

## PREPRINT

Author-formatted, not peer-reviewed document posted on 22/06/2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3897/arphapreprints.e108466>

# Genetic diversity of European tree frogs (*Hyla arborea* group): A systematic review

 Elza Birbele,  Alessandro Di Marzio,  Dace Grauda,  Giovanni Vimercati, Gunita Deksne

## Disclaimer on biological nomenclature and use of preprints

The preprints are preliminary versions of works accessible electronically in advance of publication of the final version. They are not issued for purposes of botanical, mycological or zoological nomenclature and **are not effectively/validly published in the meaning of the Codes**. Therefore, nomenclatural novelties (new names) or other nomenclatural acts (designations of type, choices of priority between names, choices between orthographic variants, or choices of gender of names) **should NOT be posted in preprints**. The following provisions in the Codes of Nomenclature define their status:

### International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (ICNafp)

**Article 30.2:** "An electronic publication is not effectively published if there is evidence within or associated with the publication that its content is merely preliminary and was, or is to be, replaced by content that the publisher considers final, in which case only the version with that final content is effectively published." In order to be validly published, a nomenclatural novelty must be effectively published (Art. 32.1(a)); in order to take effect, other nomenclatural acts must be effectively published (Art. 7.10, 11.5, 53.5, 61.3, and 62.3).

### International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN)

**Article: 21.8.3:** "Some works are accessible online in preliminary versions before the publication date of the final version. Such advance electronic access does not advance the date of publication of a work, as preliminary versions are not published (Article 9.9)".

## Genetic diversity of European tree frogs (*Hyla arborea* group): A systematic review

Elza Birbele<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Alessandro Di Marzio<sup>2</sup>, Dace Grauda<sup>3</sup>, Giovanni Vimercati<sup>4</sup>, Gunita Dekšne<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Latvia, Faculty of Biology, LV-1004, Riga, Latvia

5 <sup>2</sup>Riga National Zoological Garden, LV-1014, Riga, Latvia

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Biology, University of Latvia, LV-1004, Riga, Latvia

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biology, Unit Ecology & Evolution, University of Fribourg, Chemin du Musée 15, 1700, Fribourg, Switzerland

<sup>5</sup>Institute of Food safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR", LV-1076, Riga, Latvia

10 \* Corresponding author

E-mail: [elza.birbele@rigazoo.lv](mailto:elza.birbele@rigazoo.lv)

**Abstract.** Amphibian populations are increasingly threatened by global change and the study of their genetic diversity is a major conservation priority. Western palearctic tree frog species of the *Hyla arborea* group are commonly distributed across Europe and the Middle East and many have declining populations. We performed a PRISMA systematic review to gain insight into the genetic diversity of *H. arborea* group. Sixteen published studies were included in the final qualitative analysis. While the genetic diversity of *H. arborea* group species was widely variable, it could often be explained by phylogeographic history. Populations in Western and Northern Europe had lower genetic diversity, with some populations also affected by habitat fragmentation. However, important regions of high genetic diversity were found in the Balkan peninsula for *H. arborea* sensu stricto and around the Black Sea for *H. orientalis*. Genetic diversity of *H. molleri*, *H. savignyi*, *H. meridionalis*, *H. felixarabica*, *H. intermedia*, *H. sarda* has been investigated only across extensive phylogeographical studies, while data regarding

15

20

their genetic diversity at the local level are missing. Through our review, we identify  
25 knowledge gaps about the genetic diversity of the *H. arborea* group that require further  
investigation, of and illustrate how filling these gaps might translate into future conservation  
efforts.

**Keywords:** *Hyla arborea* group, genetic diversity, amphibians, phylogeography, conservation,  
30 biodiversity

## Introduction

An increased number of studies report the decline of amphibian population sizes and the number of species during the last few decades with an accelerating extinction rate (Ceballos et al. 2020). Amphibians are sensitive to environmental pollution, habitat destruction and the presence of pathogens (Beebee and Griffiths 2005, Skerratt et al. 2007), which can lead to decreased genetic diversity and variation within populations or species (Freeland 2020). The Western palearctic tree frog species complex referred to as the *Hyla arborea* group consists of ten species from the *Hyla* genus that are distributed across Europe and the Middle East (Dufresnes et al. 2020). Six of the species (*H. arborea* sensu stricto, *H. sarda*, *H. intermedia*, *H. perrini*, *H. savignyi* and *H. meridionalis*) are included in the Red List of International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN 2022) and three of them (*H. arborea* s.s., *H. sarda* and *H. meridionalis*) are also protected by the European Habitat Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992). All *H. arborea* group species in the IUCN Red List are listed as Least Concerned (LC) many (*H. arborea* s.s., *H. intermedia*, *H. perrini*, *H. meridionalis*) with decreasing population trends (IUCN 2022). Many species in the *H. arborea* group have declining populations and like other amphibians are affected by habitat fragmentation (Andersen et al. 2004, IUCN 2022).

Genetic diversity is gaining support of inclusion in species conservation assessments. Despite some criticism (Teixeira and Huber 2021) many agree that monitoring genetic diversity of populations improves the quality of conservation measures (Laikre 2010, Laikre et al. 2010, Phillips 2020, DeWoody et al. 2021). It is important for a sustainable population to have a high genetic diversity as it makes them more resilient and less vulnerable to environmental changes, successfully establish new populations and distribute geographically (Forsman and Wennersten 2016, Freeland 2020). The loss of genetic diversity can accelerate the extinction processes of a population or even species (Frankham 2005, Allentoft and O'Brien 2010, Frankham et al. 2010). Even reintroduced populations are at risk of genetic diversity loss if the founder

60 population is not genetically diverse (Freeland 2020). Assessing genetic diversity is an effective method to follow the viability of a population (Hamer and McDonnell 2008). Recent advancements in molecular biology have made genetic analyses even more accessible and affordable than before. Microsatellite and single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) analyses are nowadays particularly popular for assessing genetic diversity, in consideration of their repeatability and comparability (Beebee and Rowe 2004, Freeland 2020). However the use of appropriate genetic markers and cautious interpretation is strongly advised (Hoban et al. 2021, Paz-Vinas et al. 2021).

65 Here, we present a systematic review to summarize the evidence concerning the genetic diversity of European tree frog (*Hyla arborea* group) populations and identify the most common methods used for its assessment. The aim of this review is to identify knowledge gaps about the genetic diversity of the *H. arborea* group that require further investigation and illustrate how filling these gaps might translate into future conservation efforts.

70

## Materials and methods

### *Search strategy and sources*

75 The methodology was based on "The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses" (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al. 2021). Four international databases were searched (Scopus, PubMed, Web of Science, ScienceDirect) for all published studies reporting the genetic diversity of *Hyla arborea* group species. Selected keywords for the databases were "hyla", "genetic" and "diversity". No limits were set on publication years or geographic regions. Only studies reported in peer-reviewed articles were considered eligible. The databases were searched for English-language publications published up to November 8th, 2022.

### *Study selection and analyses*

80 All search results from the four databases were combined and entered in MS Excel (Microsoft Corporation 2022). Authors (EB, GD, ADM) then independently screened the title

and abstract of each article and selected eligible studies using inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1). Selected eligible studies from all authors were combined and if there were different results of the eligibility of a study all authors discussed it until an agreement was reached. The data representing the eligible studies for the full-text screening were merged and managed in Microsoft Excel 2021. Papers were further screened for eligibility based on the full-text by three independent reviewers (EB, GD, ADM). Exclusion criteria for the full text screening were: i) studies that did not investigate genetic diversity or variation, ii) studies that were conducted in the laboratory or relied on common-garden experiments and data simulations, iii) studies whose full text was not available.

Table 1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of eligible studies for a systematic review on the genetic diversity of *Hyla arborea* group populations.

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
English language	Reviews, letters, editorials, notes, comments
Research article	Studies on <i>Hyla</i> morphology, reproduction, song, mating, pathogens, biometry
No geographical restriction	Studies not related to any <i>Hyla</i> species
Publications published up to 4th April 2022	No genetic analysis
Studies on species in the <i>Hyla arborea</i> group	

#### *Data extraction*

A data extraction sheet was created in Microsoft Excel 2021. It contained the following information: article information (title, author, year), sample information (study site, species studied, age group used in study, sample type and storage, DNA sample extraction method and storage, sample tests (electrophoretic analysis, microsatellite analysis, sequencing and other tests used), other methods used in study (phylogenetic analysis, bottleneck analysis, genetic diversity analysis, population structure analysis), results (microsatellite results, enzyme results, overall genetic diversity, bottleneck effect, phylogenetic results, other results).

## Results

### *Search results and eligible studies*

105           A total of 805 studies were identified through four databases. There were 129 studies  
that were duplicates and 651 studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria of the screening  
process for either the title and abstract screening or the full-text screening. After full-text  
screening of the 25 articles, nine were excluded for following reasons: four studies investigated  
sex chromosomes with no aim of estimating population genetic diversity; four studies used  
110 genetic data from previous studies; one study did not disclose the number of populations and  
sites that were sampled; one study used immunological methods. A total of 16 relevant studies  
were included in the review after thorough screening after the inclusion and exclusion criteria  
(Figure 1).




Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the search strategy steps for the literature review.

### 115 Genetic data sampling and analysis methods

The studies included in analysis originated from 44 countries in Europe, Middle East and Asia and were published between 1992 and 2022 (Table 2). The most common species studied was *Hyla arborea* s.s. (13 studies), others included *H. orientalis*, *H. molleri*, *H. intermedia*, *H. savignyi*, *H. meridionalis*, *H. japonica*, *H. felixarabica* and *H. sarda*. Number of sampled populations for a study ranged from one to 158, while sampled individuals ranged from 28 to 779. Most studies used buccal swabs for further deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) extraction. Following tissue samples also were used: tail and toe clips, skeletal muscles, and liver samples.

125 Table 2. Characteristics of the eligible studies included in the literature review of genetic diversity of *Hyla arborea* group. NR - not reported.

Authors	Sample location (country/-ies)	N. of populations sampled	N. of individuals sampled	Year(s) sampled	Species studied	Sample type
Auffarth et al., 2017	Germany	1	28	2005-2008	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Buccal swab
Oswald et al., 2017	Germany	3	91	2015	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Buccal swab
Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al., 1992	Greece	2	51	1991	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Blood, skeletal muscle
Dufresnes et al., 2013	Albania, Austria, Croatia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland	65	779	NR	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Buccal swab, tail clip
Stöck et al., 2012	Albania, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Belarus, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Moldavia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Spain, Switzerland, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen	158	462	1994-2011	<i>Hyla arborea</i> , <i>Hyla orientalis</i> , <i>Hyla molleri</i> , <i>Hyla savignyi</i>	Buccal swab, tail clip
Dufresnes et al., 2016	Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Belarus, Georgia, Greece, Moldavia, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Turkey, Ukraine	NR	557	NR	<i>Hyla orientalis</i>	Buccal swab
Broquet et al., 2010	Germany, France	12	539	2006-2007	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Buccal swab, tadpole tissue
Edenhamn et al., 2000	Sweden	NR	319	1991	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Skeletal muscle, liver
Andersen et al., 2004	Denmark	8	494	1991-2001	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Tail clip
Luquet et al., 2011	France	4	NR	2007-2008	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Buccal swab
Arens et al., 2006	Netherlands	12	175	1998	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Tail clip
Verardi et al., 2009	Italy, Slovenia, Croatia	16	282	NR	<i>Hyla arborea</i> , <i>Hyla intermedia</i>	NR
Dubey et al., 2009	Switzerland	2	235	2002-2003	<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Tadpole tissue

Gvoždik et al., 2010	Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Spain, Syria, Turkey, Yemen	NR	>200	NR	<i>Hyla orientalis</i> , <i>Hyla meridionalis</i> , <i>Hyla japonica</i> , <i>Hyla felixarabica</i> , <i>Hyla savignyi</i>	Buccal swab, tail, and toe clips
Gvoždik et al., 2015	Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iran, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine	NR	198	NR	<i>Hyla arborea</i> , <i>Hyla orientalis</i> , <i>Hyla intermedia</i> , <i>Hyla molleri</i> , <i>Hyla sarda</i>	Unspecified tissue sample
Car et al., 2022	Ukraine	19	216	2016-2018	<i>Hyla orientalis</i>	Tibia muscle

For sample storage two studies eluted buccal swabs in a 200µl Qiagen Buffer AE (Broquet et al. 2010, Stöck et al. 2012), one study resuspended swabs in 100 µl Invitex Elution buffer (Auffarth et al. 2017) and one study diluted swabs with ddH<sub>2</sub>O in a ratio of 1:5 (Oswald et al. 2017). All previously mentioned studies stored samples at -18°C or -20°C. For the extraction of DNA from tree frog buccal swabs the following commercial kits were used: DNeasy Tissue kit (Qiagen) (Broquet et al. 2010, Stöck et al. 2012, Dufresnes et al. 2013, 2016) or Invisorb Spin Swab Kit (Invitex) (Auffarth et al. 2017, Oswald et al. 2017). For DNA extraction from frog tissues following protocols and/or kits were used: standard CTAB buffer (Andersen et al. 2004, Dubey et al. 2009), proteinase K procedures (Andersen et al. 2004), standard phenol-chloroform protocol (Arens et al. 2006, Verardi et al. 2009), QIAamp DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen) (Dubey et al. 2009) or DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen) (Car et al. 2022).

Genetic diversity was assessed with microsatellites in ten studies (Table 3). Number of analysed microsatellites per study ranged from 6 to 30. Three studies assessed genetic diversity with enzymes (Table 4). Number of analysed loci per study ranged from nine to 18 loci, and most frequently used enzymes were aspartate aminotransferase (Aat), esterase (Est) and superoxide dismutase (Sod). Three types of buffer systems were used with standard horizontal gel or 10% starch gel.

Table 3. Microsatellites used in studies for assessment of genetic diversity of *Hyla arborea* populations. NR - not reported.

Authors	N. of microsatellites used	Microsatellites
Auffarth et al., 2017	8	WHA1-9, WHA1-60, WHA1- 67, WHA1-104, WHA1-140, WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-103
Oswald et al., 2017	12	Ha-A130, Ha-B12, Ha-B5R3, Ha-D115, WHA1-9, WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-60, WHA1-67, WHA1-103§ WHA1-104, WHA1-140
Dufresnes et al., 2013	30	WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-103, WHA1-67, Ha-B12, Ha-A130, Ha-A11, Ha-A127, Ha-B5R3, Ha-D115, Ha-A119, Ha-E2, Ha-A136, Ha-A110, Ha-D104, Ha-H116, Ha-A139, Ha-T32, Ha-T41, Ha-T49, Ha-T50, Ha-T56, Ha-T58, Ha-T60, Ha-T63, Ha-T64, Ha-T66, Ha-T67, Ha-T68, Ha-T69
Dufresnes et al., 2016	12	WHA1-103, Ha-T49, Ha-T64, Ha-T41, Ha-T69, Ha-T54, Ha-T55, Ha-T50, Ha-T58, Ha-T53, Ha-T60, Ha-T68
Broquet et al., 2010	21	Ha-A-110, Ha-A-136, Ha-A-139, Ha-A11, Ha-A119, Ha-A127, Ha-A130, Ha-B5R3, Ha-D-104, Ha-D-106, Ha-D115, Ha-D3R3, Ha-E2, Ha-H-116, WHA1-103, WHA1-104, WHA1-140, WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-67 WHA1-9
Andersen et al., 2004	12	NR
Luquet et al., 2011	15	Ha-A11, Ha-A119, Ha-A127, Ha- A130, Ha-B5R3, Ha-D3R3, Ha-D115, WHA1-20, WHA1- 25, WHA1-67, WHA1-103, Ha-D-104, Ha-D-106, Ha-H- 116, Ha-A-136
Arens et al., 2006	8	WHA5-22A, WHA5-201, WHA1- 60, WHA1-104, WHA1-09, WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-140
Dubey et al., 2009	6	WHA1- 9, WHA1-20, WHA1-25, WHA1-103, WHA1-104, WHA1-140
Car et al., 2022	21	Ha-T50, Ha-T53, Ha-T54, Ha-T55, Ha-T56, Ha-T58, Ha-T60, Ha-T61, Ha-T63, Ha-T66, Ha-T67, Ha-T68, Ha-A11, Ha-A127, Ha-B5R3, WHA1-67, Ha-D104, Ha-D115, Ha-E2, Ha-A110, Ha-A119

Table 4. Electrophoretic analysis method for assessing genetic diversity with enzymes of *Hyla arborea* group. NR - not reported.

Authors	Enzyme	Locus	Buffer system	Gel
Edenhamn et al., 2000	Aspartate aminotransferase	Aat-1, Aat-2	Tris-citrate buffer pH 8.2	Standard horizontal gel
	Isocitrate dehydrogenase	Idh-1, Idh-2		
	Malate dehydrogenase (NADP+)	Mdhp-1, Mdhp-2		
	Esterase	Est-1, Est-2, Est-3, Est-4, Est-5	N-(-3- aminopropyl) morpholine/ citratebuffer pH 6.1	
	General protein	Gp- 1, Gp-2		
	Glucose-6-phosphate Isomerase	Gpi-1, Gpi-2		
	Malate dehydrogenase	Mdh-1		
	Phosphoglucomutase	Pgm- 1		
	Superoxide dismutase	Sod-1		
Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al., 1992	Aspartate aminotransferase	Aat-1, Aat-2	N-(-3- aminopropyl) morpholine/ citratebuffer pH 6.1	10% starch gel
	Malate dehydrogenase	Mdh-1, Mdh-2		
	Creatine kinase	Ck-1	Tris-citrate buffer pH 8.2	
	Lactate dehydrogenase	Ldh-i		
	Superoxide dismutase	Sod-1		
Verardi et al., 2009	Esterase	Est-1, Est-2	NR	Standard horizontal gel
	Haemoglobin	Hb-1		
	Isocitrate dehydrogenase	Idh-1		
	Xanthine dehydrogenase	Xdh		
	Superoxide dismutase	Sod-1		
	Aspartate aminotransferase	Aat-2		
	Esterase	Est-2		
Aminopeptidase	Pep-1, Pep-2, Pep-4			
Adenosine deaminase	Ada			

For calculating genetic diversity of *H. arborea* group populations, several different softwares were used (Table 5). For calculating allelic richness, allelic frequencies, gene diversity and genetic differentiation, the software used most frequently was FSTAT (Goudet 1995). On the contrary, the software STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al. 2000) was the most frequently used for analysing population structure based on genetic data. The software ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al. 2005) was used for calculating mitochondrial gene haplotype and nucleotide diversity, deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium, genetic similarity between populations (pairwise  $F_{ST}$ ) and determining population differentiation. Studies performing bottleneck analysis often used BOTTLENECK (Cornuet and Luikart 1996).

Table 5. Softwares used for analysis of *Hyla arborea* group genetic diversity and population genetics (software developers or authors in brackets). NR - Not reported.

Analysis of genetic diversity*	Population structure*	Population differentiation*	Bottleneck analysis*	Authors
FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet, 1995) GENALEX 5.6 (Peakall and Smouse, 2006) ARLEQUIN v.3.5.2.2 (Excoffier et al., 2005) Package DEMETICS in RStudio (Gerlach et al., 2010)	STRUCTURE v.2.3.4 (Pritchard et al., 2000)	NR	BOTTLENECK v.1.2.02 (Cornuet and Luikart, 1996)	Oswald et al., 2017
BIOSYS-1 (Swofford and Selander, 1989)	NR	NR	NR	Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al., 1992
ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al., 2005) FSTAT (Goudet, 1995)	TCS 1.21 (Clement et al., 2000) STRUCTURE 2.3.3 (Pritchard et al., 2000) STRUCTURE HARVESTER 0.6.92 (Earl and vonHoldt, 2012)	PCAGEN 1.2 (Goudet, 1999)	NR	Dufresnes et al., 2013
FSTAT 2.9.3 (Goudet, 1995)	STRUCTURE 2.3.4 (Pritchard et al., 2000) STRUCTURE HARVESTER (Earl and vonHoldt, 2012)	NR	NR	Dufresnes et al., 2016
Package HIERFSTAT (Goudet, 2005) in R v2.6.1 (R Development Core Team, 2017)	NR	NR	BOTTLENECK (Cornuet and Luikart, 1996)	Broquet et al., 2010
FSTAT (Goudet, 1995)	STRUCTURE v.2 (Pritchard et al., 2000)	ARLEQUIN v. 2.0 (Schneider et al. 2000)	<i>M</i> ratio (Garza and Williamson, 2001)	Andersen et al., 2004
FSTAT 2.9.3 (Goudet, 1995)	NR	NR	NR	Luquet et al., 2011
FSTAT 2.93 (Goudet, 1995)	STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al., 2000)	Fst-estimator (Weir, Cockerham, 1984). ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al., 2005)	BOTTLENECK (Cornuet and Luikart, 1996), <i>M</i> ratio (Garza and Williamson, 2001)	Arens et al., 2006
FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet, 2001), GENEPOP 3.3 (Raymond, Rousset, 1995)	STRUCTURE 2.1 (Pritchard et al., 2000)	GENETIX 4.05 (Belkhir et al., 1996–2004)	NR	Verardi et al., 2009
FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet, 1995)	STRUCTURE 2.1 (Pritchard et al., 2000)	NR	NR	Dubey et al., 2009
FSTAT (Goudet, 1995) ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al., 2005), GENETIX (Belkhir et al., 2004), ADZE (Szpiech et al., 2008)	ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al., 2005)	ARLEQUIN (Excoffier et al., 2005)	NR	Car et al., 2022

165 Five studies performed phylogenetic analysis to assess *H. arborea* group genetic  
 diversity (Table 6). The most common gene used for genetic diversity analyses was the  
 mitochondrial *cytochrome b* gene. Most studies performed maximum likelihood  
 reconstructions with the software PHYML (Guindon and Gascuel 2003) and Bayesian  
 170 phylogeographic and species tree reconstructions with the software BEAST (Drummond and  
 Rambaut 2007) and its multiple packages and modules (Table 7).

Table 6. Sequenced genes and used primers in studies assessing *Hyla arborea* group genetic diversity. NR - not reported.

Authors	Gene name	F primer name or sequence	R primer name or sequence
Dufresnes et al., 2013	Cytochrome b	L0	H1046
	partial D-loop	Ha-Dloop-Int	Ha-Control-PH
	rag-1 intron	Ha-Rag1f	Ha-Rag1r
Stöck et al., 2012	Cytochrome b	L0	H1046
	Fibrinogen A, alpha-polypeptide	MVZ4	MVZ48
Dufresnes et al., 2016	Cytochrome b	NR	NR
Verardi et al., 2009	Cytochrome b	L14841	H15149
Gvoždík et al., 2010,	12S	12Sa	12Sbs
Gvoždík et al., 2015	16S	16SL1	16SH1
	Rhodopsin, exon 1	Rhod1A	Rhod1C
	Tyrosinase precursor, exon 1	Tyr1C	Tyr1G
Car et al., 2022	Cytochrome b	L0	H1046

175

Table 7. Data analysis methods used for phylogenetic studies of *Hyla arborea* group. ML – Maximum-likelihood, cyt-b – cytochrome b, BI – Bayesian inference.

Authors	Analysis method*	Software used for analysis
Dufresnes et al., 2013	ML phylogenetic reconstructions (1) with the selected model (2) and 1000 bootstrap replicates. Divergence time estimated between major haplogroups from cyt-b data set (3), using a strict molecular clock and a coalescent prior. Ran 3 independent chains of 30 million iterations each and checked for convergence (4). Phylogeographic history was constructed by a Bayesian phylogeographic analysis of mtDNA data set using spatial continuous diffusion models (5).	1) PHYML 3.0 (Guindon and Gascuel, 2003) 2) JMODELTEST 0.1.1 (Posada, 2008) 3) BEAST 1.6.2 (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007) 4) TRACER 1.5 (BEAST package) 5) BEAST 1.7.5 (Drummond et al., 2012)
Stöck et al., 2012	ML phylogenies (1) using the GTR model for cyt-b and selected model for the Fibrinogen alpha nuclear marker.	1) PHYML 3.0 (Guindon et al., 2010)
Dufresnes et al., 2016	ML reconstructions (1) and Bayesian phylogenetic reconstructions (2) of cyt-b haplotypes, using a selected model (3) of sequence evolution.	1) PHYML 3.0.1 (Guindon and Gascuel, 2003) 2) MrBayes 3.1.2 (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001) 3) MrAIC 1.4.4 (Nylander, 2004).
Gvoždik et al., 2010	ML tests (1) with chosen model from (2), BI analysis (3) with two runs and four chains for each run for six million generations and sampling every 100th tree. Maximum parsimony (4) was also analysed.	1) PHYML 3.0.1 (Guindon and Gascuel, 2003) 2) JMODELTEST 0.1.1 (Posada, 2008) 3) MrBayes 3.2. (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001) 4) PAUP 4.0b10 (Swofford and Sullivan, 2003)
Gvoždik et al., 2015	Gene trees were reconstructed by BI (1) and ML criterion. Best-fit partitioning schemes and nucleotide substitution models selected using (2). A species tree was inferred using (3). Alignments of all individuals were uploaded into (4) where they were assigned separate and unlinked substitution, clock, and tree models. Five independent (3) runs were performed, each for 200 million generations, sampling every 20,000th generation to obtain a posterior sample of 10,000 trees. The likelihoods were inspected using (5). The post burn-in samples of the five runs were combined in (6) The output of 45,000 sampled trees was uploaded to (7), to infer the final species tree as a maximum clade credibility tree. For species delimitation coalescent-based Bayesian species delimitation analyses were conducted in (8).	1) MrBayes 3.2. (Ronquist et al., 2012) 2) PartitionFinder v1.1.0 (Lanfear et al., 2012) 3) BEAST (Heled and Drummond, 2010) 4) BEAUti v1.8.0 (BEAST package) 5) TRACER 1.5 (BEAST package) 6) LogCombiner v1.8.0. (BEAST module) 7) TreeAnnotator v1.8.0 (BEAST module) 8) Bayesian Phylogeny and Phylogeography v2.2 (Yang, 2013)

\*Numbers in brackets correspond to the software in the adjacent column used for performing mentioned analysis

## 180 Genetic diversity results of *Hyla arborea* group populations

Overall, the genetic diversity was assessed based on microsatellite analyses (Table 8) and enzymes (Table 9) only in three species: *H. arborea* s.s., *H. orientalis* and *H. intermedia*. The sampled populations were mainly from Central and Eastern Europe.

185 Table 8. Genetic diversity results of *Hyla arborea* group populations based on microsatellites. NR - not reported.

Species	Region or country	N. of alleles	Allelic richness	Allelic frequencies	Loci polymorphism	Genetic diversity			Authors
						H <sub>exp</sub>	H <sub>o</sub>	Consensus	
<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Germany	4 to 7	NR	NR	Moderately to highly polymorphic	0.50	0.56 (mean)	High	Auffarth et al., 2017
		2 to 9	3.81 - 5.41	0.01 - 0.93	11 polymorphic, 1 monomorphic	0.62 - 0.72	0.65 - 0.72	High	Oswald et al., 2017
	Central Europe	NR	1.90 - 4.20	NR	NR	NR	0.26 - 0.62	Low to high	Dufresnes et al., 2013
		NR	0.54 - 0.94	NR	NR	NR	0.76 - 0.96	High	Broquet et al., 2010
	Denmark	6 to 21	NR	NR	Most polymorphic, few monomorphic	0.35 - 0.53	NR	Low	Andersen et al., 2004
	France	4 to 6	3.56 - 5.52	NR	NR	0.37 - 0.46	0.38 - 0.46	Low	Luquet et al., 2011
	Netherlands	2 to 10	1.90 - 6.00	0.01 - 0.13*	All polymorphic	0.39 - 0.58	NR	Low	Arens et al., 2006
	Switzerland	7 to 17	4.41 - 5.29	NR	NR	0.35 - 0.86	0.44 - 0.68	Low to high	Dubey et al., 2009
<i>Hyla orientalis</i>	East Europe	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.20 - 0.50	NR	Low	Dufresnes et al., 2016
		NR	1.53 - 1.73	NR	NR	0.19-0.27	0.17-0.25	Low	Car et al., 2022

Table 9. Genetic diversity results of *Hyla arborea* group populations based on enzymes. NR - not reported.

Species	Study site	Loci polymorphism	Nr of alleles (avg)	Allelic richness	Allelic frequencies	Enzyme genetic diversity		Authors
						Heterozygosity	Consensus	
<i>Hyla arborea</i>	Greece	5 systems polymorphic, 4 monomorphic	1.54	NR	0.10 - 1.00	0.13 - 0.14	High	Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al., 1992
	Sweden	1 out of 18 systems was polymorphic	1.06	NR	0.09 - 0.10	0.08 - 0.11	Low	Edenhamn et al., 2000
<i>Hyla intermedia</i>	Italy, Croatia, Slovenia	5 of 9 systems were bi-allelic, 2 systems were mostly bi-allelic, 2 systems polymorphic	NR	1.0 - 1.2	NR	0.00 - 0.05	Low	Verardi et al., 2009
				1.1 - 1.7		0.05 - 0.22	High	

The genetic diversity of the European tree frog *H. arborea* s.s. was assessed on microsatellite analyses in eight studies and on enzymes in three studies. In most cases the genetic diversity was described as low, however in some studies it ranged from low to high or high overall. The genetic diversity of enzymes in two of the three studies was reported very  
195 low, however it should be noted that these results can't be compared between studies, because different enzymes were used. The genetic diversity of the Italian tree frog *H. intermedia* was assessed on individuals collected from the Italian Peninsula and had higher diversity than *H. arborea* s.s. from the same region (Table 9).

The genetic diversity of the Eastern tree frog *H. orientalis* was assessed in two studies  
200 (Dufresnes et al. 2016, Car et al. 2022) from populations in Eastern Europe (Table 8). The microsatellite diversity in both studies was low, however the mitochondrial nucleotide diversity of populations from Ukraine was high at a value of 0.002 (Car et al. 2022).


Eight studies reported population genetics results of three species in the *H. arborea* group (Table 10). Few deviations from the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) were found in  
205 populations. However, the number of analysed individuals in three of these studies (Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al. 1992, Auffarth et al. 2017, Oswald et al. 2017) was lower than 100, possibly reducing the accuracy of HWE analysis. Population structures often corresponded to isolated geographic locations, however, were genetically low differentiated. Bottleneck effects were reported in multiple populations.

210

Table 10. Population genetics results of *Hyla arborea* group. NR - not reported.

Species	Deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium	Population structure	Population differentiation	Bottleneck effect present	Authors
<i>Hyla arborea</i>	1 (WHA1-60) out of 7 loci	NR	NR	NR	Auffarth et al., 2017
	1 (WHA1-60) out of 12 loci	Three genetically different clusters, corresponds to the three geographical populations	Low genetic differentiation between three populations	Yes	Oswald et al., 2017
	1 (EST-2) out of 20 loci	NR	Low genetic differentiation between two populations	NR	Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al., 1992
	NR	NR	NR	Yes	Broquet et al., 2010
	In 12 out of 144 tests at the single locus level	11 genetically different populations	NR	Yes	Andersen et al., 2004
	In 1 out of 88 tests at the single locus level	About 5 genetically different populations from 5 ponds, one subpopulation	Low to high genetic differentiation between populations	Yes	Arens et al., 2006
	None	Two populations	Low between metapopulations	NR	Dubey et al., 2009
<i>Hyla intermedia</i>	None	No ongoing gene flow between <i>H. arborea</i> . and <i>H. intermedia</i> populations	NR	NR	Verardi et al., 2009
	None		NR	NR	
<i>Hyla orientalis</i>	NR	Genetic structure corresponds to geographic distribution	Low microsatellite genetic differentiation, high mitochondrial genetic differentiation between 19 populations	No	Car et al., 2022

215 Areas with no genetic diversity data on any *Hyla* species in their distribution range currently are Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lithuania and Latvia (Figure 2). The most intensively studied geographic area appears to be Central Europe (Germany, France, Greece) which overlaps with the distribution area of the most researched species - *H. arborea* s.s.



220 Fig. 2. Genetic studies on *Hyla arborea* group populations per country across the groups distribution area in Europe (map from <https://worldmapblank.com/>, adjusted)

### *Phylogeographic diversity results of the Hyla arborea group*

Studies that performed phylogeographic analysis covered seven species in the *Hyla arborea* group: *H. arborea* s.s., *H. orientalis*, *H. molleri*, *H. meridionalis*, *H. felixarabica*, *H.*  
225 *intermedia* and *H. sarda* (Table 11). These studies covered tree frog populations across Europe and the Middle East.

The earliest *Hyla* genus species divergence was detected in the late Miocene between *H. arborea* s.s., *H. sarda* and *H. savignyi* (Stöck et al. 2012) and between *H. orientalis*, *H.*  
230 *savignyi* and *H. felixarabica* (Gvoždík et al. 2010). During the Pliocene, *H. molleri*, *H. intermedia* and *H. sarda* diverged into distinct lineages (Gvoždík et al. 2015). While Stöck et al. (2012) suggested that *H. orientalis* might have diverged from *H. molleri* in the Pliocene Gvoždík et al. (2015) postated such the divergence of the two species in the Pleistocene. i.e. about 1.4 million years ago. The genetic diversity of *H. arborea* s.s. across Europe was greatly variable, and particularly low in Western Europe and high in the southern Balkans (Stöck et al.  
235 2012, Dufresnes et al. 2013). Multiple demographic, spatial, postglacial range and recent population expansions for this species were reported across the studies. For *H. orientalis* a high genetic diversity centre was found around the Black Sea (Dufresnes et al. 2016). The genetic differentiation of *H. arborea* group populations were reported mostly strong with few low differentiated clades. Hybridization events were reported between multiple pairs of *H. arborea*  
240 group species (Table 11).

245 Table 11. Results of phylogenetic diversity and history analysis of the *Hyla arborea* group. NR - not reported, HA - *Hyla arborea* s.s., HO - *Hyla orientalis*, HMo - *Hyla molleri*, HMe - *Hyla meridionalis*, HSr - *Hyla sarda*, HSv - *Hyla savignyi*, HF - *Hyla felixarabica*, HI - *Hyla intermedia*, Mya - million years ago, kya - thousand years ago.

Divergence time or epoch	Hybridization	Genetic diversity	Population expansion	Clades	Genetic differentiation	Authors
180 kya (HA Adriatic clade) to 90 kya (HA most recent ancestor)	NR	HA - haplotype diversity greatly variable throughout range, nucleotide diversity high in southern Balkans and low in western Europe	Demographic and spatial expansions of HA	HA - main clade in the Adriatic coast	HA eastern, western, southern, and central-northern populations high differentiation	Dufresnes et al., 2013
Pliocene (species HO - HMo) Late Miocene, low Pliocene (species HA - HSr - HSv)	HMo x HMe in France HA x HO in Poland	HA – low HO – high HM – low	Postglacial range expansion of HA and HO (northern clade)	HO - five clades	HO lineages high differentiation	Stöck et al., 2012
1.2 Mya (HO main clades) 0.7 to 0.4 Mya (HO subclades)	NR	HO - overall high, higher in southern populations than northern.	Recent and postglacial range expansion of HO populations	HO - four clades, multiple subdivisions	High differentiation between eastern and western HO populations and admixture in Crimea and western Anatolia. Ring like pattern around Black Sea	Dufresnes et al., 2016
8.4 Mya (species HSv - HF) 11.1 Mya (species HO - Hsv)	HF x HSv in Israel	HO – high HSv – high HF – low to high	HO and HSv expansion from middle to late Pliocene	HSv - two main clades HF - two main clades HO - one main clade	NR	Gvoždík et al., 2010
1.4 Mya (species HO - HMo) Pliocene (species HA - HI -	HA x HO in Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland	HO – high	Recent HA expansion	HO and HMo - sister clades HSr - sister clade to rest of <i>Hyla</i> taxa	HA high differentiation, HI northern and southern populations low differentiation,	Gvoždík et al., 2015

HSr - HMo)	HA x HM in France			HI - sister clade to HA sensu lato	HO and HMo low differentiation	
5.5 Mya (species HA - HI)	HA x HI in Italy in the past	(see Table 9)	NR	NR	NR	Verardi et al. 2009

## Discussion

Overall, we observed the genetic diversity of species in the *H. arborea* group in Europe and Middle East most often being low. Genetic diversity can be used as an important marker of the persistence of native individuals (DeWoody et al. 2021, Gaitán-Espitia and Hobday 2021) and therefore can show the necessity of conservation measures (Dufresnes et al. 2016, Oswald et al. 2017).

In this review we summarised the methods used and genetic diversity data of species in the *H. arborea* group. For the genetic studies DNA samples were taken mostly from buccal swabs which is a recommended method for amphibian genetic studies (Pidancier et al. 2003). DNA extraction was done most often with commercial kits. The best has been shown to be the CTAB phenol-chlorophorm extraction method, however kits are the best alternative in reducing time and usage of hazardous chemicals (Schiebelhut et al. 2017). From the most used methods – microsatellite analysis, enzyme electrophoresis, phylogenetic methods – for assessment of *Hyla* population genetic diversity microsatellites seem to be most effective and popular and their use is becoming more widespread in genetic research. Studies that used microsatellites often chose markers that were first described by Arens et al. (2000) and Berset-Brändli et al. (2008) for *H. arborea* s.s. Use of enzymes for genetic diversity has become less common, also represented in this review by the low number of studies and the last one being more than ten years ago. The several disadvantages of enzyme electrophoresis nowadays are replaced by DNA markers (Jehle and Arntzen 2002, Freeland 2020). Another disadvantage of this method is enzyme sensitivity and complicated replicability, making the results comparable only between the same enzyme loci. Another method of genetic diversity analysis that was not

270 included in the studies of this review are single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). A study on  
Iberian tree frogs concluded that SNPs provide more reliable genetic diversity pattern results  
than microsatellites (Camacho-Sanchez et al. 2020). SNPs are currently used for genetic studies  
with many other amphibian groups and can therefore be applied to *Hyla* group studies. SNPs  
analysis adds additional advantages to the previously described methods being even more  
275 timely and cost-effective (Freeland 2020).

Phylogeographic studies in this review covered multiple tree frog species per study and  
presented not only genetic diversity data, but also their genetic history offering valuable insight.  
The five studies that performed phylogeographic analysis on tree frog species show valuable  
results explaining the plausible reasons for the variability of *Hyla* genetic diversity (Gvoždík et  
280 al. 2010, 2015, Stöck et al. 2012, Dufresnes et al. 2013, 2016). The variability of genetic  
diversity in a species can be affected by population expansions which was the case for the  
European tree frog *H. arborea* s.s. population with high genetic diversity in the Balkan  
peninsula, but the lineage that expanded to recolonize Northern and Western Europe lost its  
genetic diversity in the process (Gvoždík et al. 2010, 2015, Stöck et al. 2012, Dufresnes et al.  
285 2013, 2016). This observation aligns with studies that reported bottleneck effects (Andersen et  
al. 2004, Arens et al. 2006, Broquet et al. 2010, Oswald et al. 2017) and deviations from HWE  
(Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou et al. 1992, Andersen et al. 2004, Arens et al. 2006, Auffarth et al.  
2017, Oswald et al. 2017) in populations from Western Europe. However, some of the *H.*  
*arborea* s.s. populations were affected by habitat fragmentation decreasing their genetic  
290 diversity even more (Andersen et al. 2004, Arens et al. 2006). Fragmented populations with  
low genetic diversity should be at higher risk of extinction (Frankham et al. 2010). The Eastern  
tree frog *H. orientalis* has a high genetic diversity in the area surrounding the Black sea, but  
lower diversity in northern populations, most likely due to a recent range expansion (Dufresnes  
et al. 2016). For five pairs of species, hybridization events have been reported. Hybridization  
295 occurs between genetically close species and increases the populations genetic diversity

(Freeland 2020). While sometimes hybridization can have deleterious effects, it can be also beneficial (Stelkens et al. 2014). A study on toads found that the enhanced genetic variation by hybridization might have enabled their expansion in novel habitats (Pierce et al. 2017). Currently there is no detailed information available on the genetic diversity in *Hyla* species hybrid zones and could have potential for future studies.

European tree frog *H. arborea* s.s. is the most studied from the *H. arborea* species group, while rest of the species from the group (*H. orientalis*, *H. intermedia*, *H. molleri*, *H. sarda*, *H. felixarabica*, *H. meridionalis*, *H. savignyi*) were mostly analysed in phylogeographic studies. Therefore, genetic diversity studies on species other than *H. arborea* s.s would be beneficial to improve the knowledge of local factor influence to genetic diversity. Two species – *H. intermedia perrini* and *H. carthaginiensis* – which were added to the *H. arborea* group in the last few years (Dufresnes et al. 2018, 2019, Speybroeck et al. 2020) are not represented in any of the studies included in present systematic review. However, the follow up of the eventual changes in genetic diversity of these new species would be a valuable addition for research in the future. The map of genetic diversity research (Fig. 2), shows how many times a genetic diversity analysis has been made in each country of *Hyla* sp. distribution in Europe (one study could sample populations in multiple countries). However, many of the counts in the map are from the phylogeographic studies that cover many countries, which notes the lack of regional studies on *Hyla* populations. There is a noticeable lack of studies in Northern Europe, especially Latvia and Lithuania. However a preliminary genetic study on *H. orientalis* population in Latvia is at this time in press (Birbele et al., in press). Lithuania possibly has a population of *H. orientalis* that is expanding from the Latvian population, but no studies have yet been made.

The variability of *H. arborea* group population genetic diversity shows a rich history of species evolution and expansion over Eurasia, but also vulnerability to anthropogenic factors. Climate change is a current factor that can drive amphibian populations to expand or lose their range and occupy new niches (Enriquez-Urzelai et al. 2019, Alves-Ferreira et al. 2022). Human

activities like accidental introductions of *Hyla* species in novel habitats or spreading of amphibian pathogens like chytridiomycosis and Ranavirus into native populations could drastically affect already genetically weakened *Hyla* populations (Allentoft and O'Brien 2010).  
325 Notably studies of the *H. orientalis* population in the Chernobyl exclusion zone (Ukraine) have found unusual responses to radiation. Ongoing microevolutionary processes in the population have been detected rising the question of long-term impact of ionizing radiation on the species (Car et al. 2022). The absorbed rates of radiation in tree frogs were also generally lower than the harmful thresholds (Burraco et al. 2021). These findings of unusual environmental factors  
330 could be the reasoning behind the genetic variability in the area.

Multiple authors (Andersen et al. 2004, Arens et al. 2006, Dubey et al. 2009, Luquet et al. 2011, Dufresnes et al. 2013, 2016, Oswald et al. 2017) point out the contribution of their studies for species conservation management further proving the importance of genetic and phylogeographic studies. Monitoring genetics helps inform the health and sustainability of a  
335 population (Freeland 2020). Endangered species and amphibians in general are at a higher risk of losing genetic diversity, because of their breeding strategies, declines in population sizes, habitat fragmentation and low dispersal capabilities (Allentoft and O'Brien 2010). Despite many conservation efforts the role of genetic diversity of populations is overlooked and is not included in international and regional policies (Laikre 2010, Laikre et al. 2010, Hoban et al.  
340 2021). Therefore, comprehensive genetic studies can highlight important signals, where conservation efforts are lacking.

### Conclusions

The knowledge base of species and the necessary conservation applications is becoming more accessible and affordable with genomic technologies (Segelbacher et al. 2022). This  
345 review highlights the geographic regions and species in the *H. arborea* group (*H. orientalis*, *H. meridionalis* etc.) where there are still gaps of knowledge. The compiled methods of genetic diversity analysis provides a useful overview of the available information. This review can

guide future studies in choosing the tree frog species and appropriate methods for genetic diversity analysis.

350

### **Data availability**

The data used in this study are provided in the Supplement.

### **References**

- 355 Allentoft M, O'Brien J (2010) Global Amphibian Declines, Loss of Genetic Diversity and Fitness: A Review. *Diversity* 2: 47–71. <https://doi.org/10.3390/d2010047>
- Alves-Ferreira G, Talora DC, Solé M, Cervantes-López MJ, Heming NM (2022) Unraveling global impacts of climate change on amphibians distributions: A life-history and biogeographic-based approach. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 10: 987237. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2022.987237>
- 360 Andersen LW, Fog K, Damgaard C (2004) Habitat fragmentation causes bottlenecks and inbreeding in the European tree frog (*Hyla arborea*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 271: 1293–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.2720>
- 365 Arens P, Bugter R, Westende W van't, Zollinger R, Stronks J, Vos CC, Smulders MJM (2006) Microsatellite variation and population structure of a recovering Tree frog (*Hyla arborea* L.) metapopulation. *Conservation Genetics* 7: 825–835. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-005-9112-7>

- 370 Auffarth J, Krug A, Pröhl H, Jehle R (2017) A genetically-informed Population Viability  
Analysis reveals conservation priorities for an isolated population of *Hyla arborea*.  
SALAMANDRA 53: 171–182.
- Beebee TJC, Rowe G (2004) An introduction to molecular ecology. Oxford University Press,  
Oxford ; New York, 346 pp.
- Beebee TJC, Griffiths RA (2005) The amphibian decline crisis: A watershed for conservation  
biology? Biological Conservation 125: 271–285.  
375 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.04.009>
- Belkhir K, Borsa P, Chikhi L, Raufaste N, Bohomme F (2004) Genetix 4.05, logiciel sous  
Windows™ pour la génétique des populations. Laboratoire Génome, Populations,  
Interactions, CNRS UMR 5000, Université de Montpellier II, Montpellier (France).
- Berset-Brändli L, Jaquiéry J, Broquet T, Perrin N (2008) Isolation and characterization of  
380 microsatellite loci for the European tree frog ( *Hyla arborea* ). Molecular Ecology  
Resources 8: 1095–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02189.x>
- Birbele E, Gulbe E, Šķērstiņa R, Puchades L, Deksne G, Di Marzio A (in press) Palearctic  
385 Treefrog (*Hyla orientalis*) in Latvia: census and genetic analysis after 30 Years of its  
reintroduction: Latvian Tree Frog. Herpetology Notes.
- Broquet T, Angelone S, Jaquier J, Joly P, Lena J-P, Lengagne T, Plenet S, Luquet E, Perrin N  
(2010) Genetic Bottlenecks Driven by Population Disconnection: Population  
Disconnection and Genetic Bottlenecks. Conservation Biology 24: 1596–1605.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01556.x>

- 390 Burraco P, Car C, Bonzom J-M, Orizaola G (2021) Assessment of exposure to ionizing radiation in Chernobyl tree frogs (*Hyla orientalis*). *Scientific Reports* 11: 20509. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00125-9>
- Camacho-Sanchez M, Velo-Antón G, Hanson JO, Veríssimo A, Martínez-Solano Í, Marques A, Moritz C, Carvalho SB (2020) Comparative assessment of range-wide patterns of genetic diversity and structure with SNPs and microsatellites: A case study with Iberian amphibians. *Ecology and Evolution* 10: 10353–10363. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6670>
- 395
- Car C, Gilles A, Armant O, Burraco P, Beaugelin-Seiller K, Gashchak S, Camilleri V, Cavalié I, Laloï P, Adam-Guillermin C, Orizaola G, Bonzom J (2022) Unusual evolution of tree frog populations in the Chernobyl exclusion zone. *Evolutionary Applications* 15: 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.13282>
- 400
- Ceballos G, Ehrlich PR, Raven PH (2020) Vertebrates on the brink as indicators of biological annihilation and the sixth mass extinction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117: 13596–13602. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1922686117>
- 405
- Clement M, Posada D, Crandall KA (2000) TCS: a computer program to estimate gene genealogies. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 1657–1659. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.2000.01020.x>
- Cornuet JM, Luikart G (1996) Description and Power Analysis of Two Tests for Detecting Recent Population Bottlenecks From Allele Frequency Data. *Genetics* 144: 2001–2014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/144.4.2001>
- 410

- DeWoody JA, Harder AM, Mathur S, Willoughby JR (2021) The long-standing significance of genetic diversity in conservation. *Molecular Ecology* 30: 4147–4154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.16051>
- 415 Drummond AJ, Rambaut A (2007) BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by sampling trees. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7: 214. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-7-214>
- Drummond AJ, Suchard MA, Xie D, Rambaut A (2012) Bayesian Phylogenetics with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29: 1969–1973. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss075>
- 420 Dubey S, Ursenbacher S, Pellet J, Fumagalli L (2009) Genetic differentiation in two European tree frog (*Hyla arborea*) metapopulations in contrasted landscapes of western Switzerland. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 30: 127–133. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853809787392775>
- 425 Dufresnes C, Berroneau M, Dubey S, Litvinchuk SN, Perrin N (2020) The effect of phylogeographic history on species boundaries: a comparative framework in *Hyla* tree frogs. *Scientific Reports* 10: 5502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-62382-4>
- Dufresnes C, Litvinchuk SN, Leuenberger J, Ghali K, Zinenko O, Stöck M, Perrin N (2016) Evolutionary melting pots: a biodiversity hotspot shaped by ring diversifications around the Black Sea in the Eastern tree frog (*Hyla orientalis*). *Molecular Ecology* 25: 4285–4300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13706>
- 430 Dufresnes C, Beddek M, Skorinov DV, Fumagalli L, Perrin N, Crochet P-A, Litvinchuk SN (2019) Diversification and speciation in tree frogs from the Maghreb (*Hyla meridionalis*)

sensu lato), with description of a new African endemic. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 134: 291–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2019.02.009>

435 Dufresnes C, Wassef J, Ghali K, Brelsford A, Stöck M, Lymberakis P, Crnobrnja-Isailovic J, Perrin N (2013) Conservation phylogeography: does historical diversity contribute to regional vulnerability in European tree frogs (*Hyla arborea*)? *Molecular Ecology* 22: 5669–5684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12513>

440 Dufresnes C, Mazepa G, Rodrigues N, Brelsford A, Litvinchuk SN, Sermier R, Lavanchy G, Betto-Colliard C, Blaser O, Borzée A, Cavoto E, Fabre G, Ghali K, Grossen C, Horn A, Leuenberger J, Phillips BC, Saunders PA, Savary R, Maddalena T, Stöck M, Dubey S, Canestrelli D, Jeffries DL (2018) Genomic Evidence for Cryptic Speciation in Tree Frogs From the Apennine Peninsula, With Description of *Hyla perrini* sp. nov. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 6: 144. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2018.00144>

445 Earl DA, vonHoldt BM (2012) STRUCTURE HARVESTER: a website and program for visualizing STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method. *Conservation Genetics Resources* 4: 359–361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-011-9548-7>

450 Enriquez-Urzelai U, Bernardo N, Moreno-Rueda G, Montori A, Llorente G (2019) Are amphibians tracking their climatic niches in response to climate warming? A test with Iberian amphibians. *Climatic Change* 154: 289–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-019-02422-9>

Excoffier L, Laval G, Schneider S (2005) Arlequin (version 3.0): An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics* 1: 117693430500100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/117693430500100003>

- 455 Forsman A, Wennersten L (2016) Inter-individual variation promotes ecological success of  
populations and species: evidence from experimental and comparative studies.  
Ecography 39: 630–648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.01357>
- Frankham R (2005) Genetics and extinction. *Biological Conservation* 126: 131–140.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.05.002>
- 460 Frankham R, Ballou JD, Briscoe DA (2010) *Introduction to Conservation Genetics*. 2nd ed.  
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809002>
- Freeland J (2020) *Molecular ecology*. Third edition. Wiley Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ, 1 pp.
- Gaitán-Espitia JD, Hobday AJ (2021) Evolutionary principles and genetic considerations for  
guiding conservation interventions under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 27:  
475–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15359>
- 465 Garza JC, Williamson EG (2001) Detection of reduction in population size using data from  
microsatellite loci. *Molecular Ecology* 10: 305–318. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x.2001.01190.x>
- 470 Gerlach G, Jueterbock A, Kraemer P, Deppermann J, Harmand P (2010) Calculations of  
population differentiation based on GST and D: forget GST but not all of statistics!  
NEWS AND VIEWS: COMMENT. *Molecular Ecology* 19: 3845–3852.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04784.x>
- Goudet J (1995) FSTAT (Version 1.2): A Computer Program to Calculate F-Statistics. *Journal  
of Heredity* 86: 485–486. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a111627>

- 475 Goudet J (1999) PCAGEN. Principal Component Analysis of Gene Frequency Data. Available from: <http://www2.unil.ch/popgen/software/pcagen.htm>.
- Goudet J (2001) FSTAT, a program to estimate and test gene diversities and fixation indices (ver. 293). Available from: <http://www.unil.ch/izea/software/fstat.html>.
- 480 Guindon S, Gascuel O (2003) A Simple, Fast, and Accurate Algorithm to Estimate Large Phylogenies by Maximum Likelihood. Rannala B (Ed.). *Systematic Biology* 52: 696–704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10635150390235520>
- Guindon S, Dufayard J-F, Lefort V, Anisimova M, Hordijk W, Gascuel O (2010) New Algorithms and Methods to Estimate Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies: Assessing the Performance of PhyML 3.0. *Systematic Biology* 59: 307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syq010>
- 485 Gvoždík V, Moravec J, Klütsch C, Kotlík P (2010) Phylogeography of the Middle Eastern tree frogs (*Hyla*, Hylidae, Amphibia) as inferred from nuclear and mitochondrial DNA variation, with a description of a new species. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 55: 1146–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2010.03.015>
- 490 Gvoždík V, Canestrelli D, García-París M, Moravec J, Nascetti G, Recuero E, Teixeira J, Kotlík P (2015) Speciation history and widespread introgression in the European short-call tree frogs (*Hyla arborea* sensu lato, *H. intermedia* and *H. sarda*). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 83: 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.11.012>
- 495 Hamer AJ, McDonnell MJ (2008) Amphibian ecology and conservation in the urbanising world: A review. *Biological Conservation* 141: 2432–2449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.020>

- Heled J, Drummond AJ (2010) Bayesian Inference of Species Trees from Multilocus Data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 27: 570–580. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msp274>
- Hoban S, Campbell CD, da Silva JM, Ekblom R, Funk WC, Garner BA, Godoy JA, Kershaw F, MacDonald AJ, Mergeay J, Minter M, O’Brien D, Vinas IP, Pearson SK, Pérez-Espona S, Potter KM, Russo I-RM, Segelbacher G, Vernesi C, Hunter ME (2021) Genetic diversity is considered important but interpreted narrowly in country reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity: Current actions and indicators are insufficient. *Biological Conservation* 261: 109233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109233>
- Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F (2001) MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics* 17: 754–755. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/17.8.754>
- IUCN (2022) The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Available from: <https://www.iucnredlist.org/en> (May 24, 2022).
- Jehle R, Arntzen JW (2002) Microsatellite markers in amphibian conservation genetics. *Herpetological Journal* 12: 1–9.
- 510 Kyriakopoulou-Sklavounou P, Karakousis Y, Alexiou B (1992) A morphometric and electrophoretic study of two populations of *Hyla arborea* L. in Greece. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Comparative Biochemistry* 103: 715–719. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0491\(92\)90395-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0491(92)90395-8)
- Laikre L (2010) Genetic diversity is overlooked in international conservation policy implementation. *Conservation Genetics* 11: 349–354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-009-0037-4>
- 515

- 520 Laikre L, Allendorf FW, Aroner LC, Baker CS, Gregovich DP, Hansen MM, Jackson JA, Kendall KC, McKELVEY K, Neel MC, Olivieri I, Ryman N, Schwartz MK, Bull RS, Stetz JB, Tallmon DA, Taylor BL, Vojta CD, Waller DM, Waples RS (2010) Neglect of Genetic Diversity in Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Conservation Biology* 24: 86–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01425.x>
- Lanfear R, Calcott B, Ho SYW, Guindon S (2012) PartitionFinder: Combined Selection of Partitioning Schemes and Substitution Models for Phylogenetic Analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29: 1695–1701. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss020>
- 525 Luquet E, David P, Lena J-P, Joly P, Konecny L, Dufresnes C, Perrin N, Plenet S (2011) Heterozygosity-fitness correlations among wild populations of European tree frog (*Hyla arborea*) detect fixation load: HFC AMONG POPULATIONS DETECT FIXATION LOAD. *Molecular Ecology* 20: 1877–1887. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05061.x>
- 530 Microsoft Corporation (2022) Microsoft Excel. Available from: <https://office.microsoft.com/excel>.
- Nylander JAA (2004) MRAIC, Ver. 1.44. <https://doi.org/Program> distributed by the author
- Oswald P, Taddey K, Auffarth J, Brandt T, Pröhl H (2017) Conservation genetics of a mirrored population of the European tree frog (*Hyla arborea*). *SALAMANDRA* 53: 368–378.
- 535 Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, McKenzie JE (2021) PRISMA 2020

- 540 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*: n160. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160>
- Paz-Vinas I, Jensen EL, Bertola LD, Breed MF, Hand BK, Hunter ME, Kershaw F, Leigh DM, Luikart G, Mergeay J, Miller JM, Van Rees CB, Segelbacher G, Hoban S (2021) Macrogenetic studies must not ignore limitations of genetic markers and scale. *Mooers A (Ed.). Ecology Letters* 24: 1282–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13732>
- 545 Peakall R, Smouse PE (2006) genalex 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 6: 288–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-8286.2005.01155.x>
- Phillips S (2020) The importance of long-term genetic monitoring of reintroduced populations: inbreeding in the natterjack toad (*Epidalea calamita*). *Herpetological Journal*: 159–167.
- 550 <https://doi.org/10.33256/hj30.3.159167>
- Pidancier N, Miquel C, Miaud C (2003) Buccal swabs as a non-destructive tissue sampling method for DNA analysis in amphibians. *Herpetological Journal* 13: 175–178.
- Pierce AA, Gutierrez R, Rice AM, Pfennig KS (2017) Genetic variation during range expansion: effects of habitat novelty and hybridization. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 284: 20170007. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0007>
- 555
- Posada D (2008) jModelTest: Phylogenetic Model Averaging. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 25: 1253–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msn083>
- Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P (2000) Inference of Population Structure Using Multilocus Genotype Data. *Genetics* 155: 945–959.
- 560 <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/155.2.945>

- R Development Core Team (2017) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Raymond M, Rousset F (1995) GENEPOP (ver. 1.2): population genetics software for exact tests and ecumenicism. *Journal of Heredity* 86: 248–249.
- 565 Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, Ayres DL, Darling A, Höhna S, Larget B, Liu L, Suchard MA, Huelsenbeck JP (2012) MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference and Model Choice Across a Large Model Space. *Systematic Biology* 61: 539–542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/sys029>
- 570 Schiebelhut LM, Abboud SS, Gómez Daglio LE, Swift HF, Dawson MN (2017) A comparison of DNA extraction methods for high-throughput DNA analyses. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 17: 721–729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12620>
- Schneider S, Roessli D, Excoffier L (2000) Arlequin ver. 2.000. A software for population genetics data analysis. Genetics and Biometry Laboratory, University of Geneva, Switzerland.
- 575 Segelbacher G, Bosse M, Burger P, Galbusera P, Godoy JA, Helsen P, Hvilsom C, Iacolina L, Kahric A, Manfrin C, Nonic M, Thizy D, Tsvetkov I, Veličković N, Vilà C, Wisely SM, Buzan E (2022) New developments in the field of genomic technologies and their relevance to conservation management. *Conservation Genetics* 23: 217–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-021-01415-5>
- 580 Skerratt LF, Berger L, Speare R, Cashins S, McDonald KR, Phillott AD, Hines HB, Kenyon N (2007) Spread of Chytridiomycosis Has Caused the Rapid Global Decline and Extinction of Frogs. *EcoHealth* 4: 125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-007-0093-5>

- Speybroeck J, Beukema W, Dufresnes C, Fritz U, Jablonski D, Lymberakis P, Martínez-Solano I, Razzetti E, Vamberger M, Vences M, Vörös J, Crochet P-A (2020) Species list of the European herpetofauna – 2020 update by the Taxonomic Committee of the Societas Europaea Herpetologica. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 41: 139–189. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685381-bja10010>
- 585
- Stelkens RB, Brockhurst MA, Hurst GDD, Greig D (2014) Hybridization facilitates evolutionary rescue. *Evolutionary Applications* 7: 1209–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12214>
- 590
- Stöck M, Dufresnes C, Litvinchuk SN, Lymberakis P, Biollay S, Berroneau M, Borzée A, Ghali K, Ogielska M, Perrin N (2012) Cryptic diversity among Western Palearctic tree frogs: Postglacial range expansion, range limits, and secondary contacts of three European tree frog lineages (*Hyla arborea* group). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 65: 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2012.05.014>
- 595
- Swofford DL, Selander RB (1989) BIOSYS-1: a computer program for the analysis of allelic variation in population genetics and biochemical systematics, release 1.7. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign.
- Swofford DL, Sullivan J (2003) Phylogeny inference based on parsimony and other methods using PAUP\*. In: *The Phylogenetic Handbook: A Practical Approach to DNA and Protein Phylogeny.* , 160–206.
- 600
- Szpiech ZA, Jakobsson M, Rosenberg NA (2008) ADZE: A rarefaction approach for counting alleles private to combinations of populations. *Bioinformatics* 24: 2498–2504.

605 Teixeira JC, Huber CD (2021) The inflated significance of neutral genetic diversity in  
conservation genetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118:  
e2015096118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015096118>

610 Verardi A, Canestrelli D, Nascetti G (2009) Nuclear and Mitochondrial Patterns of  
Introgression between the Parapatric European Treefrogs *Hyla arborea* and *H.*  
*intermedia*. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 46: 247–258.  
<https://doi.org/10.5735/086.046.0402>

Weir BS, Cockerham CC (1984) Estimating F-Statistics for the Analysis of Population  
Structure. *Evolution* 38: 1358. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2408641>

Yang Z (2013) BP&P, v.2.2. Manual Distributed with the Software. [http://  
abacus.gene.ucl.ac.uk/software.html](http://abacus.gene.ucl.ac.uk/software.html)