



HAL
open science

Phylogeography of a widespread Palaeartic forest bird species: the White-backed Woodpecker (Aves, Picidae)

Jean-Marc Pons, David Campión, Giorgio Chiozzi, Antonia Ettwein,
Jean-Louis Grangé, Łukasz Kajtoch, Tomasz D Mazgajski, Marko Rakovic,
Hans Winkler, Jérôme Fuchs

► To cite this version:

Jean-Marc Pons, David Campión, Giorgio Chiozzi, Antonia Ettwein, Jean-Louis Grangé, et al.. Phylogeography of a widespread Palaeartic forest bird species: the White-backed Woodpecker (Aves, Picidae). *Zoologica Scripta*, 2020, 10.1111/zsc.12466 . hal-03064527

HAL Id: hal-03064527

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03064527v1>

Submitted on 14 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Phylogeography of a widespread Palaeartic forest bird species: the White-backed
Woodpecker (Aves, Picidae)**

Jean-Marc PONS*, David CAMPIÓN, Giorgio CHIOZZI, Antonia ETTWEIN, Jean-Louis GRANGÉ, Łukasz KAJTOCH, Tomasz D. MAZGAJSKI, Marko RAKOVIC, Hans WINKLER and Jérôme FUCHS

Jean-Marc Pons

¹UMR7205 Institut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité, CNRS MNHN UPMC EPHE, Sorbonne Universités, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CP 51, 57 rue Cuvier, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

jean-marc.pons@mnhn.fr

*Corresponding author

David Campión

²Área de Biodiversidad, Biodiversitate Arloa, Padre Adoain, 219 Bajo/AitaAdoain 219, Beheko solairua.31015 Pamplona-Iruñea. Navarra-Nafarroa, Spain
dcampion.dc@gmail.com

Giorgio Chiozzi

³Museo di Storia Naturale di Milano, Corso Venezia 55, I-20121 Milano, Italy
giorgio.chiozzi@comune.milano.

Antonia Ettwein

⁴Swiss Ornithological Institute, Seerose 1, 6204 Sempach, Switzerland
antonia.ettwein@vogelwarte.ch

Jean-Louis Grangé

⁵Groupe Ornithologique des Pyrénées et de l'Adour 81, Avenue du Laü 64000 Pau, France
lilfordi64@orange.fr

ŁukaszKajtoch:

⁶Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals, Polish Academy of Sciences, Sławkowska 17, 31-016 Kraków, Poland
lukasz.kajtoch@gmail.com

Tomasz D Mazgajski

⁷Museum and Institute of Zoology Polish Academy of Sciences, Wilcza 64, 00-679 Warszawa, Poland
mazgaj@miiz.waw.pl

Marko Rakovic

⁸Natural History Museum of Belgrade, Njegoseva 51, Serbia
markorakovic@gmail.com

Hans Winkler

⁹Konrad Lorenz-Institute of Ethology, Department of Integrative Biology and Evolution, Savoyenstraße 1A, A-1160 Vienna, Austria
hans-christoph.winkler@oeaw.ac.at

Jérôme Fuchs

¹UMR7205 Institut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité, CNRS MNHN UPMC EPHE, Sorbonne
Universités, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CP 51, 57 rue Cuvier, F-75231 Paris Cedex 05,
France

jerome.fuchs@mnhn.fr

Running title: Phylogeography of *Dendrocopos leucotos*
Jean-Marc Pons et al.

ABSTRACT

In the present study, we use multilocus molecular data and species distribution modelling to investigate the phylogenetics and the phylogeography of the White-backed Woodpecker (*Dendrocopos leucotos*), a bird species widely distributed over the entire Palearctic.

Our phylogenetic results reveal three well supported clades within *D. leucotos*: the Chinese endemic subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*), the northerly distributed subspecies *leucotos*, *uralensis* as well as the four poorly genetically differentiated Japanese subspecies (*subcirris*, *stejnegeri*, *namiyei*, *owstoni*), and the south-western Palearctic *lilfordi* subspecies. According to our results, the Amami Woodpecker, endemic to Amami-Oshima Island (Ryukyu archipelago, Japan) sometimes treated as full species *D. owstoni*, does not deserve any species-level status.

Based on mitochondrial phylogeographic results, the Japanese archipelago was recently colonized only once by *D. leucotos* from eastern Eurasia. Our results suggest a split between the *leucotos* and *lilfordi* lineages that dates back to mid-Pleistocene (around 0.6 Mya) with likely no gene flow between these two subspecies since then. Our results thus do not support a phylogeographic pattern in which central and northern Europe were recolonized from one or several southern glacial refugia where *lilfordi* populations persisted through several Pleistocene glacial periods. Spatial variation in mitochondrial diversity across *leucotos* populations and niche ecological modelling suggest a possible eastward population expansion from a unique glacial refugium likely located in central Europe.

Molecular species delimitation methods, gene flow analyses and differences in adult and juvenile plumage indicate that the *lilfordi* subspecies may warrant to be ranked as a valid phylogenetic species. Further studies are nevertheless needed in the Balkans, where *leucotos* and *lilfordi* came recently into contact to measure the effectiveness of reproductive barriers and gene flow.

Keywords: Biogeography, Glacial Refugia, Palaeartic, Pleistocene, Species limits,
Dendrocopos leucotos

INTRODUCTION

The White-backed Woodpecker *Dendrocopos leucotos* (Bechstein, 1802) is a forest-dwelling bird widely distributed over the entire Palaearctic from western Europe to eastern Russia, Mongolia, China and Japan (Fig. 1). It is part of a large Palaearctic and Indo-Malayan radiation (genus *Dendrocopos*, ten species see Fuchs & Pons 2015) of large pied woodpeckers (body size 23-28 cm), with its closest relative being the Okinawa Woodpecker (*D. noguchii*) (Winkler & Christie, 2020; Fuchs & Pons, 2015). The White-backed Woodpecker has a specialized ecological niche. Indeed, it is more dependent on old-growth deciduous or mixed forests with rotten wood especially standing trees, where it can forage on large wood-boring insect larvae, than other co-distributed *Dendrocopos* woodpeckers (Gorman, 2014; Winkler & Christie, 2020).

Nowadays, eleven or twelve morphological subspecies are generally recognized based on plumage and body size variations (Gill & Donkers, 2020; Winkler & Christie, 2020). Four of them (*subcirris*, *stejnegeri*, *namiyei*, *owstoni*), endemic to the Japanese archipelago where they occur from sea-level to mountain forests, are distributed from northern Hokkaido up to the small islands in the southern Ryukyu archipelago. The Amami Woodpecker *D. l. owstoni* which differs from other subspecies by its darker plumage, is only found on Amami-Oshima (Ryukyu archipelago) where it inhabits old mature evergreen broadleaved forests and has been treated as a full species in recent checklists (Gill & Donkers, 2020; Winkler et al., 2020). Two other subspecies occur in central (*D. l. tangi*) and southern (*D. l. fohkiensis*) mainland China and another subspecies (*D. l. insularis*) is endemic to the island of Taiwan. In Eurasia, the nominate subspecies has a very wide and continuous range spreading from northern and central Europe to eastern Asia along with the poorly differentiated subspecies *D. l. uralensis* (Winkler & Christie, 2020), which is distributed from the Ural Mountains to Lake Baikal. Finally, the southern subspecies *D. l. lilfordi*, which has well-marked distinctive plumage characteristics (six black bars on rump and back versus none or partial in nominate), is larger than *D. l. leucotos* with which it is in geographical contact in central Europe (Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia). Unlike the nominate subspecies, *D. l. lilfordi*

possesses a fragmented range restricted to old mountainous forests of the southern Palaeartic (Pyrenees, Apennines, Balkans, Asia Minor and Caucasia).

Quaternary (-2.58 million years ago to nowadays) climatic oscillations caused historical range contractions and expansions of organisms and were therefore important factors affecting the phylogeographical structure and the levels of genetic diversity of many taxa throughout the temperate Northern hemisphere (Avise & Walker 1998; Avise, 2000; Hewitt, 2000; Taberlet et al., 1998). Regarding the White-Backed Woodpecker several plausible phylogeographical hypotheses could explain its present-day geographical distribution and genetic structure across the Western Palaeartic. One scenario is that northern *leucotos* populations of the Western Palaeartic would originate from the *lilfordi* lineage which expanded from one or several southern Pleistocene glacial refugia when the climate became favorable to population expansion after the Last Glacial Maximum (in Europe, around 20 kya). This scenario has been described for many organisms exhibiting varied dispersal abilities (Hewitt, 2000; Weiss & Ferrand, 2007). The Western Palaeartic contains at least four primary areas that acted as refugia for forest birds: the Iberian Peninsula, Central Italy, the Balkans and the Caucasia (e.g. Drovetski et al., 2018; Hewitt, 2004). Under this scenario we expect low genetic divergence, the sharing of mitochondrial haplotypes between *leucotos* and *lilfordi* and higher genetic diversity in *lilfordi* populations because it would have successfully persisted through Pleistocene climatic oscillations in one or several southern European refugia (Hewitt, 1996; 2000). The second hypothesis relies upon an independent evolution of *leucotos* and *lilfordi* for a significant amount of time. Under this scenario, the western Palaeartic was first colonized by an ancestral Asian lineage that nowadays only persists in small fragmented *lilfordi* populations found in southern European mountains while the current northern and central European *leucotos* populations were more recently established from an unknown glacial refugium not located in southern Europe but likely in eastern Asia as suggested by Voous (1947). If this hypothesis is correct an old separation and significant genetic divergence between the subspecies *lilfordi* and *leucotos* is expected. Linked to this scenario, we could also expect very little divergence across populations from the northern subspecies, which

occupies a large and contiguous distribution (from South Korea to Norway); such a pattern was found for two other partly sympatric woodpecker species, the Three-Toed (*Picoides tridactylus*) and Great-spotted (*Dendrocopos major*) Woodpecker (Perktas & Quintero, 2013; Zink et al. 2002a,b).

In the present study, we aim to reconstruct the phylogenetic relationships of the White-backed Woodpecker subspecies using multilocus genetic data and we used the mitochondrial gene COI to discriminate between alternative phylogeographical hypotheses that may explain the present-day geographical distribution of the genetic variability within *D. leucotos*. We focused on the phylogeography of the two parapatric subspecies (*lilfordi*, *leucotos*) that occur in the western Palaeartic for which efficient sampling was available to infer demographic history and genetic diversity within populations. Using species distribution modelling, we compared the phylogeographical scenario inferred from genetics with the areas where climatic conditions remained potentially favourable to the White-backed Woodpecker during the last 120 000 years. We also assessed the possibility that *D. l. lilfordi*, which currently does not occur in Corsica, historically inhabited this island using ecological niche modelling and genetic results we obtained from two museum specimens supposedly collected in Corsica at the end of the nineteenth century.

The taxonomic and conservation implications of our results are discussed taking into consideration that some of the currently defined subspecies of *D. leucotos* may represent full species as it was recently suggested for other Palaeartic Pied woodpecker species (e.g. *Dendrocopos major*, Perktas & Quintero, 2013; *Dendrocoptes medius*, Kamp et al., 2018). This is particularly important as some populations attributable to these taxa strongly depend on old growth deciduous or mixed forests, which are under threat due to forest management practices. This is for example the case for the Swedish *D. l. leucotos* population which is classified as critically endangered “CR” on the Swedish national red list and *D. l. lilfordi* classified as vulnerable “VU” in France and in Italy. In Spain, the latter subspecies is considered “In danger of extinction” on the Spanish Catalogue of Threatened Species (Real Decreto 139/2011).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Sampling

We obtained fresh (blood, feathers, muscle, n = 62) and dry (toe pads, n = 8) tissue samples from 70 individuals covering a large part of the White-backed Woodpecker distribution (Fig. 1 and see Table S1 for details of exact localities). We further included 10 mitochondrial sequences that were available on GenBank (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) in the phylogeographical analyses (Accession numbers in Table S1). Eight (*leucotos*, *lilfordi*, *subcirris*, *stejnegeri*, *namiyei*, *owstoni*, *insularis*, *tangi*) out of the eleven subspecies currently recognized (Winkler and Christie 2020) were included in the present study. Two insular subspecies (*takahashii*, *quelpartensis*) morphologically very close to *D. l. namiyei* and *D. l. stejnegeri*, respectively (Vaurie, 1959; Short, 1982), and one mainland subspecies from South-East China (*fokhiensis*) were not available for this study. The two Korean subspecies whose validity is often questioned are much likely of recent origin (Winkler & Christie, 2020). *D. l. fokhiensis* is distributed in southern China and we sampled the other two subspecies that bound its distribution (*tangi* and *insularis*). Furthermore, the subspecies *fokhiensis* is morphologically intermediate between *tangi* and *insularis* (Cheng, 1956). We also sampled two *D. l. lilfordi* specimens, supposedly collected in Corsica during the nineteenth century, currently preserved at the Museum of Natural History of Bern, Switzerland.

Phylogenetic analyses

Published data corrections

During the course of this study, we realized that sequencing/editing errors, involving one base pair in each case, were present in two published sequences (*D. l. leucotos* ZMUC 141307, GenBank Accession numbers: KR049420, Myoglobin; *D. l. leucotos* BON-126, GenBank Accession numbers: GU571366, COI). The sequences were corrected prior to the analyses.

DNA extraction, amplification and sequencing

DNA was extracted from muscle, blood or feather calamus using the DNA Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen, Valencia) extraction kit. DNA was extracted from historical specimens using the DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Valencia) following the manufacturer's protocol except that digestion volume was doubled (400 ul instead of 200 ul) and 30 ul of DTT was added to the digestion solution. Digestion of tissues was performed for 16 hours.

We amplified and sequenced three nuclear autosomal introns Fibrinogene intron 5 (FGB), Myoglobin intron 2 (MB) and transforming growth factor beta 2 (TGFB2) using standard amplification protocols with varied annealing temperature and primers previously published (Fuchs & Pons, 2015). We included 75 intron sequences in the phylogenetic analyses among which 39 were retrieved from Genbank (Table S1).

The mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I (COI) was amplified and sequenced using primers COIext/FISH1R (Ward et al., 2009; Johnsen et al., 2010) following standard amplification protocols. We designed eight internal primers in order to amplify the COI from the historical specimens: primer details are given in Table 1. Our dataset for *D. leucotos* comprised 82 COI sequences of which 10 were previously published in Genbank and Bold (see Table S1). We also included in the phylogenetic analyses 32 COI sequences among which 26 were retrieved from Genbank of related *Dendrocopos* species *sensu* Fuchs and Pons (2015), including a broad sampling of the widely distributed *D. major*, in order to have an independent comparison for intra versus interspecific differentiation. Trees were rooted with sequences from *Picoides pubescens* and *Veniliornis mixtus* (e.g. Fuchs & Pons, 2015; Shakya et al., 2017). Detailed information on the sequences included in the analyses is reported in Table S1.

Determining the phase of alleles

We used PHASE v2.1.1 (Stephens et al., 2001), as implemented in DNASP 5.0 (Librado & Rozas, 2009), to infer the alleles for each nuclear locus. Genetic diversity parameters

including haplotype diversity (H_d), Watterson's Theta (Θ) and nucleotide diversity (π) were estimated in DNAsp 5.0 (Librado & Rozas, 2009) for each lineage.

Gene trees, species tree and molecular divergence time estimates

Nuclear gene tree reconstructions of the unique nuclear alleles were performed using Bayesian inference (BI), as implemented in MRBAYES 3.2 (Ronquist et al., 2012). We used the `nst=mixed` and `rates=invgamma` options such that model uncertainty is taken into account during the phylogenetic reconstruction. Four Metropolis-coupled Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains (one cold and three heated) were run for 5×10^6 iterations, with trees sampled every 10^3 iterations.

We estimated the Time to Most Recent Common Ancestor (TMRCA) among the *Dendrocopos* unique mitochondrial haplotypes using BEAST 1.8.2 (Drummond et al., 2012), with a strict molecular clock model, a TIM + I substitution model selected using TOPALI (Milne et al. 2009) under the Bayesian Information Criterion, and a Yule tree prior. MCMC chains were run for 10^7 steps and were sampled every 10^3 steps. We used three substitution rates and their associated uncertainties to calibrate the trees. The first rate (0.016 s/s/l/myr; 95% HPD: 0.014-0.019 s/s/l/myr) was based on the complete mtDNA genomes from honeycreepers (Passeriformes, Drepanididae) and calibration points based on the age of volcanic islands in the Hawaiian archipelago as proposed by Lerner et al. (2011). The second rate was the four-fold degenerated sites rate derived from complete mtDNA sequences of Adelle Penguins (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) (0.073 s/s/l/myr; 95% HPD: 0.025-0.123 s/s/l/myr; Subramanian et al. (2009). The third rate was a body-mass corrected mitochondrial clock recently proposed by Nabholz et al. (2016). We employed the equation $10^{(-0.145 \cdot \log_{10}(\text{body_mass}) + 0.459)}/100$, corresponding to their calibration set 2, to calculate the body-mass corrected substitution rate for the COI third codon position in our data set. We assumed an average body mass for five of the six sampled *Dendrocopos* species of 82.6 g (Dunning, 2007; no body mass data were available for *D. noguchii* in Dunning (2007), Winkler et al. (2020) or on Vertnet). We used the mitochondrial topology to estimate the third

codon position branch-lengths using PAML v4.9 (Yang, 2007). The branch-lengths were then converted to divergence times in R using scripts from Nabholz et al. (2016).

We reconstructed a species tree using the coalescent-based model implemented in *BEAST (Heled & Drummond, 2010). We selected the substitution model for each locus using TOPALI (Milne et al., 2009) under the Bayesian Information Criterion (COI: TrN + I, FGB: TrN, MB: JC + G, TGFb2: K80). Each locus had its own substitution rate matrix and clock model (all assigned to a strict clock model). The species tree analyses, as implemented in *BEAST require pre-defined species or species level lineages. We defined nine species within our data set corresponding to the outgroups (*P. pubescens*, *V. mixtus*, *D. m. major/pinetorum/numidus*, *D. syriacus*, *D. darjellensis*, *D. noguchii*) and the three White-backed Woodpecker clades for which all loci were available (the Japanese endemic subspecies, *D. l. leucotos/uralensis* and *D. l. lilfordi*). We used a Yule process for the tree prior with a normal prior distribution for the COI substitution rate (0.016 substitutions/site/lineage/million year $-s/l/myr$; 95% HPD: 0.011-0.021 $s/l/myr$). We conducted two runs for 25×10^6 iterations, with trees and parameters sampled every 5×10^3 iterations and discarding the first 2.5×10^6 iterations as the burnin period. TRACER v1.6 (Rambaut & Drummond, 2009) was used to ensure that our effective sample size of the underlying posterior distribution was large enough (>200) for a meaningful estimation of parameters.

Molecular species delimitation methods

We used a Bayesian implementation of the general mixed Yule-coalescent model (bGMYC 1.0; Reid & Carstens, 2012) to delimit species level lineages using molecular data. This implementation is an extension of the GMYC model (Pons et al., 2006) that incorporates gene tree uncertainty by sampling over the posterior distribution of sampled gene trees. We obtained a posterior distribution of ultrametric gene trees from the 33 unique mitochondrial haplotypes using the strategy described above. We ran MCMC for 10^7 iterations with sampling of parameters and trees every 1000 iterations. The first 10% of the samples were removed as the burn-in period. We analyzed 100 trees sampled randomly from the posterior distribution and used the default setting in

bGMYC. We ran the MCMC chains for 5×10^4 iterations, with a burn-in of 4×10^4 iterations, and sampled parameters every 100 iterations.

We also used the software BPPv3.4 (Flouri et al., 2018) to estimate the joint probability of the species tree and the speciation probability (model A11, Yang & Rannala, 2014), testing both algorithm 0 and algorithm 1, for the four-locus data set. We used invgamma priors on the population size parameters (θ) and the age of the root in the species tree (τ_0); the values for the invgamma distribution were determined by *MinimalistBPP* (<https://brannala.github.io/bpps/#/>). We allowed the loci to have different rates (locus rate = 1, Dirichlet distribution) and took into account the differences in heredity scalar (heredity = 2). We ran the rjMCMC analyses for 4×10^5 generations with a burn-in period of 4×10^4 and different starting seeds. Each analysis was run twice. We did not include the lineages *D. l. insularis/l. tangi* and *D. m. japonicus* as they were only represented by the mitochondrial locus.

We used the MCMC method implemented in IMA2 (Hey, 2010) to fit the data to a model that included both isolation and migration to enable us to estimate the level of historical gene flow between the two primary *D. leucotos* lineages: 1) *D. l. lilfordi* and 2) the clade comprising *D. l. leucotos/uralensis* and all endemic Japanese subspecies. We defined inheritance scales to reflect the difference in inheritance modes among the loci: 0.25 for the mtDNA locus, and 1.0 for the two autosomal loci (TGFb2 had to be excluded because of its low number of variable sites, 1). We used an HKY model of nucleotide substitution for all loci. We used a geometric heating scheme ($h_1 = 0.9$, $h_2 = 0.3$) coupled with 100 chains. For each data set, upper bounds for the prior for the final run were adjusted based on preliminary runs with large uniform priors. Parameters and genealogies were sampled every 100 steps until we had sampled 10^5 genealogies. The fit of 25 demographic models involving different combinations of population sizes and migration rates were then determined using likelihood ratio tests under the L-mode setting in IMA2 (Hey & Nielsen, 2007). To assess convergence, we monitored the extent of autocorrelation and parameter trend lines throughout the run and we also compared the results between four independent runs. Incorporating a genetically structured population like the *D. leucotos*/Japanese subspecies clade violates one of the

assumptions of the Isolation with Migration model (Hey & Nielsen, 2004; 2007). We tested the impact of adding the Japanese endemic subspecies (and hence structure) on gene flow estimates by performing additional runs without them. We expect that the impact will be minimal because empirical and simulation data suggest that the associated bias in parameter estimation introduced by the presence of hidden population structure is limited (Strasburg & Rieseberg, 2010).

Genetic structure across the Western Palaearctic

Selection on the mitochondrial loci

We used the McDonald–Kreitman test (MK) (McDonald & Kreitman, 1991), as implemented in DnaSP v. 5.10.01 (Librado & Rozas, 2009) to test whether selection was acting on the mitochondrial protein-coding gene (COI) used to infer phylogeny and population genetics. MK tests were performed between *leucotos* and *lilfordi* the only subspecies for which sample sizes were large enough.

Diversity indices, genetic distance and network

Standard diversity indices for *leucotos*, *uralensis* (N = 44) and *lilfordi* (N = 23) were calculated using Arlequin 3.5 (Excoffier & Lisher, 2010). Subspecies from Japan and China were not included due to small sample size. We used Arlequin 3.5 to perform Fu's F_s and Tajima' D tests (1000 replicates) to detect signatures of population expansion. Fu's F_s and Tajima' D were initially developed to test for selection but in the absence of the latter, significant negative values are indicative of population expansion. We calculated Dxy (average number of nucleotide substitution per site between taxa pairs using DNAsp (Librado & Rozas, 2009). We generated a median-joining network including all subspecies to visualize relationships among haplotypes with NETWORK 10 (Bandlet, Forster & Rohl, 1999).

Ecological niche modelling

Species occurrences data were downloaded using the *rgbif* package (Chamberlain & Boettinger, 2017; Chamberlin et al., 2020) using the *Coordinate=TRUE* and *basis Of*

Record = 'PRESERVED_SPECIMEN' filters. These occurrences were complemented by occurrence data derived from the individuals used for the genetic analyses. After checking for georeferencing errors and removing duplicates, the total number of observations was 370 for *D. l. leucotos/uralensis*, 58 for *D. l. lilfordi* and 42 for the Japanese subspecies. We did not perform species distribution modelling for the *D. l. insularis/tangi* lineage because too few data were available for meaningful species distribution modelling.

We used climatic layers from the Worldclim database (Hijmans et al., 2005; 2.5 min resolution) and restricted the study area to the following coordinates (latitude extent: 25-70; longitude extent: -11-172); corresponding to the extent of the distribution of *D. leucotos*. Among these 19 Bioclim climatic variables, nine variables were retained for the analyses. These variables were selected using *raster.cor.matrix*, as implemented in the *ENMtools* package (Warren et al., 2017) and a correlation threshold of 0.8. Retained variables included: annual mean temperature (BIO1), mean diurnal range (BIO2), isothermality (BIO3), Temperature Seasonality (BIO4), Mean Temperature of Wettest Quarter (BIO8), Annual Precipitation (BIO12), precipitation of the driest month (BIO14), precipitation seasonality (BIO15), and precipitation of the coldest quarter of the year (BIO19).

We built species distribution models for each of the three lineages using the Maximum Entropy algorithm implemented in Maxent ver. 3.3.3 (Phillips et al., 2006). For each lineage, we used 20% of the observations for testing (on randomly sampled 1000 background points) and 80% for model training. We used the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) to determine whether the predictions generated by Maxent for current conditions were better than random. The AUC is a commonly used measurement for comparison of model performance (Elith et al., 2006). The AUC ranges from 0 to 1, with greater scores indicating better discrimination ability; an AUC greater than 0.5 indicates that the model discriminates better than random.

Niche models for each lineage were then projected on paleoclimatic layers from three times periods: the Last Interglacial (about 130,000 years ago; Otto-Bliesner et al.,

2006), the Last Glacial Maximum (21,000 years ago) and the Mid-Holocene (8,326-4,200 years ago) (Fordham et al., 2017). Layers were downloaded from <http://www.paleoclim.org/> (Brown et al., 2018).

We tested for differentiation in niche models using the *niche.equivalency.test* function, as implemented in the *phyloclim* (Heibl & Calange, 2018) package. We performed 99 replicates on the occurrence data for each lineage. We did pairwise comparisons for the three primary lineages: *lilfordi* versus *leucotos*, *lilfordi* versus Japanese subspecies, *leucotos* versus Japanese subspecies.

RESULTS

Multilocus phylogenetic relationships

Gene trees

We performed the phylogenetic analyses on the 33 COI unique haplotypes from our data set using BEAST 1.8.2 (Fig. 2). Seventeen unique haplotypes were identified for *D. leucotos*. The analyses identified a clade with the Okinawa Woodpecker (*D. noguchii*) being sister (PP: 1; Fig. 2) to a monophyletic *D. leucotos* (PP: 0.96). *D. leucotos insularis/D. leucotos tangi* (PP: 1) was the first lineage to split within the *D. leucotos* complex but this relationship was not strongly supported (PP: 0.73). *Dendrocopos l. lilfordi* individuals formed a strongly supported clade (PP: 1). The White-backed subspecies found in Japan (*ownstoni*, *steijnegeri*, *subcirris*, *nameyi*) as well as *D. l. leucotos/uralensis* formed a clade (PP: 1) that was sister to *D. l. lilfordi*. In addition, *D. major* was not monophyletic with populations from the Western Palearctic (Austria, France, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Sweden, Tunisia,; *D. m. major*, *D. m. pinetorum*, *D. m. numidus*) being more closely related to *D. darjellensis*, whereas the eastern populations of *D. major* (*D. m. japonicus*, Russia, South Korea, Japan), were more closely related to *D. syriacus*, although the support for its non-monophyly was quite weak (PP: 0.78).

We failed to obtain nuclear DNA from the subspecies *D. l. insularis* and *D. l. tangi*. The nuclear gene trees were very poorly resolved (FGB, TGFb2) or polytomised (MB) (Figs. S1-3). In most cases, species were not monophyletic or undisputed species were found to share alleles (e.g. *D. major*, *D. syriacus* and *D. leucotos subcirris* in FGB), suggesting that incomplete lineage sorting is still present in *Dendrocopos* at these loci. Concerning *D. leucotos*, the number of alleles found in the nuclear loci were two (TGFb2), five (MB) and six (FGB). For the three nuclear loci, *D. leucotos lilfordi* had only one allele that was shared with individuals from the northern lineage (MB, TGFb2) or private (FGB). Genetic diversity summary statistics for the three nuclear introns are reported in Table S2.

Species tree

The subspecies *D. l. insularis* and *D. l. tangi* could not be included in the species tree analyses (Fig. 3) since no nuclear data were obtained. The topology resulting from the *BEAST analyses indicated that the Japanese subspecies are related to *D. leucotos leucotos* and *D. leucotos uralensis* (PP: 0.93) and that all lineages mentioned above are sister to *D. leucotos lilfordi* (PP: 0.99).

Molecular species delimitations methods

The bGMYC molecular species delimitation method recovered four species in the sampled members of the genus *Dendrocopos*. Even well accepted species were lumped (*Dendrocopos syriacus* with *D. major japonicus* ($p=0.08$), *D. darjellensis* with *D. major major/pinetorum/numidus* ($p=0.09$), although in several cases the p-values were close to significance threshold ($p=0.05$). Within *D. leucotos*, the p-values were 0.07-0.09 for the species status of *D. l. insularis/D. l. tangi* versus *D. l. leucotos/D. l. lilfordi* and 0.11 for *D. l. leucotos* versus *D. l. lilfordi*.

The analyses performed with BPP indicated that the nine species model received the highest posterior probability (PP: 0.998 in both algorithms 0 and 1). Noticeably, *D. l. leucotos/uralensis*, the Japanese subspecies clade and *D. leucotos lilfordi* all received speciation probabilities of 1.0. The species tree topology was very similar to the *Beast

results, with the single difference involving the relationships of *D. syriacus*, *D. major* (Western) and *D. darjellensis*.

Divergence time estimates

Molecular divergence times analyses, performed with the Fringillidae COI rate, a strict clock model and a TIM+I model indicated that *D. leucotos* diverged from *D. noguchii* about 1.1 Mya (95% HPD: 0.7-1.5 Mya), that *D. l. insularis/D. l. tangi* splitted from the remaining *D. leucotos* subspecies clade 0.8 Mya (95% HPD: 0.5-1.1 Mya), and that *D. leucotos lilfordi* splitted from the northern taxa about 0.6 Mya (95% HPD: 0.4-0.9 Mya). These splits were simultaneous with the splits between *D. darjellensis* and the Western Palearctic *D. major* (0.7 Mya, 95% HPD: 0.4-1.0 Mya) and between *D. syriacus* and *D. major japonicus* (0.8 Mya, 95% HPD: 0.5-1.1 Mya). Very similar estimates were obtained using the fourfold degenerated rate (e.g. *D. leucotos/D. noguchii* 0.9 Mya, 95% HPD: 0.3-1.7 Mya; *D. l. leucotos/D. l. lilfordi* 0.5 Mya, 95% HPD: 0.15-0.9 Mya). Estimates obtained using the body-mass corrected rate were about three times older: *D. leucotos* diverged from *D. noguchii* about 3.6 Mya (95%: 2.8-4.4 Mya), *D. l. insularis/D. l. tangi* from the *D. l. leucotos/D. l. lilfordi* clade 2.4 Mya (95%: 1.9-2.9 Mya), the two latter subspecies diverging from each other about 1.9 Mya (95%: 1.6-2.4 Mya).

Within *D. leucotos*, divergence times obtained in the species tree analyses (calibrated using the Lerner et al. 2011 rates) were similar to the one obtained using the mitochondrial DNA alone: *D. leucotos lilfordi* splitted from the northern taxa about 0.6 Mya (95% HPD: 0.2-1.0 Mya).

The *D. major/D. leucotos* clade started to diversify about 1.1-2.1 Mya (mtDNA only: Lerner et al. (2011) rate, 95% HPD: 1.1-2.0 Mya, fourfold rate: 95% HPD: 0.5-2.6 Mya; species tree: 95% HPD: 1.3-2.9 Mya).

Population genetics

Mitochondrial genetic diversity and genetic distance

Hd and π were much higher in *lifordi* populations than in *leucotos/uralensis* populations (see Table 2). The MK tests did not detect any significant evidence of selection in the mitochondrial DNA (COI) gene when comparing *leucotos/uralensis* with *lifordi* (Fischer's exact tests, $p = 0.49$). Tajima's D and Fu's tests suggested strong evidence of population expansion for the *leucotos/uralensis* lineage (Table 2). By contrast, we did not detect any sign of population expansion for *lifordi*. These results thus suggest a different historical demography for these two subspecies. The D_{xy} distance between *lifordi* and *leucotos* was 2.1% which compares to the distances between *D. noguchii* and *D. leucotos* sensu lato (3.3%), between *D. major* (W Palaearctic) and *D. darjellensis* (1.9%), and between *D. major* (E Palaearctic) and *D. syriacus* (2.6%). The D_{xy} value for the *D. l. insularis/tangi* versus the remaining *D. leucotos* subspecies was 1.8%.

Median-joining network

The median-joining network was based on 80 COI sequences and included the two Chinese subspecies (Fig. 4). Seventeen haplotypes clustered in four sub-networks corresponding to the four main clades highlighted in the COI phylogenetic analyses (Fig. 2). The Japanese subspecies sub-network was closely related to the Eurasian *leucotos* sub-network (2 mutation steps). The most common Japanese haplotype was shared by *owstoni*, *subcirris*, *stejnegeri* and *namiyei* highlighting both their close genetic proximity and their recent origin. All Japanese subspecies form a monophyletic group. The northern *leucotos* sub-network displayed a star-like shape with a common central haplotype having a wide geographical distribution at the centre of the network and derived haplotypes weakly differentiated radiating from the ancestral haplotype. Such a pattern is commonly observed in the case of recent population expansion, also suggested for *leucotos* by the Fu's F_s and Tajima significant tests (Table 2). It is remarkable that the most common *leucotos* haplotype has a very wide geographical distribution ranging from western Europe to eastern Russia. It is also worth noting the high haplotype diversity found in Poland ($n = 4$) compared to Scandinavia ($n = 2$), other European countries ($n = 1$) and especially Russia and Mongolia which cover huge areas ($n = 1$). Only two individuals were available for Chinese subspecies (*insularis*, *tangi*)

which group together in the same sub-network and are at the same time well differentiated from both *leucotos* and *lilfordi* sub-networks. The most common *lilfordi* haplotype was shared between White-backed Woodpeckers coming from the Pyrenees and the Balkans (Fig. 4). All individuals from Italy ($n = 5$) hold the same haplotype that diverges from the most common *lilfordi* haplotype by one mutation step while the only Caucasian White-backed Woodpecker included in the network was more distant (three mutation steps). Both White-backed Woodpeckers supposedly collected in Corsica hold the most common haplotype found in the Balkans and Pyrenees.

Gene flow among D. leucotos lineages

The results from the isolation-with-migration analyses were slightly different across runs; unrejected models that differed across runs implied the putative existence of differences in population sizes 1) between the two defined extant populations (*lilfordi* versus *leucotos/uralensis/owstoni/namiyei/subcirris/steijnegeri*) or 2) between the extant *leucotos/uralensis/owstoni/namiyei/subcirris/steijnegeri* and the ancestral population. Models that were always rejected across runs implied equal population sizes for the two extant populations and the ancestral population. Models that were never rejected included the full model, the models implying different population sizes among populations and models assuming equal population size between *D. l. lilfordi* and the ancestral population.

The common feature across all analyses was that the historical migration rate between the two extant populations was estimated to be 0 in all models that were not rejected by the likelihood ratio tests. Hence, the isolation-with-migration analyses strongly indicated that there is no historical gene flow between *lilfordi* and *leucotos/uralensis/owstoni/namiyei/subcirris/steijnegeri* and that alleles shared in the nuclear DNA are due to incomplete lineage sorting.

Ecological niche modelling

For the three lineages, the AUC value was higher than 0.92 (*leucotos* = 0.93, *lilfordi* = 0.97, Japanese subspecies = 0.99); values higher than 0.76 are considered to correspond to a useful predictive model (Phillips & Dudík 2008).

Models projected on current bioclimatic data were good representations of the current knowledge regarding the distribution of the species. One exception involves the climatic suitability for *D. l. lilfordi*, where the current distribution is much more restricted when compared to its potential distribution based on bioclimatic data (see below).

For the Japanese lineage, the highest predicted suitability is along the Japanese archipelago with other suitable areas in the Korean peninsula and southeastern China (Fig. 5). The predicted range of the lineage may have been stable in the Japanese archipelago during the last 120,000 years (Fig. 5), with other continuously putatively stable areas being southeastern China and Central Europe.

For the *D. l. leucotos/uralensis* lineage, the highest predicted suitability is central and eastern Europe west of the Ural Mountains, around Lake Baikal, northeastern China, the Korean peninsula as well as the isolated Kamtchatka peninsula (Fig. 5). Suitable climatic conditions were highly restricted for this lineage at the Last Glacial Maximum (Fig. 5), with two areas having high suitability, central Europe around the Carpathians Mountains and southeastern China and Japan. Projections of the niche model on paleoclimatic layers indicate a distribution extent very similar to current conditions for the Last Interglacial and Mid-Holocene periods (Fig. 5, Fig. S4).

For *D. l. lilfordi*, the current distribution is only a fraction of the potential distribution of the lineage based on the bioclimatic data (Fig. 5). Indeed, in addition to regions currently occupied by the lineage, vast areas of Western Europe (France, Great Britain and Scandinavia) are climatically potentially suitable for this lineage. The potential suitable distribution of this lineage has been relatively stable since the Last Interglacial (Fig. 5), with the four southwestern Palearctic refugia (Iberia, Italy, Balkans, Causasia) being suitable throughout. Noticeably, Corsica had suitable, yet limited to the center of the island, climatic conditions for *D. l. lilfordi* throughout the last 120,000 years (Fig. S4).

The *niche.equivalency.test* was highly significant for the three pairwise comparisons, suggesting that the three lineages occupy different niches *leucotos/uralensis* versus *lilfordi*: Schoener's $D= 0.13$, $p<0.0001$; Japanese subspecies versus *lilfordi*: Schoener's $D= 0.17$, $p<0.0001$; Japanese subspecies versus *leucotos/uralensis*: Schoener's $D= 0.20$, $p<0.0001$.

DISCUSSION

Phylogenetic relationships among morphological subspecies

Our phylogenetic results support the existence of three well-supported monophyletic groups within *D. leucotos* and confirm that *D. noguchii* is the sister species of *D. leucotos* (Fuchs & Pons, 2015; Winkler et al., 2005). Relationships among the three primary lineages are not well resolved most probably because of the relatively short sequences data upon which our phylogenetic analyses were based. Nevertheless, our results suggest that the Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) were the first to branch off around 0.8 Mya. A similar phylogenetic pattern was found for the Great Spotted Woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* for which the lineage distributed in China was also the first to split around 0.8 Mya (Perktas & Quinteros, 2013); we nevertheless highlight that caution should be taken when comparing the divergence times between the two studies because different molecular clocks were used. The second split dated back to about 0.5-0.6 Mya separated the northern *leucotos* group including two subspecies not genetically differentiated (*leucotos*, *uralensis*) and the four Japanese subspecies (*namiyei*, *subcirris*, *stejnegeri*, *owstoni*) from the southern *lilfordi* subspecies. Within the northern group, the Japanese subspecies formed a clade with respect to the continental White-Backed Woodpeckers. The Amami Woodpecker sometimes treated as a full species (*D. owstoni*; Winkler et al., 2020) is not genetically differentiated from other Japanese subspecies with which it shares the most common haplotype found across the Japanese archipelago. Significant differences in plumage and morphology highlighted for this insular taxon, only found in Amami-Oshima Island (northern Ryukyu archipelago), do not reflect an old divergent evolutionary history. They may

result from a rapid evolution or phenotypic plasticity related to humid subtropical insular environment and/or drift.

One further surprising result is the paraphyly of the Great Spotted Woodpecker. Indeed our mitochondrial results support a topology where the western subspecies of *D. major* are more closely related to *D. darjellensis* than to the eastern *D. major japonicus* subspecies which is sister to *D. syriacus*. This hypothesis was not highlighted in previous studies due to limited geographic (Fuchs & Pons 2015) and/or taxonomic (Perktas & Quintero, 2015; Zink et al. 2002a) sampling. Additional studies based on a multilocus approach and including individuals from the Chinese and himalayensis populations are necessary to validate this result and test further hypotheses regarding species limits and/or introgression of mitochondrial DNA across species.

Biogeographic history

Our molecular data clearly suggest that the Japanese archipelago was recently colonized from eastern Eurasia by *D. leucotos* only once. The four subspecies are only little genetically differentiated: all morphological subspecies share a common haplotype and the three derived haplotypes differ from this ancestral haplotype by only one to three mutations. The Ryukyu archipelago, which lies off the southern shore of Hokkaido was likely colonized independently by *D. l. owstoni* and *D. noguchii* which are not sister relatives. More samples from the eastern range of *D. leucotos* and especially from China would be crucial to understand the biogeographic history of this species in Asia in more details. On the mainland, the Eurasian *leucotos* group holds a common haplotype over an extremely wide geographical range, from western Europe (Norway) up to eastern Asia (South Korea). Within this group, the genetic variation is very low and not geographically structured, a conclusion also reached by Ellegren et al. (1999) based on the sampling of Polish and Scandinavian populations. The star-like network as well as significant tests of population expansion clearly suggest that all present-day populations recently and rapidly expanded from a unique glacial refugium. However, surprisingly, most of the haplotype diversity is found in Europe and specifically in Poland, which holds four of the six haplotypes found in the Eurasian *leucotos* group. In contrast, in

Russia and Mongolia, where twelve White-backed Woodpeckers were sampled over a large area, only one haplotype was detected. Such a geographical distribution of the genetic variability within the *leucotos* group is hardly compatible with the most common phylogeographical pattern generally invoked for forest bird species, that is a colonisation of the western Palaearctic from an Eastern Palaearctic refugium, which was ice-free during the last glacial maximum while most of Europe was still covered by ice (Adams, 1997; Hewitt, 1996; Hughes et al., 2013; Pons et al., 2015; Penzold et al., 2013; Schmitt & Varga, 2012; Voous, 1947, Zink et al., 2002a). Our mitochondrial data could support the persistence of a *leucotos* population in Central Europe in a so-called cryptic glacial refugium, possibly located around the Carpathians (see below), from which the subspecies expanded eastward across Siberia after the Last Glacial Maximum. Consistent with mitochondrial data, climatic niche modelling suggests that suitable climatic conditions might have persisted in Central Europe during the Last Glacial Maximum (Fig. 5). In further support of this hypothesis, a post glacial eastward range expansion from Central Europe to Siberia has also been suggested for the Adder (*Vipera berus*) (Schmitt & Varga, 2012) and the Willow Tit (*Poecile montanus*) (Pavlova et al., 2006). The classical view of glacial stages where trees were restricted to localized refugial areas in southern Europe and the Mediterranean basin was challenged by paleobotanical evidence (Birks & Willis, 2008) and tree megafossils (Kulmann, 2002). These authors suggest that during the glacial periods tree ranges were more extensive than previously believed and that many local areas of small tree populations in Central Europe persisted in cryptic refugia. In a study devoted to the phylogeography of the bank vole *Clethrionomys glareolus*, a European rodent species strongly associated with forest habitat, Deffontaine et al. (2005) stated that the endemic Mediterranean phylogroups did not contribute to the postglacial recolonization of much of the Palaearctic species range. Instead, the major part of this region was apparently recolonized by bank voles that survived in a glacial refugium possibly around the Carpathian Mountains, which were covered by small patches of mixed forests of coniferous and deciduous trees during the last glacial maximum (see also Provan & Bennett, 2008 for a review on the existence of a Carpathian cryptic refugia for mammals, reptiles and amphibians). More studies based on larger samples especially

from the eastern range of the species' distribution would be welcomed to confirm the eastward range expansion of *leucotos* from a European cryptic refugium.

By contrast with the wide and continuous range of *D. l. leucotos*, *D. l. lilfordi* occupies a fragmented geographical range, restricted to the mountainous regions of the southwestern Palearctic. In line with its scattered geographical distribution, our mitochondrial results suggest a completely different historical demography for this southern subspecies. *D. l. lilfordi* holds a much higher genetic diversity than *D. l. leucotos* and unlike the latter its populations did not show any sign of recent expansion. Although based on small sample sizes in the Apennines ($n = 5$) and Caucasia ($n = 1$), the geographical distribution of *lilfordi* haplotypes suggests a strong structure of the genetic variability among allopatric populations. Each mountainous population (Pyrenees, Abruzzi, Caucasia) holds its private haplotypes and does not share any haplotype with their counterparts. The only exception to this pattern are the Balkans which hold the most common Pyrenean haplotype, suggesting possible past gene flow between both regions and a more extended geographical distribution of *lilfordi* in the past than nowadays as predicted by our climatic niche modelling results (Fig. 5). Tomialojć (2000) also suggested that the White-backed Woodpecker, being the most dependent woodpecker species on decaying deciduous timbers, failed to survive in lowlands of western Europe because of woodland management since the medieval times.

Western Palearctic phylogeographical pattern

The Pleistocene has played a major role in the differentiation at the intraspecific and interspecific level of many temperate palaeartic organisms including forest and woodland birds (e.g. Brito, 2005; Drovetski et al., 2018; Hewitt, 2004; Kvist et al., 2004; Pons et al., 2011; 2015; Schmitt, 2007). Our genetic results support a mid-Pleistocene divergence between *lilfordi* and *leucotos*. The two subspecies possess different phylogeographic structures and demographic histories. In contrast to *lilfordi*, whose allopatric small populations are genetically slightly differentiated and persisted through the Pleistocene climatic oscillations in southern Europe, our results suggest no

geographical structure and recent spatial expansion of the *leucotos* lineage from a unique refuge, as suggested by the negative values of Tajima's D and Fu's Fs statistics. In Europe, the White-backed Woodpecker has a two-clade genetic structure corresponding to *D. l. leucotos* found in central and northern regions and *D. l. lilfordi* restricted to southern mountainous areas. Both subspecies are presently in geographical contact in the northern Balkans following the recent southward range expansion of *D. l. leucotos* (Hans Winkler, unpublished data). Our results do not support a phylogeographical pattern in which central and northern Europe would have been re-colonized from one or several southern glacial refugia where *lilfordi* populations persisted during the Quaternary. Penzold et al. (2013) found a similar two-clade genetic structure for the European populations of the Coal tit (*Periparus ater*) as well as Pons et al. (2015) for the Eurasian Treecreeper (*Certhia familiaris*). In both species, an old lineage mostly restricted to southern Europe co-exists with a much more widely distributed lineage whose range extends from western Europe up to eastern Asia. To explain such a pattern, the authors propose a double colonization of Europe from the eastern Asian range because the northern subspecies (*P. a. ater* and *C. f. familiaris/macrodactyla*, respectively, see Penzold et al., 2013; Pons et al., 2015) were closely related to eastern subspecies. This is probably not the case for the White-backed Woodpecker for which both Chinese subspecies are the first to branch off while *lilfordi* and *leucotos* are sister taxa. Duriez et al. (2007) highlighted a similar phylogenetic structure in the Western Capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*) which has a sister Asian species (*T. parvirostris*) and includes two divergent European lineages (the "aquitanus" lineage with a southern scattered mountainous distribution and the "urogallus" lineage with a much wider Eurasian range). Moreover, it is worth noting that *D. leucotos* shares a concordant phylogeographic pattern with its main preys, saproxylic beetles, especially Cerambycidae, which are also associated with old-growth deciduous or mixed forests where rotten trees are available (e.g. Drag et al., 2015). Interestingly, a shared phylogeographic between predator and preys is also known for other woodpecker species and their respective preys (e.g. Three-toed woodpecker and bark beetles; Zink et al., 2002b; Sallé et al, 2007).

Presence of the White-backed Woodpecker in Corsica?

In the present study, we also included two White-backed Woodpeckers specimens, putatively collected in Corsica. These two specimens were probably collected during the second half of the nineteenth century when the White-backed Woodpecker was possibly still found in Corsica according to some authors (Chappuis, 1976; Grangé, 2015a; Moltoni & Bricchetti, 1977; but see Thibault & Bonaccorsi, 1999 for an opposite opinion). In addition, the vocalizations of the White-backed Woodpecker were recorded once in Corsica in the middle of the twentieth century by Chappuis (1976) but a possible confusion with the Great Spotted Woodpecker cannot be fully excluded (Grangé, 2015a). The two putative Corsican specimens included in this study hold the most common *lilfordi* haplotype distributed in the Pyrenees and the Balkans. If the putative presence of the White-backed woodpecker in Corsica resulted from an ancient colonization event, one would have expected that both specimens hold a slightly divergent haplotype from the most ancestral haplotype as it is observed in the Abruzzi and the Caucasia (see Fig. 4) but this is not the case. The second hypothesis of a more recent colonization from the nearby Italian Peninsula, possibly during the last glacial maximum when the sea level was lower than today, can also be rejected because the putative Corsican specimens do not show the Abruzzi haplotype. The hypothesis that Corsica was colonized by what can possibly be an older and more widespread Pyrenean/Balkans lineage cannot be ruled out by our data set. Our mitochondrial data neither strongly argue for the Corsican origin of these two museum specimens nor can definitively reject it. Interestingly, the species distribution modelling suggests that Corsica had potentially suitable habitats for *lilfordi* throughout the last 120,000 years (Fig. S4). The absence of *D. leucotos sensu lato* fossils in Corsica and the fact that *D. major* is known from two Pleistocene sites in Corsica (Grangé 2015a) would argue for the hypothesis that *D. leucotos* never colonized Corsica. Yet, *D. leucotos* is usually much scarcer than *D. major* and the fact that the latter, although present, was only found in two localities suggests that the probability of finding *D. leucotos* fossils is very low. As a consequence, the problem remains currently unresolved and only genome wide data may help to solve it.

Taxonomic conclusions

The current taxonomy applied to the White-backed Woodpecker does not correctly reflect the species evolutionary history. According to our genetic results four lineages emerge: 1 - the Chinese species group includes at least two morphological subspecies. Based on its geographic distribution and morphology (Cheng, 1956) the subspecies *fokhiensis*, which could not be sampled, very likely belongs to this group. This lineage split from other White-backed woodpeckers around 0.8 Mya (mid-Pleistocene); 2 – the *leucotos* group currently includes two morphological subspecies (*leucotos* and *uralensis*) which are not genetically distinguishable in the present study; 3 – the Japanese subspecies group includes four morphological subspecies which are of recent origin and sister to the *leucotos* group. Our results do not support the species rank which is sometimes assigned to the insular *owstoni* (Winkler et al., 2020); 4 – the *lilfordi* group includes only one morphological subspecies which split from the *leucotos* group around 0.3-0.4 Mya.

The molecular species delimitation methods and the gene flow analyses (support for no historical gene flow) in line with the differences in ecology (Grangé, 2015b), adult plumage (rump mostly black, back barred black, red below more extensive than in *leucotos*) and juvenile plumage (undertail coverts not reddish and females without red on crown) (Grangé, unpublished results) suggest that the subspecies *lilfordi* may be elevated to the species rank. We also highlight that further studies are needed in the Balkans, where *leucotos* and *lilfordi* are geographically intertwined (Hans Winkler, unpublished data) to assess whether both subspecies are ecologically segregated, *lilfordi* exhibiting habitat preferences for mountainous forests over most of its distribution range, or syntopic and able to form mixed pairs. Given that the present work would support the species status for *lilfordi*, a species status is automatically deserved, under the Phylogenetic Species Concept, to the *D. l. insularis*/ *D. l. tangi* lineage, *Dendrocopos insularis* (Gould, 1863) by priority. The inclusion of *D. l. fokhiensis* will be needed to confirm the hypothesis that it is part of this group, as suggested according to morphology (Cheng, 1956).

Conservation issues

The White-backed Woodpecker is currently assigned to the “Least Concern” category in the world IUCN red list of threatened species. Our mitochondrial results nevertheless stress the important conservation role of Białowieża Forest, the last remnant of primeval forest in lowlands of Europe, as well as of the Carpathians forests, in sheltering the most genetically diversified population of *leucotos* while Eastern Palearctic populations seem to be more uniform. Following the present study which emphasizes the genetic distinctiveness of *lilfordi* and knowing its fragmented range and relatively small breeding populations at the Western edge e.g. 400-550 pairs for the French Pyrenean population and around 100 pairs on the Spanish side of the Pyrenees (Grangé, unpublished results, Campión & Senosiain, 2004; Carcamo, 2016), it all appears that the conservation status of this subspecies, as well as that of the Chinese subspecies, should be evaluated independently from other members of the northern Eurasian *leucotos* group. Most *lilfordi* populations are restricted to old-growth deciduous forests located in mountains in which dead trees and fallen timbers are abundant (Winkler & Christie, 2020). Yet a large part of these habitats is subject to major threats due to intense logging activities. According to our ecological niche modelling, the current distribution of *lilfordi* is only a small part of its potential geographic distribution that could potentially include lowlands of western France and Great-Britain if forested habitats were favourable to its ecological requirements in old forests and decaying deciduous timbers. In line with this, in Spain, there is a slow westward geographic expansion of the species that occupies new beech forests (Campión, unpublished results). This is probably due to the abandonment of charcoal manufacturing in the mid-20th century and the consequent ecological improvement of these forests, intensively exploited since the Middle Ages.

The conservation of *lilfordi* populations which are currently at risk in mountains of south-western Europe is thus directly dependent on the preservation of large areas of mature deciduous forests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We warmly thank all contributors whose names are listed in the Table S1 for providing us with tissue samples. We are very grateful to G. Boano (Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Carmagnola), J. Martens, Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Germany, Gilberto Pasinelli (Swiss Ornithological Institute), Switzerland and Paul Harris for their precious help to obtain tissue samples from Italy and Mongolia. Many thanks to Eva Remešová, Robert Špilák, Daniel Křenek and Kateřina Ševčíková for helping with the collection of samples from the Czech Republic, Robert Kruszyk, Tomasz Mokwa and Tomasz Baziak for providing some samples from Poland. We also thank M. Balman, BirdLife International and NatureServe for providing the shape files used for Fig. 1. We are particularly grateful to S. Birks (University of Washington, Burke Museum, Seattle, USA), Manuel Schweitzer (Bern Museum, Switzerland) and S. Kobayashi (Yamashina Institute for Ornithology) who provided tissue samples for molecular analyses. Many thanks to the small GOPA team (P. Urbina-Tobias, E. Q. Champagne, S. Duchateau, S. Hommeau, L. Joubert, D. Laban, H. Lafitte, P. Marsaguet, P. Navarre) for helping during the field work in the French Pyrenees approved by the Centre de Recherches sur les Populations d'Oiseaux (MNHN). The fieldwork in Spain (Navarre) was part of the Poctefa HABIOS program, financed by EU FEDER funds, and was done thanks to D. Villanúa and JM Elosegui and other technicians and Forest Rangers (G. Gorospe, G. Deán, S. Cárcamo, A. Senosiain, X. Azpirotz and J. Zuazu). We are grateful to two anonymous referees for their relevant suggestions on a previous version of this manuscript. We are also grateful to the technical staff of the "Acquisition et Analyse de Données", Pôle Analyse de Données et Service de Systématique Moléculaire, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle who helped us with the laboratory work. This work was partly supported by the "Action Transversale du Muséum", Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. M. (1997). *Global land environments since the last interglacial*. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, TN, USA. <http://www.esd.ornl.gov/ern/gen/nerc.html>

Avise, J. C., & Walker, D. E. (1998). Pleistocene phylogeographic effects on avian populations and the speciation process. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 265, 457-463.

Avise, J. C. (2000). *Phylogeography: the history and formation of species*. Harvard University.

Bandelt, H. J., Forster, P., & Rohlf, A. (1999). Median-joining networks for inferring intraspecific phylogenies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 16, 37-48.

Becker, R. A., & Wilks, A. R., (2013). *mapdata*: Extra Map Databases. R version by Brownrigg R. (2013) R package version 2.2-2. Available via <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mapdata>.

BirdLife International and NatureServe. (2013). *Bird species distribution maps of the world*. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK and NatureServe, Arlington, USA.

Birks, H. J. B., & Willis, K. J. (2008). Alpines, trees, and refugia in Europe. *Plant Ecology & Diversity*, 1, 147-160.

Bivand, R. & Lewin-Koh, N., (2014). *maptools*: Tools for reading and handling spatial objects. R package version 0.8-29. Available via <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=maptools>.

Brito, P. H. (2005). The influence of Pleistocene glacial refugia on tawny owl genetic diversity and phylogeography in western Europe. *Molecular Ecology*, 14, 3077-3094.

Brown, J., Hill D., Dolan, A., Carnaval A. C. & Haywood, A. M. (2018). PaleoClim, high spatial resolution paleoclimate surfaces for global land areas. *Scientific Data*, 5, 1-9.

Campión, D., & Senosiain, A. (2004). Pico dorsiblanco, *Dendrocopos leucotos*. In: Madroño A, González C. & Atienza J.C. (eds). *Libro Rojo de las Aves de España*. Dirección General para la Biodiversidad-SEO/BirdLife. Madrid. pp. 307-309.

Carcamo, S. (2016). Distribution du Pic de Lilford *Dendrocopos leucotos lilfordi* à l'ouest des Pyrénées espagnoles. *Le Casseur d'Os*, 16, 96-104.

Chamberlain, S, Barve, V, Mcglinn, D, Oldoni, D, Desmet, P, Geffert, L, & Ram, K. (2020). rgbif: Interface to the Global Biodiversity Information Facility API_. R package version 2.2.0, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rgbif>.

Chamberlain, S., & Boettiger, C. (2017). “R Python, and Ruby clients for GBIF species occurrence data.” PeerJ PrePrints. <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.3304v1>.

Chappuis, C. (1976). Origine et évolution des vocalisations de certains oiseaux de Corse et des Baléares. *Alauda*, 44, 475-495.

Cheng T. (1956). A new form of White-backed Woodpecker (*Dendrocopos leucotos tangi* susp. Nov.) from Szechwan (China). *Acta Zoologica Sinica*, 8, 133-142.

Clement, M., Posada, D., & Crandall, K.A. (2000). TCS: a computer program to estimate gene genealogies. *Molecular Ecology*, 9, 1657-1659.

Deffontaine, V, Libois, R, Kotlik, P, Summer, R, Searle, J. B., & Michaux J. R. 2005. Beyond the Mediterranean peninsulas: evidence of central refugia for a temperate forest mammal species, the bank vole (*Clethrionomys glareolus*). *Molecular Ecology* 14: 1727-1739

Drag, L., Hauck, D., Bérces, S., Michalcewicz, J., Šerić Jelaska, L., Aurenhammer, S., & Cizek L. (2015). Genetic differentiation of populations of the Rosalia longicorn, *Rosalia alpina* (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in Central and South-east Europe. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 116, 911-925.

Drovetski, S. V., Fadeev, I. V., Raković, M., Lopes, R. J., Boano, G., Pavia, M., ... & Voelker G. (2018). A test of the European Pleistocene refugial paradigm, using a

Western Palaearctic endemic bird species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 285, 20181606.

Drummond, A. J., Suchard, M. A., Xie D. & Rambaut A. (2012). Bayesian phylogenetics with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 29, 1969-1973.

Dunning J. B. (2007). *CRC handbook of avian body masses*, second edition: CRC Press.

Duriez, O., Sachet, J. M., Ménoni, E., Pidancier, N., Miquel, C., & Taberlet, P. (2007). Phylogeography of the capercaillie in Eurasia: what is the conservation status in the Pyrenees and Cantabrian Mounts? *Conservation Genetics*, 8, 513-526.

Elith, J., Graham, C. H., Anderson, R. P., Dudik, M., Ferrier, S., Guisan, ... & Zimmermann, N. E. (2006). Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography*, 29, 129–151.

Ellegren, H., Carlson, A., & Stenberg, I. (1999). Genetic Structure and Variability of White-Backed Woodpecker (*Dendrocopos Leucotos*) Populations in Northern Europe. *Hereditas*, 130, 291-299.

Excoffier, L. & Lischer, H. E. L. (2010). Arlequin suite ver 3.5: A new series of programs to perform population genetics analyses under Linux and Windows. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 10, 564-567.

Flouri, T., Jiao, X., Rannala, B., & Yang, Z. (2018). Species Tree Inference with BPP using Genomic Sequences and the Multispecies Coalescent. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 35, 2585-2593.

Fordham, D. A., Saltré, F., Haythorne, S., Wigley, T. M. L., Otto Bliesner, B. L., Chan, K. C., & Brook, B. W. (2017). PaleoView: a tool for generating continuous climate projections spanning the last 21 000 years at regional and global scales. *Ecography*, 40, 1348-1358.

Fuchs, J., & Pons, J. M. (2015). A new classification of the Pied Woodpeckers assemblage (Dendropicini, Picidae) based on a comprehensive multi-locus phylogeny. *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, 88, 28-37.

Gill, F., Donsker, D., & Rasmussen, P. (Eds). (2020). IOC World Bird List (v10.1). [doi: 10.14344/IOC.ML.10.1](https://doi.org/10.14344/IOC.ML.10.1).

Gorman, G. (2014). *Woodpeckers of the world: the complete guide*. Christopher Helm, London.

Grangé J.-L. (2015a). Le pic à dos blanc *Dendrocopos leucotos* sl. en Corse, entre mythe et réalité. *Bulletin de la Société des sciences historiques et naturelles de la Corse*, 750-751, 183-199.

Grangé, J.-L. (2015b). Breeding biology of the Lilford Woodpecker *Dendrocopos leucotos lilfordi* in the Western Pyrenees (SW France). *Denisia 36, zugleich Kataloge des oberösterreichischen Landesmuseums Neue Serie*, 164, 99-111.

Grangé, J. L., & Red'kin, Y., (2019). White-backed Woodpecker does not occur in Kamchatka, Russia. *Dutch Birding*, 41, 103-106.

Heibl, C., & Calenge, C. (2018). phyloclim: Integrating Phylogenetics and Climatic Niche Modeling. R package version 0.9.5. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=phyloclim>

Heled, J., & Drummond, A. J. (2010). Bayesian Inference of Species Trees from Multilocus Data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 27, 570-580.

Hewitt, G. M. (1996). Some genetic consequences of ice ages, and their role in divergence and speciation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 58, 247-276.

Hewitt, G. M. (2000). The genetic legacy of the Quaternary ice ages. *Nature*, 405, 907-913.

Hewitt, G. M. (2004). Genetic consequences of climatic oscillation in the Quaternary. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B; Biological Sciences*, 359, 183-195.

Hey, J. (2010). Isolation with migration models for more than two populations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 27, 905-920.

Hey, J., & Nielsen, R. (2004). Multilocus methods for estimating population sizes, migration rates and divergence time, with applications to the divergence of *Drosophila pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis*. *Genetics*, 167, 747–760.

Hey, J., & Nielsen, R. (2007). Integration within the Felsenstein equation for improved Markov chain Monte Carlo methods in population genetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 2785–2790.

Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 25, 1965-1978.

Hughes, P. D., Gibbard, P. L., & Ehlers, J. (2013). Timing of glaciation during the last glacial cycle: evaluating the concept of a global ‘Last Glacial Maximum’(LGM). *Earth-Science Reviews*, 125, 171-198.

Hung, C. M., Drovetski, S. V., & Zink, R. M. (2012). Multilocus coalescence analyses support a mtDNA-based phylogeographic history for a widespread palearctic passerine bird, *Sitta europaea*. *Evolution*, 66, 2850-2864.

Johnsen, A., Rindal, E., Ericson, P. G. P., Zuccon, D., Kerr, K. C. R., Stoeckle, M. Y., & Lifjeld, D. (2010). DNA barcoding of Scandinavian birds reveals divergent lineages in trans-Atlantic species. *Journal of Ornithology*, 151, 565-578.

Kamp, L., Pasinelli, G., Pietro Milanese, P., Drovetski, S. V., Kosiński, Z., Kossenko, S., ... & Schweizer, M. (2019). Significant Asia-Europe divergence in the middle spotted woodpecker (Aves: Picidae). *Zoologica Scripta*, 48, 17-32.

- Karger, D. N., Conrad, O., Böhner, J., Kawohl, T., Kreft, H., Soria-Auza, R. W., ... & Kessler, M. (2017). Climatologies at high resolution for the earth's land surface areas. *Scientific data*, 4, 170122.
- Kullman, L. (2002). Rapid recent range-margin rise of tree and shrub species in the Swedish Scandes. *Journal of ecology*, 90, 68-77.
- Kvist, L., Viiri, K., Dias P. C., Rytönen, S., & Orell, M. (2004). Glacial history and colonization of Europe by the blue tit *Parus caeruleus*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 35, 352-359.
- Lerner, H. R. L., Meyer, M., James, H. F., Hofreiter, M., & Fleischer, R. C. (2011). Multilocus resolution of phylogeny and timescale in the extant adaptive radiation of Hawaiian Honeycreepers. *Current Biology*, 21, 1838-1844.
- Librado, P., & Rozas, J. (2009). DnaSP v5: a software for comprehensive analysis of DNA polymorphism data. *Bioinformatics*, 25, 1451-1452.
- McDonald, J. H., & Kreitman, M. (1991). Adaptive protein evolution at the Adh locus in *Drosophila*. *Nature*, 351, 652-654.
- Milne, I., Lindner, D., Bayer M., Husmeier, D, McGuire, G., Marshall, D. F., & Wright F. (2009). *TOPALi v2*: a rich graphical interface for evolutionary analyses of multiple alignments on HPC clusters and multi-core desktops. *Bioinformatics*, 25, 126-127.
- Moltoni, E., & Brichetti, P. (1977). Osservazioni ornitologiche in Corsica alla fine del maggio 1977. *Rivista Italiana di Ornitologia*, 47, 149-205.
- Nabholz, B., Lanfear, R., & Fuchs, J., (2016). Body mass-corrected molecular rate for bird mitochondrial DNA. *Molecular Ecology*, 25, 4438-4449.
- Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Marshall, S. J., Overpeck, J. T., Miller, G. H., & Hu, A, (2006). Simulating Arctic climate warmth and icefield retreat in the last interglaciation. *Science*, 311, 1751-1753.

- Pavlova, A., Rohwer, S., Drovetski, S. V., & Zink, R. M. (2006). Different post-Pleistocene histories of Eurasian parids. *Journal of Heredity*, 97, 389-402.
- Perktaş, U., & Quintero, E. (2013). A wide geographical survey of mitochondrial DNA variation in the great spotted woodpecker complex, *Dendrocopos major* (Aves: Picidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 108, 173-188.
- Pentzold, S., Tristch, C., Martens, J., Tietze, D. T., Giacalone, G., Lo Valva, M., ..., Päckert, M. (2013). Where is the line? Phylogeography and secondary contact of western Palearctic coal tits (*Periparus ater*: Aves, Passeriformes, Paridae). *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 252, 367-382.
- Phillips, S. J., & Dudík, M. (2008). Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: new extensions and a comprehensive evaluation. *Ecography*, 31, 161-175.
- Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R. P., & Schapire, R. E. (2006). Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, 190, 231-239.
- Pons, J, Barraclough, T. G., Gomez-Zurita, J, Cardoso, A, Duran, D. P., Hazell, S, ..., Vogler, A. P. (2006). Sequence-based species delimitation for the DNA taxonomy of undescribed insects. *Systematic Biology*, 55, 595-609.
- Pons, J.-M., Olioso, G., Cruaud, C., & Fuchs, J. (2011). Phylogeography of the Eurasian green woodpecker (*Picus viridis*). *Journal of biogeography*, 38, 311-325.
- Pons, J.-M., Thibault, J.-C., Fournier, J., Olioso, G., Rakovic, M., Tellini Florenzano, G., & Fuchs, J. (2015). Genetic variation among Corsican and continental populations of the Eurasian treecreeper (Aves: *Certhia familiaris*) reveals the existence of a palaeoendemic mitochondrial lineage. *Biological journal of the Linnean Society*, 115, 134-153.
- Provan, J, & Benett, K.D. (2008). Phylogeographic insights into cryptic glacial refugia. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23, 564-571.
- R Core Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R

Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available via <http://www.R-project.org/>.

Rambaut, A., & Drummond, A. J. (2009). Tracer version 1.6. Available via <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk>.

Reid, N. M., & Carstens, B. C., (2012). Phylogenetic estimation error can decrease the accuracy of species delimitation: a Bayesian implementation of the general mixed Yule-coalescent model. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 12, 196.

Sallé, A., Arthofer, W., Lieutier, F., Stauffer, C., & Kerdelhué, C. (2007). Phylogeography of a host-specific insect: genetic structure of *Ips typographus* in Europe does not reflect past fragmentation of its host. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 90, 239–246.

Schmitt T. (2007). Molecular biogeography of Europe: Pleistocene cycles and postglacial trends. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 4, 11 doi: 10.1186/1742-9994-4-11

Schmitt, T., & Varga, Z. (2012). Extra-Mediterranean refugia: the rule and not the exception? *Frontiers in Zoology*, 9, 22.

Shakya, S. B., Fuchs, J., Pons, J.-M., & Sheldon, F. H. (2017). Tapping the woodpecker tree for evolutionary insight. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 116, 182-191.

Strasburg, J. L., & Rieseberg, L. H. (2010). How robust are “Isolation with Migration” analyses to violations of the IM Model? A simulation study. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 27, 297–310.

Subramanian, S, Denver, D. R., Millar, C. D., Heupink, T, Aschrafi, A, Emslie, S. D.,..., Lambert, D. M. (2009). High mitogenomic evolutionary rates and time dependency. *Trends in Genetics*, 25, 482-486.

Taberlet, P, Fumagalli, L, Wust-Saucy, A. G., & Cosson, J. F. (1998). Comparative phylogeography and post glacial colonization. *Molecular Ecology*, 7, 453-464.

Thibault, J.-C., & Bonaccorsi, G. (1999). *The Birds of Corsica. An Annotated Check-list*. No17. British Ornithologists Union, Tring.

Tomialojć, L. (2000). An East-West gradient in the breeding distribution and species richness of the European woodland avifauna. *Acta Ornithologica*, 35, 3-17.

Vaurie, C. (1959). *Systematic notes on Palearctic birds*. American Museum Novitates No 35 Picidae: The genus *Dendrocopos* (Part 1) 1946, 1-29.

Voous, K. H. (1947). On the history of the distribution of the Genus *Dendrocopos*. *Limosa*, 20, 1-142.

Ward, R. D., Hanner, R., & Hebert, P. D. N. (2009). The campaign to DNA barcode all fishes, FISH-BOL. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 74,329-356.

Warren, D., Matzke N., Cardillo, M., & Dinnage, R. (2017). ENMTools: Analysis of niche evolution using niche and distribution models. R package version 0.2.

Weiss, S, & Ferrand, N. 2007. *Phylogeography of the Southern Europe Refugia – Evolutionary perspectives on the origins and conservation of European biodiversity*. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands. 390p.

Wickham, H. (2014). scales: Scale functions for graphics. R package version 0.2.4. Available via <http://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=scales>.

Winkler, H. & Christie, D. A. (2020). White-backed Woodpecker (*Dendrocopos leucotos*). In: del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A., Sargatal, J., Christie, D.A. & de Juana, E. (eds.). *Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive*. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. <https://www.hbw.com/node/56224>.

Winkler, H., Christie, D. A., Kirwan, G. M., & Sharpe, C. J. (2020). Okinawa Woodpecker (*Dendrocopos noguchii*). In: del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A., Sargatal, J., Christie, D.A. & de Juana, E. (eds.). *Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive*. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona. <https://www.hbw.com/node/56325>).

Winkler, H., Kotaka, N., Gamauf, A., Nittinger, F., & Haring, E. (2005). On the phylogenetic position of the Okinawa woodpecker (*Sapheopipo noguchii*). *Journal of Ornithology*, 146, 103-110.

Yang, Z., (2007). PAML 4: Phylogenetic Analysis by Maximum Likelihood. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 24, 1586-1591.

Yang, Z., & Rannala, B., (2014). Unguided species delimitation using DNA sequence data from multiple loci. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 31, 3125-3135.

Zink, R. M., Drovetski, S. V., & Rohwer, S (2002a). Phylogeographic patterns in the great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major* across Eurasia. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 33,175–178.

Zink, R. M., Rohwer, S., Drovetski, S., Blackwell-Rago, R. C., & Farrell, S. L. (2002b). Holarctic phylogeography and species limits of three-toed woodpeckers. *The Condor*, 104, 167-170.

TABLES

Table 1: Information on the two external and the eight internal primers designed to amplify the COI from the historical specimens.

Forward primer	Reverse Primer
COIExt: ACGCTTTAACTCAGCCATCTTACC	leuCOI55H: AATCCCCCGATTATGATGGG
leuCOI36L: TCACCGCCCATGCATTTGTG	leuco263H: ACTGTGGAGGAGGCTAGGAG
leuco260L: ATAAGCTTYTGACTTCTCCC	leuco403H: TCCTAGGATTGATGAGATGC
leuco385L: CTCAGTAGACCTAGCCATCTT	leuco526H: GTACCGGGAGTGATAGGAGT
leuco507L: CCTATTCGTCTGATCTGTCC	FISH1R: TAGACTTCTGGGTGGCCAAAGAATCA

Table 2: Number of haplotypes, haplotype diversity (Hd), nucleotide diversity (π), Tajima's D and Fu's statistics obtained for the northern *leucotos* group (*leucotos* and *uralensis*) and the southern *lilfordi* group using the mitochondrial gene COI (647bp). Ni = number of individuals, Nh = number of haplotypes, Np = number of polymorphic sites. In bold significant values supporting population expansion.

	<i>leucotos/uralensis</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>
Ni	44	23
Nh	6	5
Np	5	6
Hd	0.29	0.64
π	0.0005	0.002
Tajima's D	- 1.82	- 1.08
p-value	0.02	0.14
Fu's Fs	-5.19	- 0.81
p-value	0.0001	0.28

LEGENDS OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Distribution of the White-backed Woodpecker (BirdLife International and NatureServe 2013) and sampling localities included in the present study. *D. l. leucotos* northern group includes *leucotos* (red) and *uralensis* (brown). Japanese subspecies (light orange = *subcirris*; pink = *stejnegeri*; dark orange = *namiyei*; yellow = *owstoni*). Chinese subspecies group (black = *insularis*; grey = *tangi*). Southern group *lilfordi* (blue). Precise sampling localities and sample size are reported in the table S1. Several checklists and monographies considered that *D. leucotos* was occurring in Kamchatka, Russia (e.g. BirdLife International & Nature Serve 2013, Vaurie 1959, Winkler & Christie 2020); a recent review of type specimens concluded that there is no evidence for the presence of *D. leucotos* in Kamchatka (Grangé & Red'kin 2019). Maps were made using R (R CoreTeam 2013) libraries *maps* and *mapdata* (Becker & Wilks 2013), *maptools* (Bivand & Lewin-Koh 2014) and *scales* (Wickham 2014).




Figure 2: Fifty percent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the mitochondrial markers (COI) using BEAST 1.8.2. Only unique haplotypes were included in the matrix. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup.





Figure 3: Species tree based on the phased nuclear alleles obtained with *BEAST. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). PP values < 0.90 not shown. *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.



1 mya

Figure 4: Median joining network showing COI haplotypes relationships among *Dendrocopos leucotos* subspecies. The size of each circle is proportional to haplotype frequency. Red = Pyrenees; Grey= Corsica? (see text); Dark blue = Balkans, Serbia; Pink = Abruzzi, Italia; Violet = Caucasia, southern Russia; Light green = Poland; Green = Western and central Europa; Black = Russia (west to far east); White = Mongolia; Grey = South-Korea; Light blue = Scandinavia. Small red dots are unsampled haplotypes.





Figure 5: Predicted geographic distributions for *leucotos/uralensis*, the *japanese subspecies clade*, and *lilfordi* subspecies of the White-backed Woodpecker. Nine climatic variables were used to build species distribution models: annual mean temperature (BIO1), mean diurnal range (BIO2), isothermality (BIO3), temperature seasonality (BIO4), mean temperature of wettest quarter (BIO8), annual precipitation (BIO12), precipitation of the driest month (BIO14), precipitation seasonality (BIO15), and precipitation of the coldest quarter of the year (BIO19). The niche models for

current conditions were projected on paleoclimatic layers from the Last Interglacial (about 130,000 years ago) and the Last Glacial Maximum (21,000 years ago).



SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table S1: Information on *Dendrocopos leucotos* specimens and sequences included in the study

Table S2: Summary statistics obtained for the three nuclear introns (FGB, MB and TGFb2). N_{ind} = number of individuals, N_{chr} = number of chromosomes, N_{alleles} = number of alleles, S = Number of segregating sites, H = allele diversity, π = nucleotide diversity.

Figure S1: Fifty percent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the FGB marker using MRBAYES. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). PP values < 0.95 not shown. *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.

Figure S2: Fifty percent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the TGFb2 marker using MRBAYES. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). PP values < 0.95 not shown. *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.

Figure S3: Fifty per cent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the MB marker using MRBAYES. All PP values < 0.95 (not shown). *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.

Figure S4_{A,B,C,D,E,F,G}: Predicted geographic distributions for *Dendrocopos leucotos* subspecies, with a focus on the potential distribution of *D. leucotos lilfordi* in Corsica. The present niche model was projected on paleoclimatic layers from three times

periods: the Last Interglacial (about 130,000 years ago, Last Glacial Maximum (21,000 years ago) and the Mid-Holocene (8,326-4,200 years ago).

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

TABLES

Table S2: Summary statistics obtained for the three nuclear introns (FGB, MB and TGFB). N_{ind} = number of individuals, N_{chr} = number of chromosomes, $N_{alleles}$ = number of alleles, S = Number of segregating sites, H = allele diversity, π = nucleotide diversity.

	FGB	MB	TGFB
<i>Leucotos sensulato</i>			
N_{ind}/N_{chr}	12/24	15/30	15/30
$N_{alleles}/S$	6/8	5/4	2/1
H/π	0.728/0.0055	0.662/0.001251	0.067/0.00014
Northern group			
N_{ind}/N_{chr}	8/16	11/22	11/22
$N_{alleles}/S$	5/7	5/4	2/1
H/π	0.608/0.0045	0.658/0.0012	0.091/0.00019
Japanese ssp			
N_{ind}/N_{chr}	3/6	5/10	4/8
$N_{alleles}/S$	4/4	4/3	2/1
H/π	0.867/0.0039	0.778/0.0018	0.25/0.00046
<i>leucotos/uralensis</i>			
N_{ind}/N_{chr}	5/10	6/12	7/14
$N_{alleles}/S$	1/0	3/2	1/0
H/π	0/0	0.318/0.0005	0/0
Southern group (<i>lilfordi</i>)			
N_{ind}/N_{chr}	4/8	4/8	4/8
$N_{alleles}/S$	1/0	1/0	1/0
H/π	0/0	0/0	0/0

FIGURES

Figure S1: Fifty percent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the FGB marker using MR BAYES. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). PP values < 0.95 not shown. *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.




Figure S2: Fifty percent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the TGFB marker using MR BAYES. Values close to nodes represent Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP). PP values < 0.95 not shown. *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoides pubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.




Figure S3: Fifty per cent majority-rule consensus tree obtained from the Bayesian analyses of the MB marker using MR BAYES. All PP values < 0.95 (not shown). *Veniliornis mixtus* and *Picoide spubescens* were used as outgroup. Chinese subspecies (*tangi*, *insularis*) could not be included in the data set.






Figure S4_{A,B,C,D,E,F,G}: Predicted geographic distributions for *Dendrocopos leucotos* subspecies during the Mid-Holocene period (S4_{A,B,C}, see the Fig. 5 for the other time periods) with a focus on the potential distribution of *D. leucotos lilfordi* in Corsica (S4_{D,E,F,G}). The present niche model was projected on paleoclimatic layers from three times periods: the Last Interglacial (about 130,000 years ago, Last Glacial Maximum (21,000 years ago) and the Mid-Holocene (8,326-4,200 years ago).

S4_A: Predicted Mid-Holocene distribution of Japanese subspecies clade




S4B: Predicted Mid-Holocene distribution of *D. leucotos/uralensis*




S4C: Predicted Mid-Holocene distribution of *D. lilfordi*

mid-Holocene Suitability




S4_D: Prediction of the present distribution of *D. lilfordi* in Corsica


Predicted Suitability




S4E: Predicted Last interglacial distribution of *D. lilfordi* in Corsica



S4F: Predicted Mid-Holocene distribution of *D. lilfordi* in Corsica



S4_G: Predicted Last glacial maximum distribution of *D. lilfordi* in Corsica



Genus	species	subspecies	Country	locality	Lat, long
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Beskid Sądecki, Carpathians	49.887, 20.811
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Beskid Sądecki, Carpathians	49.887, 20.811
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Carpathians	49.887, 20.811
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Spain	Navarra, Pyrenees	42.872, -1.019
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Spain	Navarra, Pyrenees	42.872, -1.019
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Arette, Pyrenees	43.063, -0.726
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Vallée d'Aspe, Urdos, Pyrenees	42.872, -0.564
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Serbia		44.173, 21.469
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Serbia		44.173, 21.469
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Morávka, Trauny' Potok	49.731, 18.480
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Dolni Lomna	49.597, 18.466
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Morávka, Ropiae	49.829, 18.495
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Morávka, Trauny' Potok	49.829, 18.495
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Kosariska	49.591, 18.683
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Horni Lomná	49.597, 18.466
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Dolni Lomna	49.597, 18.466
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Czech Republic	Kozubova	49.580, 18.672
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Aussurucq, Pyrenees	43.131, -0.947
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Aussurucq, Pyrenees	43.131, -0.947
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Laruns, Pyrénées-Atlantiques	42.987, -0.442
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Borce, Pyrénées-Atlantiques	42.908, -0.579
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>subcirris</i>	Japan	Bankei 226, Chuo, Sapporo, Hokkaido	43.035, 141.287
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>subcirris</i>	Japan	Takino 274, Minami, Sapporo, Hokkaido	42.936, 141.158
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>subcirris</i>	Japan	Shikaoi, Kato, Hokkaido	43.276, 143.042
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>subcirris</i>	Japan	Kitaurimaku, Shikaoi, Kato, Hokkaido	43.276, 143.042
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>stejnegeri</i>	Japan	Towada, Aomori	40.567, 140.922
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>namiyei</i>	Japan	Kakeaicho-Hata, Un-nan, Shimane	35.205, 132.890
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>owstoni</i>	Japan	Naze-Itubugachi, Amami, Kagoshima	28.370, 129.482
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Spain	Navarra, Pyrenees	43.062, -1.790
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Corsica?	42.260, 9.090
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Corsica?	42.260, 9.090
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Russia	Krasnodarskiy Kray	43.50, 40.19
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Avtonomnaya Respublika Buryatiya	51.577, 106.85
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>mauritanus</i>	Morocco	Azrou	33.417, -5.174
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Kurskaya Oblast'	51.687, 34.912
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Khabarovskiy Kray	49.75, 137.12
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Primorskiy Kray	43.87, 131.42
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Kirovskaya Oblast'	59.927, 52.946
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Sakhalinskaya Oblast'	46.37, 141.87
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Romania	Rastolita	46.967, 24.992
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>tangi</i>	China	Chin Tu Shi N.W. Of Kwansien W. Szechuan	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>insularis</i>	Taiwan		23.811, 120.960
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>subcirris</i>	Japan	Lake Tohya, Hokkaido	42.597, 140.769
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Italy	Near Veroli, Central Italy	41.813, 13.387
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Forêt d'Issaux, Pyrenees	43.020, -0.706
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Italy	Parco Abruzzi	41.889, 13.776
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.098
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.098
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.092
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.092
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.092
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>uralensis</i>	Mongolia	Bulgan Gol	46.224, 91.092
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Switzerland		46.961, 9.707

<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Switzerland		47.261, 9.475
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Austria		47.210, 9.795
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Austria		47.199, 9.565
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Austria		47.306, 9.720
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Austria		47.160, 9.681
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Switzerland		46.946, 9.608
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Izeste, Pyenees, 64	43.079, -0.454
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Austria		47.196, 9.601
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Italy	Pescasser oli, La Difesa, Parco Abruzzi	41.800, 13.763
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Italy	Pescasser oli, La Difesa, Parco Abruzzi	41.800, 13.763
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	Italy	Parco Abruzzi	41.800, 13.763
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Italy	Ferrera Erbognone, Lombardia	45.118, 8.869
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Izeste, Pyrenees, 64	43.029, -0.760
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>lilfordi</i>	France	Barétous, Pyrenees, 64	43.068, -0.780
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Białowieża Forest - Siemianówka	52.734, 23.876
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Białowieża Forest - Siemianówka	52.734, 23.876
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland	Bieszczady, Carpathians	49.259, 22.448
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>numidus</i>	Tunisia	Aïn Soltane	36.525934, 8.33746
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>numidus</i>	Tunisia	Aïn Soltane	36.525934, 8.33746
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>numidus</i>	Tunisia	Aïn Soltane	36.525870, 8.33744
Sequences Genbank					
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Sweden		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Norway	Vest-Agder	58.10, 7.79
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Poland		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Khabarovskiy Kray	50.93, 137.45
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Rossiya, Moscovskaya Oblast	54.917, 39.367
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Russia	Primorskiy Kray	46.017, 135.25
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	South Korea	near Seoul	37.640, 126.981
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Sweden	Norrbotten	56.9165, 18.1468
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	Sweden		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>namiyei</i>	Japan	Kyushu-chiho, Kagoshima	32.69, 130.77
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>leucotos</i>	<i>namiyei</i>	Japan	Kyushu-chiho, Kagoshima	32.69, 130.77
Outgroup					
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>darjellensis</i>		China		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>darjellensis</i>		China		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>noguchii</i>		Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>noguchii</i>		Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>noguchii</i>		Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>noguchii</i>		Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>noguchii</i>		Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>brevirostris</i>	Russia		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>brevirostris</i>	Russia		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Russia		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	Japan		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>japonicus</i>	South Korea		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>	Russia		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>			
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>			

<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>		
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>major</i>	Denmark	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum</i>	France	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum</i>	Netherlands	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum</i>	France	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum</i>	France	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum</i>	France	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>major</i>	<i>pinetorum/m</i>	Austria	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>syriacus</i>		Iran	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>syriacus</i>		Captive	
<i>Dendrocopos</i>	<i>syriacus</i>		Captive	
<i>Picoides</i>	<i>pubescens</i>		USA	
<i>Picoides</i>	<i>pubescens</i>		USA	
<i>Veniliornis</i>	<i>mixtus</i>		Paraguay	
1 italics=sequences retrieved from Genbank, normal style=new sequences				
*sequences retrieved from BOLD				

Collector/Provider	Institution	Specimen Voucher number
Tomasz Baziak, Łukasz Kajtoch	Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals Polish Academy of Sciences	
Robert Kruszyk, Łukasz Kajtoch	Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals Polish Academy of Sciences	
Łukasz Kajtoch	Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals Polish Academy of Sciences	
David Champion		
David Champion		
Patrick Urbina-Tobias, Jean-Louis Grangé		
Jean-Louis Grangé/ Jeremy Bauwin		
Marko Rakovic	Natural History Museum of Belgrade	
Marko Rakovic	Natural History Museum of Belgrade	
Robert Špilák		
Eva Kolárovà		
Robert Špilák		
Robert Špilák		
Eva Kolárovà		
Eva Kolárovà		
Eva Kolárovà		
Daniel Kozubova		
Jean-Louis Grangé/ Laurent Joubert		
Jean-Louis Grangé/ Laurent Joubert		
Jean-Louis Grangé/ P. Fontanilles		
Jean-Louis Grangé/ P. Fontanilles		
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
Sayaka Kobayashi	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology	
A. Senosian-S. Carcamo		
Manuel Schweizer	Natural History Museum, Bern, Switzerland	NHM 1035430
Manuel Schweizer	Natural History Museum, Bern, Switzerland	NHM 1035431
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 64700
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 46354
Stein A. Saether	University of Oslo, Norway	
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 49418
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 46919
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 71785
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 71369
	Burke Museum, University of Washington	UWBM 83093
	Natural history Museum Vienna	NMW 72.920
	Tring: Natural History Museum	Tring: 1954.59.34
	Tring: Natural History Museum	Tring: 1965.M.6413
Paul Harris		
Patrick Urbina-Tobias, Jean-Louis Grangé		
Paul Harris		
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
W. Stenzel, Jochen Martens	Institut für Zoologie, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität	
Antonia Ettwein	Schweizerische Vogelwarte	

		ZMUC 128973
		MNHN Uncat. 27-47
		ZMA58803
		MNHN ZO 2015-015
		MNHN ZO 2016-578
		MNHN ZO 2017-162
		MNHN Uncat. 36-H05
		NRM 2001-6743
		NRM 2003-6318
		CAS 95942
		NRM 937175

Ring Number	tissue/DNA	tissue number	Collecting date	DNA extract MNHN num	COI
	fresh	DL-CM1	02-06-2012	D101	MW042330
	fresh	DL-CM2	2013	D103	MW042331
	fresh	DL-CM6		D104	MW042332
	fresh	MNHN105		D105	MW042333
	fresh	MNHN106		D106	MW042334
GH134919	fresh	MNHN107	12/05/19	D107	MW042335
GH108101	fresh	MNHN11	27/05/15	D11	MW042269
	fresh	MNHN12		D12	MW042270
	fresh	MNHN14		D14	MW042271
K531504	fresh	MNHN15	28/05/15	D15	MW042272
K531565	fresh	MNHN16	16/05/15	D16	MW042273
KB531566	fresh	MNHN17	29/05/15	D17	MW042274
K531568	fresh	MNHN18	11/07/15	D18	MW042275
K525905	fresh	MNHN19	15/05/15	D19	MW042276
K531563	fresh	MNHN20	16/05/15	D20	MW042277
K531564	fresh	MNHN21	16/05/15	D21	MW042278
K340747	fresh	MNHN22	02/05/15	D22	MW042279
GF29461	fresh	MNHN23	21/05/16	D23	MW042280
GF29462	fresh	MNHN24	22/05/16	D24	MW042281
GH48969	fresh	MNHN25	30/05/16	D25	MW042282
GH92002	fresh	MNHN27	31/05/16	D27	MW042283
	DNA	GEN06-06I	05/11/99	D28	MW042284
	DNA	GEN06-05I	25/04/03	D29	MW042285
	DNA	GEN37-02B	20/11/11	D30	MW042286
	DNA	GEN37-03B	29/04/12	D31	MW042287
	DNA	GEN33-06F	07/05/08	D32	MW042288
	DNA	GEN33-07F	16/06/12	D33	MW042289
	DNA	GEN37-01B	07/07/06	D34	MW042290
	fresh	MNHN35	16/05/16	D35	MW042291
	historical	MNHN36	second half 19th century	D36	MW042292
	historical	MNHN37	second half 19th century	D37	MW042293
	fresh	MNHN38	6/20/99	D38	MW042294
	fresh	MNHN39	6/19/93	D39	MW042295
	fresh	MNHN4	May 2008	D4	
	fresh	MNHN40	6/7/94	D40	MW042296
	fresh	MNHN41	6/30/93	D41	MW042297
	fresh	MNHN42	7/23/01	D42	MW042298
	fresh	MNHN43	7/5/98	D43	MW042299
	fresh	MNHN44	6/29/03	D44	MW042300
	historical	Dleu6		D49	MW042301
	historical	Dleutan1	30/06/38	D50	MW042302
	dry	Dleuins 5		D51	MW042303
	fresh	Dleusub 1		D52	MW042304
	fresh	MNHN54	26/05/06	D54	MW042305
GH134912	fresh	MNHN56	29/04/17	D56	MW042306
	fresh	MNHN61	around 2006	D61	MW042307
	fresh	410	mid-August 2002	D66	MW042308
	fresh	432	mid-August 2002	D67	MW042309
	fresh	433	mid-August 2002	D68	MW042310
	fresh	453	mid-August 2002	D69	MW042311
	fresh	11.384	mid-August 2002	D70	MW042312
	fresh	11.387	mid-August 2002	D71	MW042313
	fresh	WBW7	3/3/17	D72	MW042314

	fresh	WBW8	8/25/17	D73	MW042315
	fresh	WBW10	7/15/17	D75	MW042316
	fresh	WBW12	6/2/17	D76	MW042317
	fresh	WBW13	8/30/17	D77	MW042318
	fresh	WBW14	8/14/17	D78	MW042319
	fresh	WBW20	5/13/17	D79	MW042320
GH134903	fresh	MNHN8	01/05/14	D8	MW042267
	fresh	WBW22	5/18/17	D80	MW042321
	historical	D81	11/1/63	D81	MW042322
	historical	D84	11/1/63	D84	MW042323
	historical	D85	25/10/60	D85	MW042324
	historical	D86	31/03/72	D86	MW042325
GH134904	fresh	MNHN9	01/05/14	D9	MW042268
GH134916	fresh	MNHN92	02/06/18	D92	MW042326
	fresh	DL-BF1		D93	MW042327
	fresh	DL-BF6	30/06/05	D95	MW042328
	fresh	DL-CM4		D97	MW042329
	fresh	JMP350	12 May 2012	JMP350	MW042338
	fresh	JMP352	12 May 2012	JMP352	MW042339
	fresh	JMP383	17 May 2012	JMP383	MW042340
	fresh			O3	GU566412
		BON126			GU571366
					KBPBU474
					KBPBU476
					KBPBU477
					KU131555
		BISE014			GU571860
		BISE406			GU571859
					YIO571-17*
					YIO572-17*
					NC042683
					AB843125
					AB843742
					GQ481709
					GQ481711
					GQ481708
					AB843467
					AB843466
					AB842723
					AB842722
					AB842721
					AB842720
					AB842719
					AB842718
					AB842717
					NC028174
					GQ481710
					GQ481712
					GU571863

					<i>GU571862</i>
					<i>GU571861</i>
					<i>GU571368</i>
					<i>GU571367</i>
					<i>KF946651</i>
		JF4818			MW042336
		JF5082			MW042337
					<i>KY754503</i>
		DP1			MW042343
		NRM27			MW042341
		NRM28			MW042342
					<i>NC027936</i>
		DP12			MW042344

Genbank numbers¹

Myo2	Fib5	TGFb2						
MW050940	MW050965	MW050953						
MW050941	MW050966	MW050954						
MW050942	MW050967	MW050955						
MW050943	MW050968	MW050956						
MW050944		MW050957						
MW050945								
MW050946	MW050969	MW050958						
MW050947	MW050970	MW050959						
MW050948	MW050971	MW050960						
<i>KR049400</i>	<i>KR049338</i>							
MW050949	MW050972	MW050961						
MW050950	MW050973	MW050962						
MW050951	MW050974	MW050963						

KR049419	KR049360	KR049486						
	KR049362	KR049488						
MF766904		MF767167						
KR049418	KR049352	KR049479						
KR049444	KR049376	KR049504						
KR049445	KR049377	KR049505						
KR049398	KR049336	KR049464						
KR049425	KR049355	KR049482						

