1 Multiple, solid evidence support that *Austropotamobius italicus* is not

2 native to Spain

3 Miguel Clavero^{1,*} and Alejandro Centeno-Cuadros²

4

5 ¹Estación Biológica de Doñana-CSIC, Americo Vespucio s.n., 41092 Sevilla, Spain

- 6 ²University Pablo de Olavide, Department of Molecular Biology & Biochemical Engineering, Seville, Spain
- 7 * Corresponding author: miguelclavero@ebd.csic.es

8

9 On July 14th 2015 a review work on the status of *Austropotamobius* crayfish in Spain co-

10 authored by us (Clavero *et al.*, 2016) was first made available online and B. Matallanas and

11 collaborators first submitted a manuscript to Organisms Diversity & Evolution, which has been

12 recently published (Matallanas *et al.*, 2016). Our work had concluded that the knowledge

13 generated by disparate scientific disciplines robustly converged to indicate that

14 Austropotamobius italicus is non-native species in Spain, but Matallanas et al. (2016) argue that

15 *A. italicus* is native to Spain, where it has been present since the Late Pleistocene. Here, we

16 question the conclusions of Matallanas *et al.* (2016) regarding the status of *A. italicus* in Spain.

First, we point out that the mono-disciplinary approach followed by Matallanas *et al.* (2016) is much weaker than the transdisciplinary approach used and advocated by Clavero *et al.* (2016).

19 Second, we believe that the genetic patterns presented by Matallanas *et al.* (2016) are

20 inappropriate to discuss the hypothetical nativeness of Spanish *A. italicus*.

21 Don't discredit transdisciplinary science

22 Clavero et al. (2016) collected evidences from several disciplines, including taxonomy, genetics 23 and phylogeography, history, linguistics, biogeography, ecology, coevolution and even 24 gastronomy and pharmacy, to show that multiple independent patterns converged robustly to 25 support the non-native status of A. italicus in Spain. We provided explicit references to the 26 historical absence of crayfish in Spain, made by Ulisse Aldrovandi, the greatest naturalist of the 27 16th century worldwide, who had first-hand knowledge of Spain. We transcribed the abundant 28 diplomatic correspondence between Spanish and Tuscan courts negotiating the import of A. 29 italicus, which finally took place in 1588. This Tuscan origin of Spanish A. italicus is perfectly 30 congruent with the current geographic distribution of the different subspecies of A. italicus (e.g., 31 Pedraza-Lara et al., 2010), which is difficultly understandable as a result of purely natural 32 dispersion events. After its introduction crayfish was mentioned by its Italian name in Spain, 33 since the animal lacked a Spanish name. We highlighted the lack of ecto-symbiotic 34 branchiobdellidans in Spanish A. italicus, which would be caused by the long-distance 35 transportation from Italy. We also reviewed and analysed mtDNA sequences available to date 36 from Spain and Italy, showing that they supported the non-native status of Spanish A. italicus. 37 Clavero et al. (2016) proposed that transdisciplinary approaches surpass single-discipline ones 38 in producing new understanding, a statement that is equally valid for the A. italicus case and

several others. But Matallanas *et al.* (2016) seem to suggest that knowledge should be

40 prioritized in terms of some ranking of disciplines: "taking into account the serious constraints for

finding and giving a reliable interpretation of historical documents, genetic evidence should

42 prevail if both lead to different conclusions". The problems with this statement are that historical

43 documents are neither scarce nor that difficult to interpret and that constraints are present in all

disciplines. Historians could follow the rationale of Matallanas *et al.* (2016) and argue that given

the methodological and analytical problems of associated to genetic studies (e.g., Karl *et al.*,

- 46 2012), historical evidences should prevail whenever they are contradicted by genetic results,
- 47 but this, of course, makes no sense. For the sake of knowledge building, scholars should avoid

identifying "winning" and "losing" scientific disciplines and rely more in transdisciplinary learning
 and collaborations (e.g., Szabó & Hedl, 2011). The work of archaeologists, linguists,

50 biogeographers or anthropologists may provide an essential context to interpret patterns in

51 genetic variability. An illustrating example is provided by Seixas et al. (2014), who analysed the

52 history of rabbit (*Oryctolagus cunniculus*) introduction into the island of Mallorca (Spain) based

53 on the variability of the control region of the mtDNA. They found a highly differentiated

54 haplotype group, found exclusively in Mallorca, which had diverged from other up to 170,000

55 years BP. However, the authors did not propose that rabbit had been present in Majorca since

the Middle Pleistocene, because thanks to non-genetic works (e.g. Alcover, 2008) they actually

57 *knew* that rabbits could have arrived to Mallorca only after at least 4,300 years BP, when

58 humans first landed in the island. Consequently, Seixas *et al.* (2014) did not use their genetic 59 results to guestion the knowledge about the deep history of the Balearic Islands, adapting their

60 interpretation accordingly instead.

61 Wrong sampling for the question posed

62 The work by Matallanas et al. (2016) had two main aims: i) "to study the phylogeographic 63 relationships among Spanish white-clawed crayfish [A. italicus] populations"; and ii) "to review 64 the genetic data available regarding their natural or human-mediated origin". The design of the 65 study was accurate for the first aim, but inappropriate for the second. The authors analysed 25 66 A. italicus populations, 24 of which were Spanish, while only one was Italian. This design is not 67 suitable either to obtain conclusions about the relationships of Spanish and Italian populations 68 or to disentangle the real origin of the Spanish populations. If relying on genetic data, the 69 ascertainment of the origin of Spanish A. italicus must be unavoidably addressed with a relevant 70 representation of Italian populations. Failing to characterise comprehensively the genetic 71 variability in putative donor precludes trustable discussion on the status of putatively introduced 72 populations (Bonett et al., 2007). Nonetheless, even well designed genetic studies might be 73 unable to discern the status of Spanish A. italicus, because a relevant part of the genetic 74 diversity of Italian populations could have been lost due to the collapse of the species (Clavero 75 et al., 2016). This is because the context-setting provided by disciplines other than genetics is 76 critical for interpreting the patterns of genetic variation among Austropotamobius crayfish

77 populations.

78 Matallanas et al. (2016) said that they would "review the genetic data available", which would be 79 a reasonable option to further discuss on the origin of Spanish A. italicus. However, they did not 80 perform such a data review. Clavero et al. (2016) did do a review and analysis of the whole 81 dataset available of Cytochrome c Oxidase subunit I (COI) sequences of Austropotamobius 82 italicus stored in GenBank and showed that the structure of haplotype networks supported the 83 non-native status of the species in Spain ("Italian" and "Spanish" haplotypes occupied 84 intermixed positions). According to Chapman et al. (2008), the structure of networks is a more 85 reliable tool to assess the status of taxa of unknown origin than the mere existence of private 86 haplotypes, which often occur in non-native populations (e.g. Lejeusne et al., 2014). Matallanas 87 et al. (2016) they did not discuss the genetic contribution of Clavero et al. (2016) and used older 88 genetic studies to deny our conclusions regarding the status of A. italicus, in spite that those 89 conclusions were built by reviewing the same previous studies.

90 Matallanas et al. (2016) seem to equal the geographical location of sampled individuals and the 91 long-term geographic belonging of haplotypes. This assumption is wrong, because divergence 92 times inform about the age of the differentiation among haplotypes, not about the place where 93 those haplotypes actually were when the divergence started [see the rabbit example of Seixas 94 et al. (2014)]. Attending to divergence time estimates of up to 14,000 years, Matallanas et al. 95 (2016) concluded that A. italicus "seems to be long established in the Iberian Peninsula, at least 96 since the Late Pleistocene". However, divergence times in the range of tens of thousands of 97 years do not seem reasonable between aquatic organisms in Spain and Italy. Populations of

- 98 several Iberian aquatic organisms have been isolated for much longer periods than those
- 99 proposed by Matallanas *et al.* (2016) to mark the divergence between their assumedly
- 100 "Spanish" and "Italian" crayfish populations (e.g. Gante et al., 2009; Perea et al., 2016). On the
- 101 other hand, Matallanas *et al.* (2016) based their estimate of the population expansion up to
- 102 14,000 years using mismatch distributions (Rogers & Harpending, 1992), which may involve
- 103 relevant methodological constraints. First, mismatch distributions rely on evolutionary rates (i.e.
- molecular clocks) that are hardly ever calibrated for the studied species and researchers usually
 import rates from closely related species (see Baer *et al.* 2007). Second, Schenekar & Weiss
- 106 (2011) showed that the mismatch distribution method is frequently applied wrongly (e.g. by
- 107 confounding divergence rates with mutation rates) and provides estimates of time since
- 108 expansion within an unknown error range, which arguably varies from <0.05 to 10-fold.
- 109 Wrapping-up
- 110 The multiple evidences provided by Clavero *et al.* (2016) coincided in signalling a human
- 111 introduction as the only plausible explanation for the presence of *A. italicus* in Spain. With the
- available information at hand, any other possibility would be far less parsimonious because
- several independent facts and patterns should be robustly contradicted to support the native
- 114 status of the species. This does not mean that we found an incontrovertible truth. Solid
- evidences could (and should) be used to criticize our conclusions, but they are not found in
- 116 Matallanas et al. (2016). In summary, pending robust new insights, a human introduction is the
- 117 only supported hypothesis for the presence of *A. italicus* in Spain.

118 References

- Alcover, J. A. (2008). The first Mallorcans: prehistoric colonization in the Western
 Mediterranean. *Journal of World Prehistory*, 21, 19-84.
- Baer, C. F, Miyamoto, M. M., & Denver, D. R. (2007). Mutation rate variation in multicellular
 eukaryotes: causes and consequences. *Nature Review Genetics*, 8, 619-631.
- Bonett, R. M., Kozak, K. H., Vieites, D. R., Bare, A., Wooten, J. A., & Trauth, S. E. (2007). The
 importance of comparative phylogeography in diagnosing introduced species: a lesson from
 the seal salamander, *Desmognathus monticola. BMC Ecology*, 7, 7.
- 126 Chapman, J. W., Blakeslee, A. M., Carlton, J. T., & Bellinger, M. R. (2008). Parsimony dictates
 127 a human introduction: on the use of genetic and other data to distinguish between the natural
 128 and human-mediated invasion of the European snail *Littorina littorea* in North America.
 129 *Biological Invasions*, 10, 131-133.
- Clavero, M., Nores, C., Kubersky-Piredda, S., & Centeno-Cuadros, A. (2016). Interdisciplinarity
 to reconstruct historical introductions: solving the status of cryptogenic crayfish. *Biological Reviews* (in press; doi: 10.1111/brv.12205).
- Gante, H. F., Micael, J., Oliva-Paterna, F. J., Doadrio, I., Dowling, T. E., & Alves, M. J. (2009).
 Diversification within glacial refugia: tempo and mode of evolution of the polytypic fish *Barbus sclateri. Molecular Ecology*, 18, 3240-3255.
- Karl, S. A., Toonen, R. J., Grant, W. S., & Bowen, B. W. (2012). Common misconceptions in
 molecular ecology: echoes of the modern synthesis. *Molecular Ecology*, 21, 4171-4189.
- Lejeusne, C., Saunier, A., Petit, N., Béguer, M., Otani, M., Carlton, J. T., Rico, C. & Green, A. J.
 (2014). High genetic diversity and absence of founder effects in a worldwide aquatic invader. *Scientific Reports*, 4, 5808.

- Matallanas, B., Ochando, M. D., Alonso, F., & Callejas, C. (2016). Update of genetic information
 for the white-clawed crayfish in Spain, with new insights into its population genetics and
 origin. *Organisms Diversity & Evolution* (in press; doi: 10.1007/s13127-016-0268-4)
- Pedraza-Lara, C., Alda, F., Carranza, S., & Doadrio, I. (2010). Mitochondrial DNA structure of
 the Iberian populations of the white-clawed crayfish, *Austropotamobius italicus italicus*(Faxon, 1914). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 57, 327-342.
- Perea, S., Cobo-Simon, M., & Doadrio, I. (2016). Cenozoic tectonic and climatic events in
 southern Iberian Peninsula: implications for the evolutionary history of freshwater fish of the
 genus *Squalius* (Actinopterygii, Cyprinidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 97, 155169.
- Rogers, A. R., & Harpending, H. (1992). Population growth makes waves in the distribution of
 pairwise genetic differences. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 9, 552–569.
- Schenekar, T., & Weiss, S. (2011). High rate of calculation errors in mismatch distribution
 analysis results in numerous false inferences of biological importance. *Heredity*, 107, 511–
 512.
- 156 Seixas, F. A., Juste, J., Campos, P. F., Carneiro, M., Ferrand, N., Alves, P. C., & Melo-Ferreira,
- 157 J. (2014). Colonization history of Mallorca Island by the European rabbit, *Oryctolagus*
- 158 *cuniculus*, and the Iberian hare, *Lepus granatensis* (Lagomorpha: Leporidae). *Biological*
- Journal of the Linnean Society, 111, 748-760.
- Szabó, P. & Hedl, R. (2011). Advancing the integration of history and ecology for conservation.
 Conservation Biology, 25, 680-687.