ancestor shared with Musteloidea to the exclusion of Ursidae.

Key words: Arctoidea, Carnivora, nuclear DNA, phylogeny, Pinnipedia

INTRODUCTION

The phylogenetic affinities of pinnipeds, the largely marine group of "fin-footed" members of the placental mammalian order Carnivora, are of considerable long-standing controversy and confusion (e.g., Duffield Kulu, 1972; Flynn *et al.*, 1988; Wozencraft, 1989; Wyss, 1989; Bininda-Emonds, 2000). An impressive bibliography has accumulated relating the enigma of the phylogenetic relationships of pinnipeds to terrestrial carnivorans, including studies based on either morphological or genetic grounds, or integrating morphological and genetic data (morphology—e.g., Mivart, 1885; Weber, 1904; McLaren, 1960; Gambarjan and Karapetjan, 1961; Ling, 1965; Mitchell, 1967; Tedford, 1976; de Muizon, 1982a, b; Ginsburg, 1982; Wiig, 1983; Wyss, 1987, 1988, 1989; Flynn *et al.*, 1988; Wozencraft, 1989; Berta and Ray, 1990; Nojima, 1990; Berta, 1991; Wolsan, 1993; Wyss and Flynn, 1993; Berta and Wyss, 1994; Hunt and Barnes, 1994; Tedford *et al.*, 1994; Bininda-Emonds and Russell, 1996; Kohno, 1996; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; genetics—e.g., Leone and Wiens, 1956; Pauly and Wolfe, 1957; Fay *et al.*, 1967; Borisov, 1969; Sarich, 1969a, b, 1976; Seal, 1969; Seal *et al.*, 1970, 1971; Duffield Kulu, 1972; Farris, 1972; Árnason, 1974, 1977, 1981; Prager and Wilson, 1978; Romero-Herrera *et al.*, 1978; Anbinder, 1980; de Jong, 1982, 1986; de Jong and Goodman, 1982; Dutrillaux *et al.*, 1982; de Jong *et al.*, 1984, 1993; Árnason and Widegren, 1986; Couturier and Dutrillaux, 1986; Miyamoto and Goodman, 1986; Tagle *et al.*, 1986; Braunitzer and Hofmann, 1987; McKenna, 1987, 1992; Wayne *et al.*, 1989; Czelusniak *et al.*, 1990; Keith *et al.*, 1991; Árnason and Ledje, 1993; Hashimoto *et al.*, 1993; Stanhope *et al.*, 1993; Masuda and Yoshida, 1994; Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Árnason *et al.*, 1995, 2002; Ledje and Árnason, 1995, 1996a, b; Lento *et al.*, 1995; Ikehara *et al.*, 1996; Zhang and Ryder, 1996; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Byrnes *et al.*, 1998; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Schreiber *et al.*, 1998; Emerson *et al.*, 1999; Gatesy *et al.*, 1999; Flynn *et al.*, 2000, 2005; Pecon Slattery *et al.*, 2000; Zehr *et al.*, 2001; Árnason and Janke, 2002; Vassetzky and Kramerov, 2002; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Yu *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005; combined genetics and morphology—Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Bininda-Emonds *et al.*, 1999; Bininda-Emonds, 2003).

Despite this extensive interest and substantial accumulation of information, doubts remain and the phylogenetic relationships of pinnipeds have yet to be satisfactorily resolved. Although the arctoid carnivoran nature of the pinnipeds is currently largely accepted (for exceptions, see, e.g., Ginsburg, 1999; Aristov and Baryshnikov, 2001), there remain disagreements over whether the pinnipeds have evolved from two unrelated arctoid ancestors (diphyletic origin) or from a single arctoid ancestor (monophyletic origin), and, in the instance of pinniped monophyly, whether the monophyletic origin was with affinity to bears

(Ursidae) or to weasels, otters, martens, badgers, raccoons, red panda, skunks, and allies (Musteloidea). Until most recently, the two major competing hypotheses were that the pinnipeds have a dual origin, with sea lions (Otariidae) derived from a bear-like ancestor and seals (Phocidae) derived from an otter-, mustelid-, or musteloid-like ancestor, or that they have a single origin from a bear-like ancestor. The dual-origin notion overwhelmingly dominated in the morphological systematic literature over most of the later part of the past century (e.g., McLaren, 1960; Mitchell and Tedford, 1973; Ray, 1976; Repenning, 1976; Tedford, 1976; Savage, 1977; Repenning *et al.*, 1979; de Muizon, 1982a, b; Ginsburg, 1982; Barnes *et al.*, 1985; Barnes, 1989, 1997; Wolsan, 1989, 1991; Wozencraft, 1989; Nojima, 1990) and is still being defended by some systematists (Koretsky and Barnes, 2003; Pavlinov, 2003). The notion of a single origin with affinity to bears has become widely accepted during the last two decades (Flynn, 1988; Flynn *et al.*, 1988; Berta *et al.*, 1989; Berta and Ray, 1990; Berta, 1991; Wyss and Flynn, 1993; Berta and Wyss, 1994; Hunt and Barnes, 1994; Tedford *et al.*, 1994; Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Werdelin, 1996; McKenna and Bell, 1997; Byrnes *et al.*, 1998; Berta and Sumich, 1999; Deméré *et al.*, 2003; Davis *et al.*, 2004; and others).

Recent attention in carnivoran phylogeny reconstruction has centered on DNA sequence data. Using these data, the overwhelming majority of phylogenetic studies on Carnivora in general, and Arctoidea in particular, have analyzed information obtained from mitochondrial loci. However, studies comparing the utility and efficacy of mitochondrial versus nuclear DNA sequences in phylogeny reconstruction indicate that nuclear sequences, especially when combined from various loci, are phylogenetically more informative and more effective in resolving phylogenetic relationships at deeper levels of evolutionary divergence. These studies span a wide range of animal taxa (e.g., Prychitko and Moore, 2000; Baker *et al.*, 2001; Matthee *et al.*, 2001; Springer *et al.*, 2001) and also include Arctoidea (Slade *et al.*, 1994; Koepfli and Wayne, 2003; Sato *et al.*, 2003). In all instances, the low amount of homoplasy exhibited by the nuclear genes is the reason given for the greater utility of the nuclear genes compared with the mitochondrial genes.

In this study of deep-level phylogenetic relationships among arctoids we relied on DNA sequence data obtained from nuclear genes, sampled from all relevant extant clades of Arctoidea and proved informative in arctoid phylogenetic reconstruction (Sato *et al.*, 2003, 2004). Evidence from nuclear DNA evolution presented here contradicts the two major hypotheses of pinniped relationships and strongly suggests a single origin of the pinnipeds from an arctoid ancestor shared with Musteloidea to the exclusion of Ursidae.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling

A total of 34 species were examined, of which 29 represented all relevant extant clades of the arctoid Carnivora and five represented the aeluroid Carnivora (Table 1). For each of these species, partial nucleotide sequences of three single-copy protein-coding (orthologous) nuclear genes were either newly generated or derived from Sato *et al.* (2003, 2004). The three genes included: the apolipoprotein B (APOB) gene, the gene encoding interphotoreceptor retinoid-binding protein (IRBP), and the recombination-activating gene 1 (RAG1). The studied APOB gene segment consisted of a fragment of exon 26, 963 base pairs (bp) in length, corresponding to human homologous locations 8488–8764 and 9140–9825 in DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accession M19828 (Ludwig *et al.*, 1987). The studied IRBP gene segment consisted of a fragment of exon 1, 1188 bp in length, corresponding to human homologous locations 337–1317 and 1324–1530 in DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accession J05253 (Fong *et al.*, 1990). The studied RAG1 segment consisted of a fragment of the exon, 1095 bp in length, corresponding to human homologous locations 1852–2946 in DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accession M29474 (Schatz *et al.*, 1989).

As all examined species of *Mustela* and *Martes*, as well as *Enhydra lutris*, *Gulo gulo*, *Meles meles*, and *Melogale moschata*, lacked a 15-bp fragment of the APOB gene segment, corresponding to human homologous locations 9593–9607 (this study), and all examined species of *Mustela* also lacked a 3-bp fragment of the IRBP gene segment, corresponding to human homologous locations 1311–1313 (Sato *et al.*, 2003), these gene fragments were excluded from phylogenetic analyses.

DNA extraction, amplification, and sequencing

Total genomic DNA was extracted from tissues preserved in ethanol by the conventional phenol-chloroform method. The amplification was performed via nested polymerase chain reactions (PCRs), using an automated thermal cycler (model PC 808, ASTEC). In the first PCR, a 1-kb fragment of the APOB gene was amplified using primers APOB-F8487 and APOB-R9826, a 1.3-kb fragment of the IRBP gene was amplified using primers +IRBP217 and –IRBP1531, and a 1.1-kb fragment of RAG1 was amplified using primers RAG1F1842 and RAG1R2951 (Table 2). Each first PCR mix contained 20 mM Tris (pH 8.4), 50 mM KCl, 2.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.2 mM dNTP mix, 0.05 μM of each primer (1 pmol of each primer per reaction), 0.5 units of Taq DNA polymerase, recombinant (Invitrogen), and 0.1–0.5 μg of template total genomic DNA in a total volume of 20 μl. Thermal cycling parameters of the first PCR were as follows: a cycle of denaturation at 94°C for 3 min and 30 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 45 sec, annealing at 55°C for 30 sec,

and extension at 72°C for 90 sec followed by an extension cycle at 72°C for 10 min.

The second PCR was performed under the same thermal cycling conditions as the first PCR. A 1-µl aliquot of each reaction mixture after the first PCR was used as a template for the second PCR in a 20 µl reaction mixture with the same reagents except for the primer pairs. In the second PCR, sets of primer pairs were employed to amplify partially overlapping gene fragments. For the APOB gene, the following two primer sets were used: (1) APOB-F8487 and APOB-R9324, and (2) APOB-F9287 and APOB-R9826 (Table 2). For the IRBP gene, the three primer sets were used: (1) R +IRBP335 and U –IRBP734, (2) R +IRBP724 and U –IRBP1145, and (3) R +IRBP1085 and U –IRBP1532. For RAG1, the two primer sets were used: (1) RAG1F1851 and RAG1R2486, and (2) RAG1F2357 and RAG1R2951.

The sequencing of the second PCR products was carried out with the same primers as for the second PCR and the Big Dye Terminator Cycle Sequencing Kit (Applied Biosystems), and run on an ABI 310 automated sequencer following the manufacturer's protocol.

Phylogenetic analyses

Phylogenetic analyses were conducted on the following four datasets: (1) 948 bp of the APOB gene, (2) 1185 bp of the IRBP gene, (3) 1095 bp of RAG1, and (4) 3228 bp of the total combined data. Trees were rooted using five aeluroid species (Table 1) as outgroups. All datasets were analyzed using, as optimality criteria, maximum parsimony (Edwards and Cavalli-Sforza, 1964; Camin and Sokal, 1965; Farris, 1970, 1977; Fitch, 1971), maximum likelihood (Edwards and Cavalli-Sforza, 1964; Cavalli-Sforza and Edwards, 1967; Felsenstein, 1981), and Bayesian inference (Rannala and Yang, 1996; Mau and Newton, 1997; Yang and Rannala, 1997; Larget and Simon, 1999; Mau *et al.*, 1999).

Maximum parsimony

Maximum-parsimony analyses were performed with PAUP* version 4.0b10 (Swofford, 2002). Trees were obtained from heuristic searches using 100 replicates of random sequence addition and tree-bisection-reconnection branch swapping. Nucleotide substitutions were equally weighted and treated as unordered. All other settings were set by default.

Robustness of support for inferred clades was evaluated using nonparametric bootstrapping (Efron, 1979; Felsenstein, 1985a) and Bremer (branch) support (Bremer, 1988, 1994), the latter representing the difference in tree length between the most-parsimonious tree and that lacking a particular clade. Bootstrap proportions

were computed with PAUP* 4.0b10 using heuristic searches for 1000 bootstrap replicates, with 100 random sequence additions per replicate and tree-bisection-reconnection branch swapping. Bremer support values were calculated using TreeRot version 2b (Sorenson, 1999). For limitations of the nonparametric bootstrap method and discussion of the interpretation of the bootstrap proportion, see Hedges (1992), Zharkikh and Li (1992a, b, 1995), Felsenstein and Kishino (1993), Hillis and Bull (1993), Li and Zharkikh (1994), Berry and Gascuel (1996), Efron *et al.* (1996), Newton (1996), DeBry and Olmstead (2000), Alfaro *et al.* (2003), Holmes (2003), Huelsenbeck and Rannala (2004), and Yang and Rannala (2005). For limitations of the Bremer support index, see Lee (2000) and DeBry (2001).

Maximum likelihood

Maximum-likelihood analyses were conducted with PAUP* version 4.0b10 using the models and parameters of nucleotide substitution that best fit the data as determined by hierarchical likelihood-ratio tests implemented in Modeltest version 3.06 (Posada and Crandall, 1998). Trees were obtained from heuristic searches using as-is sequence addition and tree-bisection-reconnection branch swapping, with all other settings set by default.

Support for hypothesized clades was assessed by nonparametric bootstrap resampling analysis and likelihood support (Lee and Hugall, 2003), the latter representing the difference in negative log-likelihood between the most-likely tree and that lacking a particular clade. Both analyses were performed using PAUP* 4.0b10. Bootstrap proportions were obtained from heuristic searches for 100 bootstrap replicates, with as-is sequence additions per replicate and tree-bisection-reconnection branch swapping. Likelihood support values were calculated using reverse constraint searches as described by Lee and Hugall (2003).

Bayesian inference

Bayesian-inference analyses were carried out with MrBayes version 3.1.1 (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001; Ronquist and Huelsenbeck, 2003) using best-fitting nucleotide-substitution models inferred via hierarchical likelihood-ratio tests implemented in MrModeltest version 2.2 (Nylander, 2004) for the separate datasets, and a mixed-model approach for the combined dataset. The models applied were as follows: HKY+Γ for the APOB dataset, HKY+I+Γ for the IRBP dataset, and SYM+I+Γ for the RAG1 dataset (HKY, Hasegawa-Kishino-Yano [Hasegawa *et al.*, 1985]; Γ, gamma distribution; I, invariable sites; SYM, symmetrical model [Zharkikh, 1994]). Model parameters were estimated as part of the analyses, and each

gene partition in the combined-data analysis was allowed to have its own estimates. Trees were generated using the Metropolis-coupled Markov-chain Monte-Carlo algorithm (Altekar *et al.*, 2004). The algorithm was run twice for each dataset to assure convergence. Each run consisted of four simultaneous chains, one cold and three incrementally heated, started from a random tree. Chains were run for 1 million generations, and sampled once every 100 generations. For each analysis, the first 1000 trees were discarded as burn-in. The remaining 9000 post-burn-in trees were used to construct a 50% majority-rule consensus tree and to calculate posterior probabilities of inferred clades. For discussion on the Bayesian posterior probability versus the nonparametric-bootstrap proportion as measures of phylogenetic reliability, see Suzuki *et al.* (2002), Wilcox *et al.* (2002), Alfaro *et al.* (2003), Douady *et al.* (2003), Erixon *et al.* (2003), Huelsenbeck and Rannala (2004), Simmons *et al.* (2004), and Yang and Rannala (2005).

Analyses of congruence among gene genealogies

The analyses of partitioned Bremer support (Baker and DeSalle, 1997) and partitioned likelihood support (Lee and Hugall, 2003) were performed not only to explore the effect of different gene partitions on the inferred combined-data phylogenetic hypotheses, but also to evaluate the level of heterogeneity in phylogenetic signal among the partitions. A positive value of the partitioned Bremer support or partitioned likelihood support shows support for a particular clade by a given partition, whereas a negative value indicates that the most-parsimonious or most-likely explanation (respectively) of the data in that partition is not congruent with the combined-data hypothesis. Partitioned Bremer support values were calculated using TreeRot version 2b and, as recommended by Lambkin *et al.* (2002), on each equally most-parsimonious tree separately. Partitioned likelihood support values were computed with PAUP* 4.0b10. Statistical significance of negative partitioned Bremer support values was evaluated using the nonparametric Templeton (Wilcoxon signed ranks) test (Templeton, 1983; Felsenstein, 1985b). The significance of negative partitioned likelihood support values was assessed with the nonparametric Kishino-Hasegawa (Kishino and Hasegawa, 1989) and Shimodaira-Hasegawa (Shimodaira and Hasegawa, 1999) tests.

Phylogenetic incongruence among gene genealogies was additionally assessed using pairwise comparisons between bootstrap proportions or posterior probabilities for the conflicting clades that exclude each other mutually among tree topologies inferred from analyses of single-gene datasets (de Queiroz, 1993). Bootstrap proportions of $\geq 70\%$ and posterior probabilities of ≥ 0.95 were considered corresponding to a probability of ≥ 0.95 that a clade is correct (Hillis and Bull, 1993; Huelsenbeck and Rannala, 2004), and thus

indicative of significant conflict.

Partition homogeneity (incongruence-length difference) tests (Farris *et al.*, 1995a, b) as implemented in PAUP* 4.0b10 were performed as a supplementary measure of phylogenetic discordance among gene genealogies. A number of authors (e.g., Dolphin *et al.*, 2000; Yoder *et al.*, 2001; Barker and Lutzoni, 2002; Darlu and Lecointre, 2002; Dowton and Austin, 2002) have encountered problems with this test that call into question its validity as a criterion for topological congruence between gene genealogies. These studies, however, do not support categorical or unqualified rejection of the test (Hipp *et al.*, 2004).

RESULTS

Heterozygosity

In addition to the heterozygosities reported by Sato *et al.* (2003, 2004), found in five mustelid nucleotide sequences of RAG1 and four mustelid, two felid, and one viverrid sequences of the IRBP gene, there are two heterozygosities among the newly generated sequences of RAG1 (C/T silent substitutions at locations 2092 and 2419 in *Callorhinus ursinus*) and five heterozygosities among the newly generated sequences of the IRBP gene (C/G silent substitution at location 816 in *Phoca vitulina*; C/T silent substitutions at location 642 in *Phoca largha* and locations 375 and 1218 in *Phoca vitulina*; C/T nonsilent substitution at location 1262 in *Phoca vitulina*). Moreover, 10 heterozygosities were found among the nucleotide sequences of the APOB gene, including A/C silent substitution at location 9260 in *Leopardus pardalis*; A/G silent substitutions at locations 9374, 9545, and 9785 in *Melogale moschata*, *Procyon lotor*, and *Leopardus pardalis*, respectively; A/G nonsilent substitution at location 8710 in *Mustela putorius*; A/T and C/G nonsilent substitutions at locations 9506 and 8524, respectively, in *Mustela erminea*; C/T silent substitutions at locations 8741, 9167, and 9557 in *Mustela putorius*, *Leopardus pardalis*, and *Panthera pardus*, respectively.

Sequence characteristics

Sequence-composition statistics for the arctoid gene segments studied are listed in Table 3. The sequence of the IRBP gene is longest and also contains the highest numbers of observed variable sites (41.0%) and parsimony-informative sites (42.9%), whereas the APOB sequence is shortest and contains the smallest numbers of these sites (29.4% and 26.0%, respectively). The majority of observed variable and parsimony-informative sites were found in the third position of codons. For each gene, the null hypothesis of homogeneity in base composition across the arctoid taxa was not rejected by the χ^2-test ($P > 0.05$).

Phylogenetic inference

Tree topologies summarizing the results of maximum parsimony, maximum likelihood, and Bayesian-inference phylogenetic analyses of the separate and combined datasets are shown in Figs. 1–4.

Congruence among gene genealogies

There is a high degree of congruence in the recovered single-gene tree topologies among the maximum parsimony, maximum likelihood, and Bayesian-inference optimality criteria, and less so among the APOB, IRBP, and RAG1 datasets. Of the trees illustrated in Figs. 1–3, those based on the same dataset but different optimality criteria either have identical branching arrangements (Fig. 2B, C) or differ only slightly in resolution. No conflicting mutually-exclusive clades were found between any of these trees (Tables 6, 9). In contrast to this, the majority of the trees that are based on different single-gene datasets are not only different in topological resolution, but also contradict one another in one or more inferred clades. A pairwise comparison of all combinations of these trees revealed nine different pairs of self-contradictory clades, concentrated in four tree regions (Table 6). Three of these pairs, containing clades 10–12 and 21, are associated with three alternative placements of *Meles meles* with respect to *Melogale moschata* and the *Martes-Gulo* clade. Three other pairs, containing clades 13–16, are involved in the variable position of *Martes martes*, *Martes americana*, or *Martes foina* relative to *Martes zibellina* and *Martes melampus*. Two pairs that contain clades 18 and 19 are related to alternative placements of *Martes flavigula* and *Gulo gulo* with respect to the rest of the *Martes-Gulo* clade (subgenus *Martes*). The four remaining pairs, which contain clades 24–27, are associated with three alternative placements of *Ailurus fulgens* (Ailuridae) relative to the *Procyon* clade (Procyonidae) and *Mephitis mephitis* (Mephitidae).

Pairwise comparisons between support values for the conflicting clades that exclude each other mutually between any of the tree topologies in Figs. 1–3 showed that for the majority of the conflicts, at least one of the self-contradictory clades was supported by a bootstrap proportion of < 70% or posterior probability of < 0.95, indicating insignificant incongruence (Table 9). The only instances where both self-contradictory clades were supported by a bootstrap proportion of ≥ 70% or posterior probability of ≥ 0.95 occurred between the RAG1 tree of Fig. 3C (Bayesian inference) and any of the APOB trees in Fig. 1 (clades 13 versus 15) and between either of the RAG1 trees in Fig. 3B–C (maximum likelihood and Bayesian inference) and any of the IRBP trees in Fig. 2 (clades 24 versus 25). This suggests the presence of significant

disagreement between the inferred RAG1 genealogy and either of the inferred APOB and IRBP genealogies.

However, neither the partitioned Bremer support analysis (Table 7) nor the partitioned likelihood support analysis (Table 8) revealed any significant conflict in phylogenetic signal among the gene partitions in the combined-data tree topologies inferred from maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood analyses. Only 11 (13%) of the 84 partitioned Bremer support values and 17 (19%) of the 90 partitioned likelihood support values were negative. None of these negative values proved significant (all one-tailed *P* values > 0.05) under the Templeton test (partitioned Bremer support) or the Kishino-Hasegawa and Shimodaira-Hasegawa tests (partitioned likelihood support).

The lack of significant phylogenetic incongruence among the gene genealogies was also indicated by partition homogeneity tests, which failed to reject the null hypothesis of homogeneity in phylogenetic signal between any of the single-gene datasets.

Relative phylogenetic contribution of gene partitions

The nuclear gene segments studied exhibit low levels of homoplasy, considerably lower than does the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene (Fig. 5). This is also shown by the high values of the consistency and retention indices for the nuclear genes (Table 4). The nuclear genes are also characterized by high decisiveness, as judged by the high values of the index of data decisiveness (Table 4). The APOB gene segment is least homoplastic and most decisive, whereas the IRBP and RAG1 segments display comparable amounts of homoplasy and are similarly decisive (Fig. 5, Table 4).

The IRBP gene showed the best performance for resolving relationships, the APOB gene was less effective, and RAG1 was least efficient, recovering 24–27, 22–24, and 19–23 clades, respectively (Figs. 1–3, Table 6). The low resolution of the single-gene analyses was improved when the sequences were concatenated, yielding nearly completely resolved relationships (28–30 recovered clades; Fig. 4, Table 6).

Tree topologies inferred from the IRBP dataset alone show the largest number of clades (24–25) recovered in agreement with the combined-data topologies based on the same optimality criterion (Table 6). Trees derived from the APOB dataset show 20–24 clades shared with the combined-data topologies, and the RAG1 trees consistently show only 18 shared clades. However, it is the trees based on the APOB dataset that in total exhibit the fewest number of pairwise incongruences with all combined-data topologies. That total number is nine for all APOB trees, ranging from zero to two for an individual APOB tree, whereas for the IRBP and RAG1 datasets it is 18 (spanning from zero to four for an individual tree) and 33 (spanning from

one to six for an individual tree), respectively (Table 9). In addition, the RAG1 dataset is the only partition whose analyses (maximum likelihood and Bayesian inference) resulted in significant pairwise incongruence with the combined-data topologies, as suggested by comparing the strength of bootstrap or posterior probability support between the self-contradictory clades (Table 9).

As indicated by the analyses of partitioned Bremer support (Table 7) and partitioned likelihood support (Table 8), the IRBP partition contributes the most support (38.5–38.7%) to the combined-data topologies derived from maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood analyses. The RAG1 partition contributes 32.3–32.9% of overall support, and the APOB partition contributes the least support (28.5–29.2%). From among the clades recovered by these combined-data analyses, 13 (maximum parsimony) and 15 (maximum likelihood) receive positive support from all three partitions, 10 and 13 (respectively) from two partitions, and five and two (respectively) from only one partition. The numbers of the negative contributions for the maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood combined-data topologies, respectively, are as follows: one and three from the IRBP partition, three and seven from the APOB partition, and seven and seven from the RAG1 partition.

Pinniped relationships

There is robust evidence of the monophyletic Pinnipedia. The species of Phocidae, on the one hand, and the species of Otariidae, on the other, are clustered together in a sister-group relationship in all trees inferred from both the single-gene and combined-data analyses (Figs. 1–4). This relationship was recovered on nearly all of the maximum-parsimony bootstrap-estimated trees (99–100% bootstrap support in single-gene analyses and 100% bootstrap support in the combined-data analysis) and on all maximum-likelihood bootstrap-estimated trees (100% bootstrap support in both single-gene and combined-data analyses), and also consistently supported by a 1.00 posterior probability value in all Bayesian-inference analyses (Table 6). All data partitions positively contributed to the high values of the overall Bremer support (25; Table 7) and likelihood support (63.50; Table 8) for the pinniped clade.

All combined-data analyses and all but two single-gene analyses supported a close relationship between Pinnipedia and Musteloidea, to the exclusion of Ursidae which has a basal position within Arctoidea (Figs. 1–4). The two exceptions are the maximum-parsimony analysis of the APOB dataset (Fig. 1A) and maximum-likelihood analysis of the RAG1 dataset (Fig. 3B), which failed to resolve the relationships among the three clades. The pinniped-musteloid clade was recovered on 95% and 70%, respectively, of the

maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood bootstrap-estimated trees in the combined-data analysis, and also supported by a posterior probability of 0.83 in the Bayesian-inference combined-data analysis (Table 6). Single-gene analyses provided weaker (albeit not very week) support for this clade, with bootstrap proportions of 51%, 65%, and 83% and posterior probabilities of 0.53, 0.67, and 0.71. Even though the Bremer support and likelihood support values for the pinniped-musteloid clade in the combined-data tree topologies are not high (6 and 0.91, respectively), it is noteworthy that this clade received positive support from all data partitions under the maximum-likelihood optimality criterion (Table 8) and all but one partitions under the maximum-parsimony criterion (Table 7). The single, albeit minor, conflicting signal is present from the APOB partition, with a partitioned Bremer support value of –0.5 versus +3.0 and +3.5 from the IRBP and RAG1 partitions, respectively.

DISCUSSION

Pinniped monophyly versus diphyly

While the traditional, long-standing classification of the seals, sea lions, and walruses in a single taxon (Pinnipedia) has increasingly over time implied a single origin for these largely marine carnivores, a double origin for this group has been suggested from time to time to ultimately become the dominant view in the latter half of the past century. Since that time, considerable evidence in favor of pinniped monophyly has been accumulated, while support for pinniped diphyly has eroded. Currently, there appears to be little evidence available to support the dual-origin notion.

Although the hypothesis of a diphyletic origin of the pinnipeds has received some support from morphology (e.g., Mivart, 1885; McLaren, 1960; Tedford, 1976; de Muizon, 1982a, b; Ginsburg, 1982; Wozencraft, 1989; Nojima, 1990), only in few studies (Tedford, 1976; de Muizon, 1982a, b; Ginsburg, 1982; Wozencraft, 1989) is this support provided using cladistic methodology. What is more, Tedford's (1976) phylogenetic hypothesis, historically perhaps the most influential argument in favor of pinniped diphyly, is indeed put forward in conflict with the premises of cladistics (Wiig, 1983). The hypotheses of de Muizon (1982a, b) and Ginsburg (1982) are manually generated cladograms based on characters weighted and ordered subjectively. Moreover, de Muizon's (1982a, b) cladograms include phocids and musteloids only, with no other carnivoran taxa included explicitly in the comparison. In turn, Wozencraft's (1989) result, although inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis done on a large set of data, has not been confirmed by Wyss and Flynn's (1993) maximum-parsimony analysis based on a revised data matrix of Wozencraft (1989)

and using increased taxon sampling.

Wyss and Flynn's (1993) analysis, instead, suggests a single origin of the pinnipeds, a notion also supported by other morphological studies employing cladistic methodology (Wyss, 1987, 1988, 1989; Berta and Ray, 1990; Berta, 1991; Wolsan, 1993; Berta and Wyss, 1994; Bininda-Emonds and Russell, 1996; Werdelin, 1996; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998). Substantial evidence in support of pinniped monophyly has come from genetics, including nuclear DNA sequences (Ledje and Árnason, 1995; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Flynn *et al.*, 2000, 2005; Zehr *et al.*, 2001; Yu *et al.*, 2004), mitochondrial DNA sequences (Masuda and Yoshida, 1994; Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Árnason *et al.*, 1995, 2002; Lento *et al.*, 1995; Ledje and Árnason, 1996a, b; Zhang and Ryder, 1996; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Emerson *et al.*, 1999; Flynn *et al.*, 2000, 2005; Árnason and Janke, 2002; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005), DNA hybridization (Árnason and Widegren, 1986; Wayne *et al.*, 1989; Árnason and Ledje, 1993; Byrnes *et al.*, 1998), protein sequences (Romero-Herrera *et al.*, 1978; de Jong, 1982, 1986; de Jong and Goodman, 1982; de Jong *et al.*, 1984, 1993; Miyamoto and Goodman, 1986; Tagle *et al.*, 1986; Braunitzer and Hofmann, 1987; McKenna, 1987, 1992; Czelusniak *et al.*, 1990; Stanhope *et al.*, 1993), serum immunology (Borisov, 1969; Sarich, 1969a, b, 1976; Seal *et al.*, 1970, 1971; Farris, 1972; Prager and Wilson, 1978), and karyology (Fay *et al.*, 1967; Seal *et al.*, 1971; Duffield Kulu, 1972; Árnason, 1974, 1977; Anbinder, 1980; Dutrillaux *et al.*, 1982; Couturier and Dutrillaux, 1986). Pinniped monophyly has also consistently been supported by studies integrating genetic and morphological data (Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Bininda-Emonds *et al.*, 1999; Bininda-Emonds, 2003).

Our study provides consistent robust support for the monophyletic Pinnipedia from three nuclear loci, with 99–100% bootstrap support and 1.00 Bayesian posterior probabilities from both the single-gene and combined-data analyses. The values of bootstrap proportions reported previously in support of pinniped monophyly range from less than 50% to 100% (Masuda and Yoshida, 1994; Árnason *et al.*, 1995, 2002; Ledje and Árnason, 1995, 1996a, b; Lento *et al.*, 1995; Bininda-Emonds and Russell, 1996; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Emerson *et al.*, 1999; Flynn *et al.*, 2000, 2005; Zehr *et al.*, 2001; Árnason and Janke, 2002; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Yu *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005). All Bayesian posterior probability values given in the literature for the monophyletic Pinnipedia equal 1.00 (Davis *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005; Flynn *et al.*, 2005). No quantitative clade support has been reported in favor of pinniped diphyly.

Musteloid versus ursid affinities of Pinnipedia

Although the notion of a monophyletic origin of the pinnipeds with affinity to ursids has recently become widely accepted and appears to be currently the prevailing view, a point also reflected by its acceptance in general and influential texts (e.g., McKenna and Bell, 1997; Berta and Sumich, 1999), the actual support for this hypothesis is relatively weak. A close relationship of the pinnipeds to ursids has received some support from morphology (Weber, 1904; Flynn *et al.*, 1988; Berta and Ray, 1990; Berta, 1991; Wyss and Flynn, 1993; Berta and Wyss, 1994; Hunt and Barnes, 1994; Werdelin, 1996; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998), a study combining morphological evidence with mitochondrial DNA sequence data (Vrana *et al.*, 1994), as well as from genetics, including mitochondrial DNA sequences (Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Lento *et al.*, 1995; Ledje and Árnason, 1996a; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005), DNA hybridization (Byrnes *et al.*, 1998), and serum immunology (Leone and Wiens, 1956; Pauly and Wolfe, 1957). However, the values of quantitative clade support that have been presented for this relationship are low (Wyss and Flynn, 1993; Vrana *et al.*, 1994; Lento *et al.*, 1995; Ledje and Árnason, 1996a; Werdelin, 1996; Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005).

The alternative, and less popular, view that the pinnipeds are derived from an ancestor shared with musteloids, to the exclusion of ursids, has recently been supported by a broad spectrum of data sets. These comprise morphological evidence from skeleton, dentition, and soft anatomy (Wolsan, 1993; Bininda-Emonds and Russell, 1996; Kohno, 1996), combined evidence from morphology and genetics (Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Bininda-Emonds *et al.*, 1999; Bininda-Emonds, 2003), and also genetic evidence. The last is derived from protein sequences (Miyamoto and Goodman, 1986; Ikehara *et al.*, 1996), DNA hybridization (Árnason and Widegren, 1986; Árnason and Ledje, 1993), mitochondrial DNA sequences (Zhang and Ryder, 1996; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Davis *et al.*, 2004), nuclear DNA sequences (long interspersed nuclear element LINE-1, 741 bp: Ledje and Árnason, 1995; transthyretin [TTR] gene intron 1, 847–851 bp: Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Zehr *et al.*, 2001; TTR intron 1 + IRBP, 2341 bp: Yu *et al.*, 2004), as well as combined mitochondrial and nuclear DNA sequence data, containing a nuclear sequence of 851 bp from the TTR intron 1 (Flynn and Nedbal, 1998; Flynn *et al.*, 2000) and a concatenated nuclear sequence of 2977 bp from the TTR, IRBP, and thyroxine-binding globulin (TBG) genes (Flynn *et al.*, 2005). Nonetheless, similarly as for the ursid-affinity notion, the musteloid affinity of Pinnipedia has largely received weak quantitative clade support (Bininda-Emonds and Russell, 1996; Zhang and Ryder, 1996; Dragoo and Honeycutt, 1997; Bininda-Emonds *et al.*, 1999; Bininda-Emonds, 2003; Davis *et al.*, 2004; Delisle and Strobeck, 2005). A bootstrap-

estimated confidence ≥ 70% or a Bayesian posterior probability ≥ 0.95 for the pinniped-musteloid clade have only been reported for analyses using nuclear DNA sequences, with the strongest support coming from studies using a concatenated sequence from a group of nuclear genes (Yu *et al.*, 2004; Flynn *et al.*, 2005).

The present study is based on the largest nuclear sequence data set yet employed for reconstructing the phylogenetic relationships of pinnipeds, sampled from a comprehensive taxon set representing all relevant extant arctoid clades. We analyzed a concatenated sequence of 3228 bp from three nuclear loci (APOB, IRBP, RAG1) of 29 arctoid species. Flynn *et al.* (2005: Appendix 1) analyzed a concatenated sequence of 2977 bp from three nuclear loci (IRBP, TBG, TTR) of eight arctoid species, and Yu *et al.* (2004: Table 1) analyzed a concatenated sequence of 2341 bp from two nuclear loci (IRBP, TTR) of 13 arctoid species. The three studies provide independent evidence and strong support for the affinity of Pinnipedia and Musteloidea. Bootstrap proportions and Bayesian posterior probabilities obtained in these studies in support of the pinniped-musteloid clade range from 70% to 99% and from 0.83 to 1.00, respectively. Our study additionally supports this relationship by providing confidence in congruence of phylogenetic signal among three different nuclear genes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the reviewers (Isabelle Delisle, Lars Werdelin, and one anonymous) for constructive comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. We also thank Kei Fujii, Satoshi Fujimoto, Daniel J. Harrison, Mitsuhiro Hayashida, Yumi Kobayashi, Alexei P. Kryukov, Yoshitaka Obara, Toshio Takeuchi, Kimiyuki Tsuchiya, and Yasuhiko Yamamoto for their help in collecting samples. The Fisheries Agency, Japan, permitted us to use the tissue of *Callorhinus ursinus*. Partial support for this study was provided by grants-in-aid for scientific research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan.

REFERENCES

Alfaro ME, Zoller S, Lutzoni F (2003) Bayes or bootstrap? A simulation study comparing the performance of Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling and bootstrapping in assessing phylogenetic confidence. Mol Biol Evol 20: 255–266

Altekar G, Dwarkadas S, Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F (2004) Parallel Metropolis coupled Markov chain Monte Carlo for Bayesian phylogenetic inference. Bioinformatics 20: 407–415

Amrine-Madsen H, Koepfli K-P, Wayne RK, Springer MS (2003) A new phylogenetic marker,

apolipoprotein B, provides compelling evidence for eutherian relationships. Mol Phylogenet Evol 28: 225–240

Anbinder EM (1980) Karyology and Evolution of Pinnipeds. Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Moscow (in Russian)

Archie JW (1989) Homoplasy excess ratios: New indices for measuring levels of homoplasy in phylogenetic systematics and a critique of the consistency index. Syst Zool 38: 253–269

Aristov AA, Baryshnikov GF (2001) The Mammals of Russia and Adjacent Territories. Carnivores and Pinnipeds. Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg (in Russian)

Árnason Ú (1974) Comparative chromosome studies in Pinnipedia. Hereditas 76: 179–225

Árnason Ú (1977) The relationship between the four principal pinniped karyotypes. Hereditas 87: 227–242

Árnason Ú (1981) Localization of nucleolar organizing regions in pinniped karyotypes. Hereditas 94: 29–34

Árnason Ú, Adegoke JA, Bodin K, Born EW, Esa YB, Gullberg A, Nilsson M, Short RV, Xu X, Janke A (2002) Mammalian mitogenomic relationships and the root of the eutherian tree. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 99: 8151–8156

Árnason Ú, Bodin K, Gullberg A, Ledje C, Mouchaty S (1995) A molecular view of pinniped relationships with particular emphasis on the true seals. J Mol Evol 40: 78–85

Árnason Ú, Janke A (2002) Mitogenomic analyses of eutherian relationships. Cytogenet Genome Res 96: 20–32

Árnason Ú, Johnsson E (1992) The complete mitochondrial DNA sequence of the harbor seal, *Phoca vitulina*. J Mol Evol 34: 493–505

Árnason Ú, Ledje C (1993) The use of highly repetitive DNA for resolving cetacean and pinniped phylogenies. In "Mammal Phylogeny: Placentals" Ed by FS Szalay, MJ Novacek, and MC McKenna, Springer Verlag, New York, pp 74–80

Árnason Ú, Widegren B (1986) Pinniped phylogeny enlightened by molecular hybridizations using highly repetitive DNA. Mol Biol Evol 3: 356–365

Baker RH, DeSalle R (1997) Multiple sources of character information and the phylogeny of Hawaiian drosophilids. Syst Biol 46: 654–673

Baker RH, Wilkinson GS, DeSalle R (2001) Phylogenetic utility of different types of molecular data used to infer evolutionary relationships among stalk-eyed flies (Diopsidae). Syst Biol 50: 87–105

Barker EK, Lutzoni FM (2002) The utility of the incongruence length difference test. Syst Biol 51: 625–637

Barnes LG (1989) A new enaliarctine pinniped from the Astoria Formation, Oregon, and a classification of

the Otariidae (Mammalia: Carnivora). Contrib Sci Nat Hist Mus Los Angeles County 403: 1–26

Barnes LG (1997) Evolution and adaptation of marine mammals in the Pacific Rim. J Fossil Res 30: 48–54

Barnes LG, Domning DP, Ray CE (1985) Status of studies on fossil marine mammals. Mar Mammal Sci 1: 15–53

Berry V, Gascuel O (1996) On the interpretation of bootstrap trees: Appropriate threshold of clade selection and induced gain. Mol Biol Evol 13: 999–1011

Berta A (1991) New *Enaliarctos** (Pinnipedimorpha) from the Oligocene and Miocene of Oregon and the role of "enaliarctids" in pinniped phylogeny. Smithsonian Contrib Paleobiol 69: 1–33

Berta A, Ray CE (1990) Skeletal morphology and locomotor capabilities of the archaic pinniped *Enaliarctos mealsi*. J Vertebr Paleontol 10: 141–157

Berta A, Ray CE, Wyss AR (1989) Skeleton of the oldest known pinniped, *Enaliarctos mealsi*. Science 244: 60–62

Berta A, Sumich JL (1999) Marine Mammals: Evolutionary Biology. Academic Press, San Diego

Berta A, Wyss AR (1994) Pinniped phylogeny. Proc San Diego Soc Nat Hist 29: 33–56

Bininda-Emonds ORP (2000) Factors influencing phylogenetic inference: A case study using the mammalian carnivores. Mol Phylogenet Evol 16: 113–126

Bininda-Emonds ORP (2003) Novel versus unsupported clades: Assessing the qualitative support for clades in MRP supertrees. Syst. Biol. 52: 839–848

Bininda-Emonds ORP, Gittleman JL, Purvis A (1999) Building large trees by combining phylogenetic information: A complete phylogeny of the extant Carnivora (Mammalia). Biol Rev 74: 143–175

Bininda-Emonds ORP, Russell AP (1996) A morphological perspective on the phylogenetic relationships of the extant phocid seals (Mammalia: Carnivora: Phocidae). Bonner Zool Monogr 41: 1–256

Borisov VI (1969) Application of the precipitation reaction for studying phylogenesis and systematics of pinnipeds and carnivors. Zool Zh 48: 248–255 (in Russian)

Braunitzer G, Hofmann O (1987) Les hémoglobines des pandas. C R Soc Biol 181: 116–121

Bremer K (1988) The limits of amino acid sequence data in angiosperm phylogenetic reconstruction. Evolution 42: 795–803

Bremer K (1994) Branch support and tree stability. Cladistics 10: 295–304

Byrnes D, Miranpuri S, Kirsch J (1998) Phylogeny of Caniformia (Mammalia: Carnivora), based on DNA hybridization. In “Abstracts, Euro-American Mammal Congress, Santiago de Compostela, 19–24 July, 1998” Ed by S Reig, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, p 346

Camin JH, Sokal RR (1965) A method for deducing branching sequences in phylogeny. Evolution 19: 311–326

Cavalli-Sforza LL, Edwards AWF (1967) Phylogenetic analysis: Models and estimation procedures. Evolution 21: 550–570

Couturier J, Dutrillaux B (1986) Évolution chromosomique chez les Carnivores. Mammalia 50 (Num spéc): 124–162

Cummings MP, Handley SA, Myers DS, Reed DL, Rokas A, Winka K (2003) Comparing bootstrap and posterior probability values in the four-taxon case. Syst Biol 52: 477–487

Czelusniak J, Goodman M, Koop BF, Tagle DA, Shoshani J, Braunitzer G, Kleinschmidt TK, de Jong WW, Matsuda G (1990) Perspectives from amino acid and nucleotide sequences on cladistic relationships among higher taxa of Eutheria. In “Current Mammalogy Vol 2” Ed by HH Genoways, Plenum Press, New York, pp 545–572

Darlu P, Lecointre G (2002) When does the incongruence length difference test fail? Mol Biol Evol 19: 432–437

Davis CS, Delisle I, Stirling I, Siniff DB, Strobeck C (2004) A phylogeny of the extant Phocidae inferred from complete mitochondrial DNA coding regions. Mol Phylogenet Evol 33: 363–377

DeBry RW (2001) Improving interpretation of the decay index for DNA sequence data. Syst Biol 50: 742–752

DeBry RW, Olmstead RG (2000) A simulation study of reduced tree-search effort in bootstrap resampling analysis. Syst Biol 49: 171–179

de Jong WW (1982) Eye lens proteins and vertebrate phylogeny. In “Macromolecular Sequences in Systematics and Evolutionary Biology” Ed by M Goodman, Plenum Press, New York, pp 75–114

de Jong WW (1986) Protein sequence evidence for monophyly of the carnivore families Procyonidae and Mustelidae. Mol Biol Evol 3: 276–281

de Jong WW, Goodman M (1982) Mammalian phylogeny studied by sequence analysis of the eye lens protein α-crystallin. Z Säugetierk 47: 257–276

de Jong WW, Leunissen JAM, Wistow GJ (1993) Eye lens crystallins and the phylogeny of placental orders: Evidence for a macroscelid-paenungulate clade? In “Mammal Phylogeny: Placentals” Ed by FS Szalay, MJ Novacek, and MC McKenna, Springer Verlag, New York, pp 5–12

de Jong WW, Zweers A, Versteeg M, Nuy-Terwindt EC (1984) Primary structures of the α-crystallin A chains of twenty-eight mammalian species, chicken and frog. Eur J Biochem 141: 131–140

Delisle I, Strobeck C (2002) Conserved primers for rapid sequencing of the complete mitochondrial genome from carnivores, applied to three species of bears. Mol Biol Evol 19: 357–361

Delisle I, Strobeck C (2005) A phylogeny of the Caniformia (order Carnivora) based on 12 complete protein-coding mitochondrial genes. Mol Phylogenet Evol 37: 192–201

Deméré TA, Berta A, Adam PJ (2003) Pinnipedimorph evolutionary biogeography. Bull Am Mus Nat Hist 279: 32–76

de Muizon C (1982a) Les relations phylogénétiques des Lutrinae (Mustelidae, Mammalia). Geobios Mém Spéc 6: 259–277

de Muizon C (1982b) Phocid phylogeny and dispersal. Ann S Afr Mus 89: 175–213

de Queiroz A (1993) For consensus (sometimes). Syst Biol 42: 368–372

Dolphin K, Belshaw R, Orme CDL, Quicke DLJ (2000) Noise and incongruence: Interpreting results of the incongruence length difference test. Mol Phylogenet Evol 17: 401–406

Douady CJ, Delsuc F, Boucher Y, Doolittle WF, Douzery EJP (2003) Comparison of Bayesian and maximum likelihood bootstrap measures of phylogenetic reliability. Mol Biol Evol 20: 248–254

Dowton M, Austin AD (2002) Increased congruence does not necessarily indicate increased phylogenetic accuracy—The behavior of the incongruence length difference test in mixed-model analyses. Syst Biol 51: 19–31

Dragoo JW, Honeycutt RL (1997) Systematics of mustelid-like carnivores. J Mammal 78: 426–443

Duffield Kulu D (1972) Evolution and cytogenetics. In “Mammals of the Sea: Biology and Medicine” Ed by SH Ridgway, Charles C Thomas Publisher, Springfield, pp 503–527

Dutrillaux B, Couturier J, Chauvier G (1982) Les Pinnipèdes, monophylétiques, sont issus de Procyonidae ancestraux, et non d’Ursidae ni de Mustelidae. Mém Mus Nat Hist Nat A 123: 141–143

Edwards AWF, Cavalli-Sforza LL (1964) Reconstruction of evolutionary trees. In “Phenetic and Phylogenetic Classification” Ed by VH Heywood and J McNeill, Syst Assoc Publ 6: 67–76

Efron B (1979) Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jacknife. Ann Stat 7: 1–26

Efron B, Halloran E, Holmes S (1996) Bootstrap confidence levels for phylogenetic trees. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 93: 13429–13434

Emerson GL, Kilpatrick CW, McNiff BE, Ottenwalder J, Allard MW (1999) Phylogenetic relationships of the order Insectivora based on complete 12S rRNA sequences from mitochondria. Cladistics 15: 221–230

Erixon P, Svennblad B, Britton T, Oxelman B (2003) Reliability of Bayesian posterior probabilities and bootstrap frequencies in phylogenetics. Syst Biol 52: 665-673

Farris JS (1970) Methods for computing Wagner trees. Syst Zool 19: 83–92

Farris JS (1972) Estimating phylogenetic trees from distance matrices. Am Nat 106: 645–668

Farris JS (1977) Phylogenetic analysis under Dollo's Law. Syst Zool 26: 77–88

Farris JS (1989) The retention index and the rescaled consistency index. Cladistics 5: 417–419

Farris JS, Källersjö M, Kluge AG, Bult C (1995a) Testing significance of incongruence. Cladistics 10 (1994): 315–319

Farris JS, Källersjö M, Kluge AG, Bult C (1995b) Constructing a significance test for incongruence. Syst Biol 44: 570–572

Fay FH, Rausch VR, Feltz ET (1967) Cytogenetic comparison of some pinnipeds (Mammalia: Eutheria). Can J Zool 45: 773–778

Felsenstein J (1981) Evolutionary trees from DNA sequences: A maximum likelihood approach. J Mol Evol 17: 368–376

Felsenstein J (1985a) Confidence limits on phylogenies: An approach using the bootstrap. Evolution 39: 783–791

Felsenstein J (1985b) Confidence limits on phylogenies with a molecular clock. Syst Zool 34: 152–161

Felsenstein J, Kishino H (1993) Is there something wrong with the bootstrap on phylogenies? A reply to Hillis and Bull. Syst Biol 42: 193–200

Fitch WM (1971) Toward defining the course of evolution: Minimum change for a specific tree topology. Syst Zool 20: 406–416

Flynn JJ (1988) Ancestry of sea mammals. Nature 334: 383–384

Flynn JJ, Finarelli JA, Zehr S, Hsu J, Nedbal MA (2005) Molecular phylogeny of the Carnivora (Mammalia): Assessing the impact of increased sampling on resolving enigmatic relationships. Syst Biol 54: 317–337

Flynn JJ, Nedbal MA (1998) Phylogeny of the Carnivora (Mammalia): Congruence vs incompatibility

among multiple data sets. Mol Phylogenet Evol 9: 414–426

Flynn JJ, Nedbal MA, Dragoo JW, Honeycutt RL (2000) Whence the red panda? Mol Phylogenet Evol 17: 190–199

Flynn JJ, Neff NA, Tedford RH (1988) Phylogeny of the Carnivora. In "The Phylogeny and Classification of the Tetrapods Vol 2" Ed by MJ Benton, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp 73–115

Fong S-L, Fong W-B, Morris TA, Kedzie KM, Bridges CDB (1990) Characterization and comparative structural features of the gene for human interstitial retinol-binding protein. J Biol Chem 265: 3648–3653

Gambarjan PP, Karapetjan WS (1961) Besonderheiten im Bau des Seelöwen (*Eumetopias californianus*), der Baikalrobbe (*Phoca sibirica*) und des Seeotters (*Enhydra lutris*) in Anpassung an die Fortbewegung im Wasser. Zool Jb Anat 79: 123–148

Gatesy J, O'Grady P, Baker RH (1999) Corroboration among data sets in simultaneous analysis: Hidden support for phylogenetic relationships among higher level artiodactyl taxa. Cladistics 15: 271–313

Ginsburg L (1982) Sur la position systématique du petit Panda, *Ailurus fulgens* (Carnivora, Mammalia). Geobios Mém Spéc 6: 247–258

Ginsburg L (1999) Order Carnivora. In "The Miocene Land Mammals of Europe" Ed by GE Rössner and K Heissig, Verlag Dr. Friedrich Pfeil, Munich, pp 109–148

Goloboff PA (1991) Homoplasy and the choice among cladograms. Cladistics 7: 215–232

Hasegawa M, Kishino H, Yano T (1985) Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular clock of mitochondrial DNA. J Mol Evol 22: 160–174

Hashimoto T, Otaka E, Adachi J, Mizuta K, Hasegawa M (1993) The giant panda is closer to a bear, judged by α- and β-hemoglobin sequences. J Mol Evol 36: 282–289

Hassanin A, Lecointre G, Tillier S (1998) The "evolutionary signal" of homoplasy in protein-coding gene sequences and its consequences for a priori weighting in phylogeny. CR Acad Sci III-Vie 321: 611–620

Hedges SB (1992) The number of replications needed for accurate estimation of the bootstrap *P* value in phylogenetic studies. Mol Biol Evol 9: 366–369

Hillis DM, Bull JJ (1993) An empirical test of bootstrapping as a method for assessing confidence in phylogenetic analysis. Syst Biol 42: 182–192

Hipp AL, Hall JC, Sytsma KJ (2004) Congruence versus phylogenetic accuracy: Revisiting the incongruence length difference test. Syst Biol 53: 81–89

Holmes S (2003) Bootstrapping phylogenetic trees: Theory and methods. Stat Sci 18: 241–255

Hosoda T, Suzuki H, Harada M, Tsuchiya K, Han S-H, Zhang Y-P, Kryukov AP, Lin L-K (2000) Evolutionary trends of the mitochondrial lineage differentiation in species of genera *Martes* and *Mustela*. Genes Genet Syst 75: 259–267

Huelsenbeck JP, Rannala B (2004) Frequentist properties of Bayesian posterior probabilities of phylogenetic trees under simple and complex substitution models. Syst Biol 53: 904–913

Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F (2001) MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. Bioinformatics 17: 754–755

Hunt RM Jr, Barnes LG (1994) Basicranial evidence for ursid affinity of the oldest pinnipeds. Proc San Diego Soc Nat Hist 29: 57–67

Ikehara T, Eguchi Y, Kayo S, Takei H (1996) Amino acid sequences of hemoglobin β chains of five species of pinnipeds: *Neophoca cinerea*, *Otaria byronia*, *Eumetopias jubatus*, *Pusa hispida*, and *Pagophilus groenlandica*. J Protein Chem 15: 659–665

Jiang Z, Priat C, Galibert F (1998) Traced orthologous amplified sequence tags (TOASTs) and mammalian comparative maps. Mammal Genome 9: 577–587

Keith EO, Grobler J, Pervaiz S, Brew K (1991) Pinniped phylogenies deduced from protein sequence data. In "Abstracts, Ninth Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, December 5–9, 1991, Chicago, Illinois, USA", Society for Marine Mammalogy, Chicago, p 38

Kishino H, Hasegawa M (1989) Evaluation of the maximum likelihood estimate of the evolutionary tree topologies from DNA sequence data, and the branching order in Hominoidea. J Mol Evol 29: 170–179

Kluge AG, Farris JS (1969) Quantitative phyletics and the evolution of anurans. Syst Zool 18: 1–32

Koepfli K-P, Wayne RK (1998) Phylogenetic relationships of otters (Carnivora: Mustelidae) based on mitochondrial cytochrome *b* sequences. J Zool 246: 401–416

Koepfli K-P, Wayne RK (2003) Type I STS markers are more informative than cytochrome *b* in phylogenetic reconstruction of the Mustelidae (Mammalia: Carnivora). Syst Biol 52: 571–593

Kohno N (1996) The Oligo-Miocene aquatic arctoid carnivore *Potamotherium*, and its bearing on the relationships of pinnipeds. In "Résumés, La Readaptation au Milieu Aquatique, Poitiers, Septembre 1996" Ed by J-M Mazin, P Vignaud, and V de Buffrenil, Université de Poitiers, Poitiers, pp 22–23

Koretsky I, Barnes LG (2003) Origins and relationships of pinnipeds, and the concepts of monophyly versus diphyly. J Vertebr Paleontol 23 (3 Suppl): 69A

Kurose N, Abramov AV, Masuda R (2000) Intrageneric diversity of the cytochrome *b* gene and phylogeny of Eurasian species of the genus *Mustela* (Mustelidae, Carnivora). Zool Sci 17: 673–679

Kurose N, Masuda R, Siriaroonrat B, Yoshida MC (1999) Intraspecific variation of mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene sequences of the Japanese marten *Martes melampus* and the sable *Martes zibellina* (Mustelidae, Carnivora, Mammalia) in Japan. Zool Sci 16: 693–700

Lambkin CL, Lee MSY, Winterton SL, Yeates DK (2002) Partitioned Bremer support and multiple trees. Cladistics 18: 436–444

Larget B, Simon DL (1999) Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms for the Bayesian analysis of phylogenetic trees. Mol Biol Evol 16: 750–759

Ledje C, Árnason Ú (1995) LINE-1 elements in carnivores. In "Phylogeny of Caniform Carnivores, with Specific Emphasis on Pinnipeds: A Study Based on Mitochondrial and Nuclear DNA" By C. Ledje, Doctoral Thesis, University of Lund, Lund, pp 1–13 (Paper II)

Ledje C, Árnason Ú (1996a) Phylogenetic analyses of complete cytochrome *b* genes of the order Carnivora with particular emphasis on the Caniformia. J Mol Evol 42: 135–144

Ledje C, Árnason Ú (1996b) Phylogenetic relationships within caniform carnivores based on analyses of the mitochondrial 12S rRNA gene. J Mol Evol 43: 641–649

Lee MSY (2000) Tree robustness and clade significance. Syst Biol 49: 829–836

Lee MSY, Hugall AF (2003) Partitioned likelihood support and the evaluation od data set conflict. Syst Biol 52: 15–22

Lento GM, Hickson RE, Chambers GK, Penny D (1995) Use of spectral analysis to test hypotheses on the origin of pinnipeds. Mol Biol Evol 12: 28–52

Leone CA, Wiens AL (1956) Comparative serology of carnivores. J Mammal 37: 11–23

Li W-H, Zharkikh A (1994) What is the bootstrap technique? Syst Biol 43: 424–430

Ling JK (1965) Functional significance of sweat glands and sebaceous glands in seals. Nature 208: 560–562

Ludwig EH, Blackhart BD, Pierotti VR, Caiati L, Fortier C, Knott T, Scott J, Mahley RW, Levy-Wilson B, McCarthy BJ (1987) DNA sequence of the human apolipoprotein B gene. DNA 6: 363–372

Masuda R, Yoshida MC (1994) A molecular phylogeny of the family Mustelidae (Mammalia, Carnivora), based on comparison of mitochondrial cytochrome *b* nucleotide sequences. Zool Sci 11: 605–612

Matthee CA, Burzlaff JD, Taylor JF, Davis SK (2001) Mining the mammalian genome for artiodactyl systematics. Syst Biol 50: 367–390

Mau B, Newton MA (1997) Phylogenetic inference for binary data on dendograms using Markov Chain Monte Carlo. J Comput Graph Stat 6:122–131

Mau B, Newton MA, Larget B (1999) Bayesian phylogenetic inference via Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. Biometrics 55: 1–12

McKenna MC (1987) Molecular and morphological analysis of high-level mammalian interrelationships. In "Molecules and Morphology in Evolution: Conflict or Compromise?" Ed by C Patterson, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 55–93

McKenna MC (1992) The alpha crystallin A chain of the eye lens and mammalian phylogeny. Ann Zool Fenn 28: 349–360

McKenna MC, Bell SK (1997) Classification of Mammals above the Species Level. Columbia University Press, New York

McLaren IA (1960) Are the Pinnipedia biphyletic? Syst Zool 9: 18–28

Mitchell E (1967) Controversy over diphyly in pinnipeds. Syst Zool 16: 350–351

Mitchell E, Tedford RH (1973) The Enaliarctinae, a new group of extinct aquatic Carnivora and a consideration of the origin of the Otariidae. Bull Am Mus Nat Hist 151: 201–284

Mivart SG (1885) Notes on the Pinnipedia. Proc Zool Soc Lond 1885: 484–501

Miyamoto MM, Goodman M (1986) Biomolecular systematics of eutherian mammals: Phylogenetic patterns and classification. Syst Zool 35: 230–240

Newton MA (1996) Bootstrapping phylogenies: Large deviations and dispersion effects. Biometrika 83: 315–328

Nojima T (1990) A morphological consideration of the relationships of pinnipeds to other carnivorans based on the bony tentorium and bony falx. Mar Mammal Sci 6: 54–74

Nylander JAA (2004) MrModeltest v2. Program distributed by the author. Evolutionary Biology Centre, Uppsala University, Uppsala

Pauly LK, Wolfe HR (1957) Serological relationships among members of the Order Carnivora. Zoologica 42: 159–166

Pavlinov IY (2003) Systematics of Recent mammals. Sborn Trud Zool Muz MGU 46: 3–293 (in Russian)

Pecon Slattery J, Murphy WJ, O'Brien SJ (2000) Patterns of diversity among SINE elements isolated from three Y-chromosome genes in carnivores. Mol Biol Evol 17: 825–829

Posada D, Crandall KA (1998) MODELTEST: Testing the model of DNA substitution. Bioinformatics 14: 817–818

Prager EM, Wilson AC (1978) Construction of phylogenetic trees for proteins and nucleic acids: Empirical evaluation of alternative matrix methods. J Mol Evol 11: 129–142

Prychitko TM, Moore WS (2000) Comparative evolution of the mitochondrial cytochrome *b* gene and nuclear β-fibrinogen intron 7 in woodpeckers. Mol Biol Evol 17: 1101–1111

Rannala B, Yang Z (1996) Probability distribution of molecular evolutionary trees: A new method of phylogenetic inference. J Mol Evol 43: 304–311

Ray CE (1976) Geography of phocid evolution. Syst Zool 25: 391–406

Repenning CA (1976) Adaptive evolution of sea lions and walruses. Syst Zool 25: 375–390

Repenning CA, Ray CE, Grigorescu D (1979) Pinniped biogeography. In "Historical Biogeography, Plate Tectonics, and the Changing Environment" Ed by J Gray and AJ Boucot, Oregon State University Press, Oregon

Romero-Herrera AE, Lehmann H, Joysey KA, Friday AE (1978) On the evolution of myoglobin. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B 283: 61–163

Ronquist F, Huelsenbeck JP (2003) MrBayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. Bioinformatics 19: 1572–1574

Sarich VM (1969a) Pinniped origins and the rate of evolution of carnivore albumins. Syst Zool 18: 286–295

Sarich VM (1969b) Pinniped phylogeny. Syst Zool 18: 416–422

Sarich VM (1976) Transferrin. In "'Chi-Chi'. The Giant Panda *Ailuropoda melanoleuca* at the London Zoo 1958–1972: A Scientific Study" Ed by LG Goodwin, Trans Zool Soc Lond 33 (2): 165–171

Sato JJ, Hosoda T, Wolsan M, Suzuki H (2004) Molecular phylogeny of arctoids (Mammalia: Carnivora) with emphasis on phylogenetic and taxonomic positions of the ferret-badgers and skunks. Zool Sci 21: 111–118

Sato JJ, Hosoda T, Wolsan M, Tsuchiya K, Yamamoto Y, Suzuki H (2003) Phylogenetic relationships and divergence times among mustelids (Mammalia: Carnivora) based on nucleotide sequences of the nuclear interphotoreceptor retinoid binding protein and mitochondrial cytochrome *b* genes. Zool Sci 20: 243–264

Savage RJG (1977) Evolution in carnivorous mammals. Palaeontology 20: 237–271

Schatz DG, Oettinger MA, Baltimore D (1989) The V(D)J recombination activating gene, RAG-1. Cell 59: 1035–1048

Schreiber A, Eulenberger K, Bauer K (1998) Immunogenetic evidence for the phylogenetic sister group relationship of dogs and bears (Mammalia, Carnivora: Canidae and Ursidae): A comparative determinant analysis of carnivoran albumin, C3 complement and immunoglobulin μ-chain. Exp Clin Immunogenet 15: 154–170

Seal US (1969) Carnivora systematics: A study of hemoglobins. Comp Biochem Physiol 31: 799–811

Seal US, Erickson AW, Siniff DB, Hofman RJ (1971) Biochemical, population genetic, phylogenetic and cytological studies of Antarctic seal species. In "Symposium on Antarctic Ice and Water Masses" Ed by G Deacon, Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, Cambridge, pp 77–95

Seal US, Phillips NI, Erickson AW (1970) Carnivora systematics: Immunological relationships of bear serum albumins. Comp Biochem Physiol 32: 33–48

Serizawa K, Suzuki H, Tsuchiya K (2000) A phylogenetic view on species radiation in *Apodemus* inferred from variation of nuclear and mitochondrial genes. Biochem Genet 38: 27–40

Shimodaira H., Hasegawa M (1999) Multiple comparisons of log-likelihoods with applications to phylogenetic inference. Mol Biol Evol 16: 1114–1116

Simmons MP, Pickett KM, Miya M (2004) How meaningful are Bayesian support values. Mol Biol Evol 21: 188–199

Slade RW, Moritz C, Heideman A (1994) Multiple nuclear-gene phylogenies: Application to pinnipeds and comparison with a mitochondrial DNA gene phylogeny. Mol Biol Evol 11: 341–356

Sorenson MD (1999) TreeRot, Version 2. Boston University, Boston

Springer MS, DeBry RW, Douady C, Amrine HM, Madsen O, de Jong WW, Stanhope MJ (2001) Mitochondrial versus nuclear gene sequences in deep-level mammalian phylogeny reconstruction. Mol Biol Evol 18: 132–143

Stanhope MJ, Bailey WJ, Czelusniak J, Goodman M, Si J-S, Nickerson J, Sgouros JG, Singer GAM, Kleinschmidt TK (1993) A molecular view of primate supraordinal relationships from the analysis of both nucleotide and amino acid sequences. In "Primates and Their Relatives in Phylogenetic Perspective" Ed by RDE MacPhee, Plenum Press, New York, pp 251–292

Stanhope MJ, Czelusniak J, Si J-S, Nickerson J, Goodman M (1992) A molecular perspective on mammalian evolution from the gene encoding interphotoreceptor retinoid binding protein, with convincing evidence for bat monophyly. Mol Phylogenet Evol 1: 148–160

Suzuki H, Tsuchiya K, Takezaki N (2000) A molecular phylogenetic framework for the Ryukyu endemic

rodents *Tokudaia osimensis* and *Diplothrix legata*. Mol Phylogenet Evol 15: 15–24

Suzuki Y, Glazko GV, Nei M (2002) Overcredibility of molecular phylogenies obtained by Bayesian phylogenetics. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 99: 16138–16143

Swofford DL (2002) PAUP*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and Other Methods). Version 4. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland

Tagle DA, Miyamoto MM, Goodman M, Hofmann O, Braunitzer G, Göltenboth R, Jalanka H (1986) Hemoglobin of pandas: Phylogenetic relationships of carnivores as ascertained with protein sequence data. Naturwissenschaften 73: 512–514

Talbot SL, Shields G.F (1996) A phylogeny of the bears (Ursidae) inferred from complete sequences of three mitochondrial genes. Mol Phylogenet Evol 5: 567–575

Tamura K, Nei M (1993) Estimation of the number of nucleotide substitutions in the control region of mitochondrial DNA in humans and chimpanzees. Mol Biol Evol 10: 512–526

Tedford RH (1976) Relationship of pinnipeds to other carnivores (Mammalia). Syst Zool 25: 363–374

Tedford RH, Barnes LG, Ray CE (1994) The early Miocene littoral ursoid carnivoran *Kolponomos*: Systematics and mode of life. Proc San Diego Soc Nat Hist 29: 11–32

Teeling EC, Scally M, Kao DJ, Romagnoli ML, Springer MS, Stanhope MJ (2000) Molecular evidence regarding the origin of echolocation and flight in bats. Nature 403: 188–192

Templeton AR (1983) Phylogenetic inference from restriction endonuclease cleavage site maps with particular reference to the evolution of humans and the apes. Evolution 37: 221–244

Vassetzky NS, Kramerov DA (2002) CAN—a pan-carnivore SINE family. Mammal Genome 13: 50–57

Vrana PB, Milinkovitch MC, Powell JR, Wheeler WC (1994) Higher level relationships of the arctoid Carnivora based on sequence data and "total evidence". Mol Phylogenet Evol 3: 47–58

Wayne RK, Benveniste RE, Janczewski DN, O'Brien SJ (1989) Molecular and biochemical evolution of the Carnivora. In "Carnivore Behavior, Ecology, and Evolution" Ed by JL Gittleman, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp 465–494

Weber M (1904) Die Säugetiere. Einführung in die Anatomie und Systematik der recenten und fossilen Mammalia. Verlag von Gustav Fischer, Jena

Werdelin L (1996) Carnivoran ecomorphology: A phylogenetic perspective. In "Carnivore Behavior, Ecology, and Evolution Vol 2" Ed by JL Gittleman, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp 582–624

Wiig Ø (1983) On the relationship of pinnipeds to other carnivores. Zool Scr 12: 225–227

Wilcox TP, Zwickl DJ, Heath TA, Hillis DM (2002) Phylogenetic relationships of the dwarf boas and a comparison of Bayesian and bootstrap measures of phylogenetic support. Mol Phylogenet Evol 25: 361–371

Wolsan M (1989) Drapieżne—Carnivora. In "Historia i Ewolucja Lądowej Fauny Polski" Ed by K Kowalski, Folia Quatern 59–60: 177–196

Wolsan M (1991) Pochodzenie i ewolucja ssaków morskich Polski. Przegl Zool 35: 261–268

Wolsan M (1993) Phylogeny and classification of early European Mustelida (Mammalia: Carnivora). Acta Theriol 38: 345–384

Wozencraft WC (1989) The phylogeny of the Recent Carnivora. In "Carnivore Behavior, Ecology, and Evolution" Ed by JL Gittleman, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp 495–535

Wyss AR (1987) The walrus auditory region and the monophyly of pinnipeds. Am Mus Novitates 2871: 1–31

Wyss AR (1988) Evidence from flipper structure for a single origin of pinnipeds. Nature 334: 427–428

Wyss AR (1989) Flippers and pinniped phylogeny: Has the problem of convergence been overrated? Mar Mammal Sci 5, 343–360

Wyss AR, Flynn JJ (1993) A phylogenetic analysis and definition of the Carnivora. In "Mammal Phylogeny: Placentals" Ed by FS Szalay, MJ Novacek, and MC McKenna, Springer Verlag, New York, pp 32–52

Yang Z, Rannala B (1997) Bayesian phylogenetic inference using DNA sequences: A Markov Chain Monte Carlo method. Mol Biol Evol 14: 717–724

Yang Z, Rannala B (2005) Branch-length prior influences Bayesian posterior probability of phylogeny. Syst Biol 54: 455–470

Yoder AD, Irwin JA, Payseur BA (2001) Failure of the ILD to determine data combinability for slow loris phylogeny. Syst Biol 50: 408–424

Yu L, Li Q-W, Ryder OA, Zhang Y-P (2004) Phylogenetic relationships within mammalian order Carnivora indicated by sequences of two nuclear DNA genes. Mol Phylogenet Evol 33: 694–705

Zehr SM, Nedbal MA, Flynn JJ (2001) Tempo and mode of evolution in an orthologous *Can* SINE. Mammal Genome 12: 38–44

Zhang Y-P, Ryder OA (1996) A molecular phylogeny of the Arctoidea. Chinese J Genet 23: 239–246

Zharkikh A (1994) Estimation of evolutionary distances between nucleotide sequences. J Mol Evol 39: 315–329

Zharkikh A, Li W-H (1992a) Statistical properties of bootstrap estimation of phylogenetic variability from

nucleotide sequences. I. Four taxa with a molecular clock. Mol Biol Evol 9: 1119–1147

Zharkikh A, Li W-H (1992b) Statistical properties of bootstrap estimation of phylogenetic variability from nucleotide sequences: II. Four taxa without a molecular clock. J Mol Evol 35: 356–366

Zharkikh A, Li W-H (1995) Estimation of confidence in phylogeny: The complete-and-partial bootstrap technique. Mol Phylogenet Evol 4: 44–63

Table 1. Taxon, organism, and gene sampling, with DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accession numbers

Taxon	Organism		Genes		
	Collection number[a]	Source location	APOB	IRBP	RAG1
Arctoidea					
Musteloidea					
Ailuridae					
Ailurus fulgens, red panda	JS191	Asa Zoological Park	AB193430[b]	AB188520[b]	AB188525[b]
Mephitidae					
Mephitis mephitis, striped skunk	HTS3	Obihiro Zoo	AB193406[b]	AB109331[c]	AB109358[c]
Mustelidae					
Enhydra lutris, sea otter	TH257	Alaska, USA	AB193403[b]	AB082978[d]	AB109355[c]
Gulo gulo, wolverine	TH150	Sakhalin, Russia	AB193407[b]	AB082962[d]	AB109340[c]
Martes americana, American marten	HS990	Maine, USA	AB193408[b]	AB082963[d]	AB109341[c]
Martes flavigula, yellow-throated marten	AK11	Primorye, Russia	AB193409[b]	AB082964[d]	AB109342[c]
Martes foina, stone or beech marten	HS1396	Thuringia, Germany	AB193410[b]	AB082965[d]	AB109343[c]
Martes martes, European pine marten	AK702	Moscow, Russia	AB193411[b]	AB082966[d]	AB109344[c]
Martes melampus, Japanese marten	HS517	Wakayama, Honshu, Japan	—	AB082967[d]	—
	HS523	Kumamoto, Honshu, Japan	AB208514[b]	—	AB208515[b]
Martes zibellina, sable	TH47	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193412[b]	AB109329[c]	AB109345[c]
Meles meles, Eurasian badger	TH223	Thuringia, Germany	AB193404[b]	AB082979[d]	AB109356[c]
Melogale moschata, Chinese ferret-badger	AK703	Vietnam	AB193405[b]	AB109330[c]	AB109357[c]
Mustela altaica, mountain weasel	AK805	Altai region, Russia	AB193413[b]	AB082968[d]	AB109346[c]
Mustela erminea, stoat or ermine	TH106	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193414[b]	AB082969[d]	AB109347[c]
Mustela eversmanii, steppe polecat	HS2169	Chita region, Russia	AB193415[b]	AB082970[d]	AB109348[c]

Mustela furo, domestic ferret	TH27	experimental animal	AB193418[b]	AB082974[d]	AB109351[c]
Mustela lutreola, European mink	AK13	Novosibirsk, Russia	AB193416[b]	AB082972[d]	AB109349[c]
Mustela nivalis, least weasel	HS686	Aomori, Honshu, Japan	AB193417[b]	AB082973[d]	AB109350[c]
Mustela putorius, European polecat	AK720	Moscow, Russia	AB193419[b]	AB082975[d]	AB109352[c]
Mustela sibirica, Siberian weasel	TH98	Wakayama, Honshu, Japan	AB193420[b]	AB082976[d]	AB109353[c]
Mustela vison, American mink	TH49	Hokkaido, Japan[e]	AB193421[b]	AB082977[d]	AB109354[c]
Procyonidae					
Procyon cancrivorus, crab-eating raccoon	HS1423	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193426[b]	AB109332[c]	AB109360[c]
Procyon lotor, northern raccoon	KT2994	Miyazaki, Kyushu, Japan[e]	AB193427[b]	AB082981[d]	AB109359[c]
Pinnipedia					
Otariidae					
Callorhinus ursinus, northern fur seal	JS186	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193422[b]	AB188516[b]	AB188521[b]
Eumetopias jubatus, Steller sea lion	NT02-01	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193423[b]	AB188517[b]	AB188522[b]
Phocidae					
Phoca largha, spotted seal	NG02-02	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193424[b]	AB188519[b]	AB188524[b]
Phoca vitulina, harbor seal	NZ02-43	Hokkaido, Japan	AB193425[b]	AB188518[b]	AB188523[b]
Ursidae					
Melursus ursinus, sloth bear	HS1421	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193428[b]	AB109334[c]	AB109362[c]
Ursus arctos, brown bear	HS1420	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193429[b]	AB109333[c]	AB109361[c]
Aeluroidea					
Felidae					
Leopardus pardalis, ocelot	HS1229	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193431[b]	AB109335[c]	AB109363[c]
Panthera leo, lion	HS1205	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193432[b]	AB109336[c]	AB109364[c]
Panthera pardus, leopard	HS1203	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193433[b]	AB109337[c]	AB109365[c]

Panthera tigris, tiger	HS1201	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193434[b]	AB109338[c]	AB109366[c]
Viverridae					
Paguma larvata, masked palm civet	HS1198	Yokohama City Zoo	AB193435[b]	AB109339[c]	AB109367[c]

[a] Numbers refer to DNA or tissue samples stored by Alexei P. Kryukov, Institute of Biology and Soil Science, Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok (AK); Hitoshi Suzuki (HS, HT); Jun J. Sato (JS); Kimiyuki Tsuchiya, Faculty of Agriculture, Tokyo University of Agriculture, Atsugi (KT); Mari Kobayashi (NG, NT, NZ); and Tetsuji Hosoda (TH).

[b] New DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accessions, this study.

[c] Reference: Sato *et al.* (2004).

[d] Reference: Sato *et al.* (2003).

[e] Introduced.

Table 2. Primers used for DNA amplification and sequencing

Gene	Primer name[a]	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Reference
APOB	APOB-F8487	GTGCCAGGTTCAATCAGTATAAGT	Amrine-Madsen *et al.* (2003, 187F)
	APOB-F9287	TATAACCAGTCAGATATTGTTGCT	This study
	APOB-R9324	GGTGCCCTCTAATTTGTACTGCAG	This study
	APOB-R9826	CCAGCAAAATTTTCTTTTACTTCAA	Jiang *et al.* (1998), Amrine-Madsen *et al.* (2003, J1R)
IRBP	+IRBP217	ATGGCCAAGGTCCTCTTGGATAACTACTGCTT	Stanhope *et al.* (1992)
	–IRBP1531	CGCAGGTCCATGATGAGGTGCTCCGTGTCCTG	Stanhope *et al.* (1992)
	R +IRBP335	CAGGAAACAGCTATGACCCATCTCAGACCCTCAGACGCT	Serizawa *et al.* (2000)
	R +IRBP724	CAGGAAACAGCTATGACCCCTGCACGTGGACACCATCT	Sato *et al.* (2003)
	R +IRBP1085	CAGGAAACAGCTATGACCAGAGAAGGCCCTGGCCATCCT	Suzuki *et al.* (2000)
	U –IRBP734	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTTCTCTGTGGTGGTGTTGGAGG	Serizawa *et al.* (2000)
	U –IRBP1145	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTGCGGTCCACCAGCGTGTAGT	Sato *et al.* (2003)
	U –IRBP1532	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTTGATGAGGTGCTCCGTGTCCT	Suzuki *et al.* (2000)
RAG1	RAG1-F1842	GCTTTGATGGACATGGAAGAAGACAT	Teeling *et al.* (2000, RAG1F1705)
	RAG1-F1851	ACATGGAAGAAGACATCTTGGAAGG	Sato *et al.* (2004)
	RAG1-F2357	AGCCTCCCAAAATCTTGTCTTCCACTCCA	Sato *et al.* (2004)
	RAG1-R2486	AATGTCACAGTGAAGGGCATCTATGGAAGG	Sato *et al.* (2004)
	RAG1-R2951	GAGCCATCCCTCTCAATAATTTCAGG	Teeling *et al.* (2000, RAG1R2864)

[a] Orientation of the primer is indicated by "F" or "+" (forward) or "R" or "–" (reverse). Numbers refer to the location of the 3' end of the primer in the human reference sequence (APOB: DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accession M19828 [Ludwig *et al.*, 1987]; IRBP: J05253 [Fong *et al.*, 1990]; RAG1: M29474 [Schatz *et al.*, 1989]).

Table 3. Sequence-composition statistics for the arctoid APOB, IRBP, and RAG1 gene segments

Parameter	APOB				IRBP				RAG1			
	Codon positions			Total	Codon positions			Total	Codon positions			Total
	First	Second	Third		First	Second	Third		First	Second	Third	
Length, base pairs	316	316	316	948	395	395	395	1185	365	365	365	1095
Variable sites: number (%)	49 (26.2)	38 (20.3)	100 (53.5)	187 (100)	54 (20.7)	36 (13.8)	171 (65.5)	261 (100)	15 (7.9)	16 (8.5)	158 (83.6)	189 (100)
Parsimony-informative sites: number (%)	27 (25.5)	25 (23.6)	54 (50.9)	106 (100)	33 (18.9)	23 (13.1)	119 (68.0)	175 (100)	11 (8.7)	9 (7.1)	107 (84.3)	127 (100)
Empirical frequency of A, %	39.4	34.1	24.9	32.8	20.5	24.9	7.9	17.8	29.1	34.7	15.4	26.4
Empirical frequency of C, %	14.2	27.6	23.9	21.9	29.2	24.3	42.4	32.0	20.8	20.6	33.3	24.9
Empirical frequency of G, %	23.8	10.8	19.1	17.9	38.7	19.5	37.9	32.1	31.8	16.7	31.4	26.6
Empirical frequency of T, %	22.6	27.5	32.1	27.4	11.6	31.2	11.8	18.2	18.3	28.0	19.9	22.0

Table 4. Statistics for the strict-consensus trees inferred from maximum-parsimony analyses of the separate and combined datasets

Dataset	Equally most-parsimonious trees	Tree length	CI[a]	RI[b]	DD[c]
APOB	16	239	0.776	0.927	0.917
IRBP	24	429	0.655	0.881	0.860
RAG1	60	334	0.647	0.882	0.864
APOB+IRBP+RAG1	7	1009	0.674	0.891	0.873

[a] Consistency index (Kluge and Farris, 1969) for parsimony-informative substitutions.

[b] Retention index (Archie, 1989, HERM; Farris, 1989).

[c] Data decisiveness (Goloboff, 1991).

Table 5. Negative log-likelihoods (–lnL) of the most-likely tree topologies, the best-fit nucleotide-substitution models, and model parameter values for maximum-likelihood analyses of the separate and combined datasets

Dataset	–lnL	Model[a]	Parameters[b]												
			Nucleotide frequencies				α	I	Ti/Tv	Substitution rates					
			A	C	G	T				A↔C	A↔G	A↔T	C↔G	C↔T	G↔T
APOB	3327.70595	HKY+Γ	0.328	0.218	0.183	0.271	0.835	0.000	3.318	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
IRBP	4602.52518	HKY+I+Γ	0.192	0.307	0.308	0.193	0.694	0.454	3.286	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RAG1	3787.13508	TrNef+I+Γ	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.730	0.525	n/a	1.000	5.148	1.000	1.000	9.053	1.000
APOB+IRBP+RAG1	11958.40983	TrNef+I+Γ	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.250	0.816	0.417	n/a	1.000	5.831	1.000	1.000	7.101	1.000

[a] HKY, Hasegawa-Kishino-Yano (Hasegawa *et al.*, 1985); Γ, gamma distribution of variable sites; I, proportion of invariable sites; TrNef, Tamura-Nei (Tamura and Nei, 1993) equal frequencies.

[b] α, gamma-distribution shape parameter; I, proportion of invariable sites; Ti/Tv, transition/transversion ratio.

Table 6. Comparison of clade support, topological resolution, and phylogenetic congruence among the trees of Figs. 1–4. Bootstrap proportions (maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood) or posterior probabilities (Bayesian inference) are given for the recovered clades. Dashes indicate that a particular clade was not recovered

Clade		Datasets and optimality criteria[a]												Ref. Nos. of contradictory clades
Ref. No.[b]	Name	APOB			IRBP			RAG1			APOB+IRBP+RAG1			
		MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI	
1	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo*	—	—	0.50	64	65	1.00	—	—	—	63	68	1.00	
2	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii*	83	78	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	92	95	1.00	
3	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica*	—	—	—	97	95	1.00	—	—	—	98	99	1.00	
4	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola*	—	—	—	74	87	0.98	98	98	1.00	100	100	1.00	
5	*Mustela altaica* + *M. nivalis*	—	—	—	63	63	0.77	—	—	—	58	60	0.79	
6	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis*	—	—	—	94	94	1.00	—	—	—	94	97	1.00	
7	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis* + *M. erminea*	87	82	0.97	90	95	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
8	*Mustela*	98	96	1.00	100	100	1.00	95	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
9	*Mustela* + *Enhydra*	99	95	1.00	99	100	1.00	77	82	0.99	100	100	1.00	
10	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale*	—	—	—	84	84	0.95	—	—	—	79	58	0.92	11
11	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Meles*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55	0.89	—	—	—	10, 21
12	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale* + *Meles*	—	—	—	—	60	0.59	—	59	0.82	—	61	—	21
13	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus*	90	83	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	52	51	0.96	14, 15
14	*Martes martes* + *M. americana*	—	—	—	—	46	0.60	—	—	—	—	—	—	13, 16
15	*Martes zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. foina*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	65	0.95	—	—	—	13
16	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. foina*	—	60	0.90	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	57	0.99	14
17	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. americana* + *M. foina*	72	59	0.96	84	85	1.00	67	60	0.77	98	100	1.00	
18	*Martes*	—	—	—	—	57	0.74	—	69	0.82	—	—	—	19

19	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. americana* + *M. foina* + *Gulo*	76	88	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	53	0.96	18
20	*Martes* + *Gulo*	63	72	0.99	85	92	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
21	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale* + *Martes* + *Gulo*	95	86	0.99	—	—	—	—	—	—	68	—	0.86	11, 12
22	Mustelidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
23	Procyonidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
24	Mustelidae + Procyonidae	55	46	0.51	92	100	1.00	—	—	—	93	93	1.00	25
25	Procyonidae + Ailuridae	—	—	—	—	—	—	67	89	0.99	—	—	—	24
26	Mustelidae + Procyonidae + Ailuridae	—	—	—	60	84	0.98	61	60	0.62	58	90	0.97	27
27	Ailuridae + Mephitidae	69	51	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26
28	Musteloidea	81	90	1.00	99	100	1.00	87	93	1.00	100	100	1.00	
29	Phocidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
30	Otariidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
31	Pinnipedia	99	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	99	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
32	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia	—	65	0.71	78	51	0.67	83	—	0.53	95	70	0.83	
33	Ursidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
34	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia + Ursidae	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
35	*Panthera tigris* + *P. pardus*	64	62	0.93	—	—	—	—	—	—	64	65	0.94	
36	*Panthera*	99	100	1.00	100	98	1.00	95	94	1.00	100	100	1.00	
37	*Panthera* + *Leopardus*	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	100	100	1.00	
Number of recovered clades		22	24	24	24	27	27	19	22	23	28	30	30	
Number of shared clades[c]		20	22	24	24	25	24	18	18	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	

[a] MP, maximum parsimony; ML, maximum likelihood; BI, Bayesian inference.

[b] Clade reference numbers correspond to those shown in Figs. 1–4.

[c] Number of the recovered clades that are shared with the APOB+IRBP+RAG1 tree inferred under the same optimality criterion.

Table 7. Bremer support and partitioned Bremer support values for clades recovered in the strict-consensus tree inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis of the combined APOB, IRBP, and RAG1 datasets (Fig. 4A)

Clade		Bremer support	Partitioned Bremer support		
Ref. No.[a]	Name		APOB	IRBP	RAG1
1	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo*	1	+0.0	+1.0	–0.0
2	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii*	2	+1.0	+1.0	0
3	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica*	3	0	+3.0	0
4	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola*	5	0	+1.0	+4.0
5	*Mustela altaica* + *M. nivalis*	1	0	+1.0	0
6	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis*	4	+0.0	+4.0	–0.0
7	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis* + *M. erminea*	10	+1.6	+3.0	+5.4
8	*Mustela*	16	+5.8	+6.0	+4.2
9	*Mustela* + *Enhydra*	14	+7.6	+7.0	–0.6
10	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale*	3	+1.1	+2.5	–0.6
13	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus*	1	+2.3	–0.5	–0.7
17	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. americana* + *M. foina*	4	+3.6	0	+0.4
20	*Martes* + *Gulo*	10	+1.6	+2.0	+6.4
21	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale* + *Martes* + *Gulo*	2	+3.0	0	–1.0
22	Mustelidae	40	+8.6	+17.0	+14.4
23	Procyonidae	53	+13.0	+25.0	+15.0
24	Mustelidae + Procyonidae	6	–0.4	+5.0	+1.4
26	Mustelidae + Procyonidae + Ailuridae	1	–2.0	+2.0	+1.0
28	Musteloidea	21	+4.0	+9.0	+8.0
29	Phocidae	30	+10.0	+13.5	+6.5
30	Otariidae	24	+6.0	+8.0	+10.0
31	Pinnipedia	25	+7.0	+11.0	+7.0
32	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia	6	–0.5	+3.0	+3.5
33	Ursidae	60	+17.0	+21.0	+22.0
34	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia + Ursidae	84	+29.0	+21.0	+34.0
35	*Panthera tigris* + *P. pardus*	1	+1.0	0	–0.0
36	*Panthera*	14	+4.6	+5.0	+4.4
37	*Panthera* + *Leopardus*	63	+22.5	+22.5	+18.0
Total		504	+147.4	+194.0	+162.7
Percent of total		100	29.2	38.5	32.3

[a] Clade reference numbers correspond to those shown in Fig. 4A.

Table 8. Likelihood support and partitioned likelihood support values for clades recovered in the most-likely tree inferred from maximum-likelihood analysis of the combined APOB, IRBP, and RAG1 datasets (Fig. 4B)

Clade		Likelihood support	Partitioned likelihood support		
Ref. No.[a]	Name		APOB	IRBP	RAG1
1	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo*	9.56	–0.99	+8.12	+2.43
2	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii*	14.19	+16.42	–2.40	+0.17
3	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica*	8.30	+0.01	+9.56	–1.27
4	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola*	21.98	–0.13	+4.32	+17.79
5	*Mustela altaica* + *M. nivalis*	1.47	+0.18	+1.72	–0.42
6	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis*	14.09	+0.31	+14.59	–0.81
7	*Mustela putorius* + *M. furo* + *M. eversmanii* + *M. sibirica* + *M. lutreola* + *M. altaica* + *M. nivalis* + *M. erminea*	26.79	–0.13	+10.63	+16.29
8	*Mustela*	53.83	+22.10	+17.01	+14.73
9	*Mustela* + *Enhydra*	33.91	+14.56	+18.64	+0.71
10	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale*	0.45	+0.04	+3.65	–3.24
12	*Mustela* + *Enhydra* + *Melogale* + *Meles*	0.13	–4.29	+1.66	+2.76
13	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus*	3.11	+8.58	+0.54	–6.02
16	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. foina*	3.62	+2.77	–8.25	+9.10
17	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. americana* + *M. foina*	17.45	–1.22	+14.08	+4.59
19	*Martes martes* + *M. zibellina* + *M. melampus* + *M. americana* + *M. foina* + *Gulo*	1.44	+5.98	–1.28	–3.25
20	*Martes* + *Gulo*	31.76	+6.75	+6.13	+18.88
22	Mustelidae	117.25	+33.06	+39.01	+45.17
23	Procyonidae	139.71	+42.52	+53.26	+43.93
24	Mustelidae + Procyonidae	9.37	–3.24	+13.23	–0.62
26	Mustelidae + Procyonidae + Ailuridae	5.10	–4.94	+6.01	+4.03
28	Musteloidea	52.26	+13.12	+20.95	+18.20
29	Phocidae	62.39	+27.88	+25.34	+9.17
30	Otariidae	58.07	+17.29	+14.41	+26.37
31	Pinnipedia	63.50	+15.99	+35.12	+12.39
32	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia	0.91	+0.55	+0.20	+0.16
33	Ursidae	138.76	+37.13	+54.12	+47.50
34	Musteloidea + Pinnipedia + Ursidae	178.26	+52.13	+50.74	+75.39
35	*Panthera tigris* + *P. pardus*	5.84	+2.27	+1.89	+1.67
36	*Panthera*	34.59	+6.93	+14.85	+12.80
37	*Panthera* + *Leopardus*	95.72	+31.06	+37.60	+27.06

Total	1203.81	+342.69	+465.45	+395.66
Percent of total	100	28.5	38.7	32.9

[a] Clade reference numbers correspond to those shown in Fig. 4B.

Table 9. Occurrence of conflicting mutually-exclusive clades suggesting significant (above diagonal) and insignificant (below diagonal) phylogenetic incongruences between any of the trees in Figs. 1–4. The significance assessment is based on a comparison of the strength of bootstrap or posterior probability support between the self-contradictory clades. Asterisks indicate clades with a bootstrap proportion of ≥ 70% (MP, ML) or a posterior probability of ≥ 0.95 (BI). Incongruences with both self-contradictory clades designated by an asterisk are considered significant. Clade reference numbers correspond to those given in Figs. 1–4 and Table 6.

Dataset	Optimality criterion[a]	Datasets and optimality criteria[a]											
		APOB			IRBP			RAG1			APOB+IRBP+RAG1		
		MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI	MP	ML	BI
APOB	MP	–								13* vs. 15*			
	ML		–							13* vs. 15*			
	BI			–						13* vs. 15*			
IRBP	MP	26 vs. 27	26 vs. 27		–				24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*			
	ML	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 18 vs. 19* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19*		–			24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*			
	BI	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 18 vs. 19* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19*			–		24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*			
RAG1	MP	24 vs. 25 26 vs. 27	24 vs. 25 26 vs. 27	24 vs. 25	24* vs. 25	24* vs. 25	24* vs. 25	–					
	ML	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 13* vs.15 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25* 26 vs. 27	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 15 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25* 26 vs. 27	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 13* vs. 15 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25*	10* vs. 11	10* vs. 11	10* vs. 11		–		24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*

	BI	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25* 26 vs. 27	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25* 26 vs. 27	11 vs. 21* 12 vs. 21* 18 vs. 19* 24 vs. 25*	10* vs. 11	10* vs. 11	10* vs. 11			–	24* vs. 25*	24* vs. 25*	13* vs. 15* 24* vs. 25*	
APOB+IRBP+RAG1	MP	26 vs. 27	26 vs. 27			12 vs. 21 13 vs. 14	12 vs. 21 13 vs. 14	24* vs. 25	10* vs. 11 11 vs. 21 12 vs. 21 13 vs. 15	10* vs. 11 11 vs. 21 12 vs. 21 13 vs. 15*	–			
	ML	12 vs. 21* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21* 26* vs. 27	12 vs. 21*		13 vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19	13 vs. 14 14 vs. 16 18 vs. 19	24* vs. 25	10 vs. 11 13 vs. 15 18 vs. 19	10 vs. 11 13 vs. 15* 18 vs. 19	12 vs. 21	–		
	BI	26* vs. 27	26* vs. 27			12 vs. 21 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16* 18 vs. 19*	12 vs. 21 13* vs. 14 14 vs. 16* 18 vs. 19*	24* vs. 25	10 vs. 11 11 vs. 21 12 vs. 21 13* vs. 15 18 vs. 19*	10 vs. 11 11 vs. 21 12 vs. 21 18 vs. 19*		12 vs. 21	–	

[a] MP, maximum parsimony; ML, maximum likelihood; BI, Bayesian inference.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Phylogenetic position of pinnipeds based on the APOB dataset. **A**, strict consensus tree inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis (for tree statistics, see Table 4). **B**, single most-likely tree inferred from maximum-likelihood analysis (for log-likelihood, substitution model, and model parameters, see Table 5). **C**, 50% majority-rule consensus tree inferred from Bayesian-inference analysis. Numbers at nodes are the reference numbers for the respective clades. Maximum-parsimony and -likelihood bootstrap support and Bayesian-inference posterior-probability values for recovered clades are given in Table 6.

Fig. 2. Phylogenetic position of pinnipeds based on the IRBP dataset. **A**, strict consensus tree inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis (for tree statistics, see Table 4). **B**, single most-likely tree inferred from maximum-likelihood analysis (for log-likelihood, substitution model, and model parameters, see Table 5). **C**, 50% majority-rule consensus tree inferred from Bayesian-inference analysis. Numbers at nodes are the reference numbers for the respective clades. Maximum-parsimony and -likelihood bootstrap support and Bayesian-inference posterior-probability values for recovered clades are given in Table 6.

Fig. 3. Phylogenetic position of pinnipeds based on the RAG1 dataset. **A**, strict consensus tree inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis (for tree statistics, see Table 4). **B**, single most-likely tree inferred from maximum-likelihood analysis (for log-likelihood, substitution model, and model parameters, see Table 5). **C**, 50% majority-rule consensus tree inferred from Bayesian-inference analysis. Numbers at nodes are the reference numbers for the respective clades. Maximum-parsimony and -likelihood bootstrap support and Bayesian-inference posterior-probability values for recovered clades are given in Table 6.

Fig. 4. Phylogenetic position of pinnipeds based on the combined (APOB+IRBP+RAG1) dataset. **A**, strict consensus tree inferred from maximum-parsimony analysis (for tree statistics, see Table 4). **B**, single most-likely tree inferred from maximum-likelihood analysis (for log-likelihood, substitution model, and model parameters, see Table 5). **C**, 50% majority-rule consensus tree inferred from Bayesian-inference analysis. Numbers at nodes are the reference numbers for the respective clades. Maximum-parsimony and -likelihood bootstrap support and Bayesian-inference posterior-probability values for recovered clades are given in Table 6, Bremer-support values in Table 7, and likelihood-support values in Table 8.

Fig. 5. Comparison of the levels of homoplasy among the arctoid nuclear APOB, IRBP, and RAG1 and mitochondrial cytochrome *b* genes, assessed by plotting the pairwise number of observed substitutions against the corresponding pairwise number of inferred substitutions (Hassanin *et al.*, 1998). Solid lines are the linear regressions ($y = ax + b$) delineated with the coefficient of determination (R^2), which are used to evaluate the actual level of homoplasy. Broken lines correspond to a theoretical situation where there is no homoplasy ($y = x$). For the nuclear genes, pairwise comparisons among the sequences from the studied 29 arctoid species were performed. The species and DDBJ/EMBL/GenBank accessions used to calculate the cytochrome *b* scatterplot, and references for these sequences, are as follows: *Ailurus fulgens*, X94919[a]; *Mephitis mephitis*, X94927[a]; *Enhydra lutris*, AB051244[b]; *Gulo gulo*, AB051245[b]; *Martes americana*, AB051234[b]; *Martes flavigula*, AB051235[b]; *Martes foina*, AB051236[b]; *Martes martes*, AB051237[b]; *Martes melampus*, AB051238[b]; *Martes zibellina*, AB012360 (Kurose *et al.*, 1999); *Meles meles*, X94922[a]; *Melogale moschata*, AF498158 (Koepfli and Wayne, 2003); *Mustela altaica*, AB051239[b]; *Mustela erminea*, AB051240[b]; *Mustela eversmanii*, AB026102[c]; *Mustela furo*, AB026103[c]; *Mustela lutreola*, AB026105[c]; *Mustela nivalis*, AB051241[b]; *Mustela putorius*, AB026107[c]; *Mustela sibirica*, AB051242[b]; *Mustela vison*, AF057129 (Koepfli and Wayne, 1998); *Procyon lotor*, X94930[a]; *Eumetopias jubatus*, NC_004030 (Árnason *et al.*, 2002); *Phoca largha*, X82305 (Árnason *et al.*, 1995); *Phoca vitulina*, NC_001325 (Árnason and Johnsson, 1992); *Melursus ursinus*, U23562 (Talbot and Shields, 1996); *Ursus arctos*, NC_003427 (Delisle and Strobeck, 2002). [a] Ledje and Árnason (1996a), [b] Hosoda *et al.* (2000), [c] Kurose *et al.* (2000).


A
Maximum parsimony
Mustela putorius
Mustela furo
Mustela eversmanii
Mustela sibirica
Mustela lutreola
Mustela altaica
Mustela nivalis
Mustela erminea
Mustela vison
Enhydra lutris
Melogale moschata
Martes martes
Martes zibellina
Martes melampus
Martes americana
Martes foina
Gulo gulo
Martes flavigula
Meles meles
Procyon lotor
Procyon cancrivorus
Ailurus fulgens
Mephitis mephitis
Phoca vitulina
Phoca largha
Eumetopias jubatus
Callorhinus ursinus
Ursus arctos
Melursus ursinus
Panthera tigris
Panthera pardus
Panthera leo
Leopardus pardalis
Paguma larvata
Mustelidae
Procyonidae
Ailuridae
Mephitidae
Phocidae
Otariidae
Musteloidea
Pinnipedia
Ursidae
Outgroups
B
Maximum likelihood
0.005 substitutions/site
C
Bayesian inference

Fig.1 APOB


A
Maximum parsimony
B
Maximum likelihood
0.005 substitutions/site
C
Bayesian inference
Mustela putorius
Mustela furo
Mustela eversmanii
Mustela sibirica
Mustela lutreola
Mustela altaica
Mustela nivalis
Mustela erminea
Mustela vison
Enhydra lutris
Melogale moschata
Meles meles
Martes martes
Martes americana
Martes zibellina
Martes melampus
Martes foina
Martes flavigula
Gulo gulo
Procyon lotor
Procyon cancrivorus
Ailurus fulgens
Mephitis mephitis
Phoca vitulina
Phoca largha
Eumetopias jubatus
Callorhinus ursinus
Ursus arctos
Melursus ursinus
Panthera tigris
Panthera pardus
Panthera leo
Leopardus pardalis
Paguma larvata
Mustelidae
Procyonidae
Ailuridae
Mephitidae
Phocidae
Otariidae
Musteloidea
Pinnipedia
Ursidae
Outgroups

Fig.2 IRBP


A
Maximum parsimony
Mustela putorius
Mustela furo
Mustela eversmanii
Mustela sibirica
Mustela lutreola
Mustela altaica
Mustela nivalis
Mustela erminea
Mustela vison
Enhydra lutris
Melogale moschata
Martes martes
Martes zibellina
Martes melampus
Martes americana
Martes foina
Martes flavigula
Gulo gulo
Meles meles
Procyon lotor
Procyon cancrivorus
Ailurus fulgens
Mephitis mephitis
Phoca vitulina
Phoca largha
Eumetopias jubatus
Callorhinus ursinus
Ursus arctos
Melursus ursinus
Panthera tigris
Panthera pardus
Panthera leo
Leopardus pardalis
Paguma larvata
Mustelidae
Procyonidae
Ailuridae
Mephitidae
Phocidae
Otariidae
Musteloidea
Pinnipedia
Ursidae
Outgroups
B
Maximum likelihood
0.005 substitutions/site
C
Bayesian inference

Fig.3 RAG1



Fig.4 Combined


APOB
y = 0.88x + 0.96
R² = 0.98
IRBP
y = 0.77x + 2.83
R² = 0.97
RAG1
y = 0.73x + 2.41
R² = 0.95
Cytochrome b
y = 0.36x + 34.20
R² = 0.70
Observed substitutions
Inferred substitutions

Fig. 5