A dated molecular phylogeny of manta and devil rays (Mobulidae) based on mitogenome and nuclear sequences
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ABSTRACT
Manta and devil rays are an iconic group of globally distributed pelagic filter feeders, yet their evolutionary history remains enigmatic. We employed next generation sequencing of mitogenomes for nine of the 11 recognized species and two outgroups; as well as additional Sanger sequencing of two mitochondrial and two nuclear genes in an extended taxon sampling set. Analysis of the mitogenome coding regions in a Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian framework provided a well-resolved phylogeny. The deepest divergences distinguished three clades with high support, one containing Manta birostris, Manta alfredi, Mobula tarapacana, Mobula japonica and Mobula mobular; one containing Mobula kuhlii, Mobula eregoidooteenkee and Mobula thurstoni; and one containing Mobula munkiana, Mobula hypostoma and Mobula rochebrunii. Mobula remains paraphyletic with the inclusion of Manta, a result that is in agreement with previous studies based on molecular and morphological data. A fossil-calibrated Bayesian random local clock analysis suggests that mobulids diverged from Rhinoptera around 30 Mya. Subsequent divergences are characterized by long internodes followed by short bursts of speciation extending from an initial episode of divergence in the Early and Middle Miocene (19–17 Mya) to a second episode during the Pliocene and Pleistocene (3.6 Mya – recent). Estimates of divergence dates overlap significantly with periods of global warming, during which upwelling intensity – and related high primary productivity in upwelling regions – decreased markedly. These periods are hypothesized to have led to fragmentation and isolation of feeding regions leading to possible regional extinctions, as well as the promotion of allopatric speciation. The closely shared evolutionary history of mobulids in combination with ongoing threats from fisheries and climate change effects on upwelling and food supply, reinforces the case for greater protection of this charismatic family of pelagic filter feeders. © 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction
Manta and devil rays (Superorder: Batoidae, Order: Myliobatiformes, Family: Mobulidae) represent one of the most
distinct groups of cartilaginous fishes. They display a dorso-ventrally flattened body with broad, well-developed pectoral fins and a whip-like tail. They are the largest (in disc width) extant group of rays inhabiting tropical, subtropical and warm temperate waters worldwide (Compagno and Last, 1999; Last and Stevens, 2009). Collectively referred to as mobulids, the two recognized genera (Mobula, Rafinesque-Schmaltz, 1810, and Manta, Bankroft, 1829) comprise 11 species. All are planktivores characterized by loss of dental function related to feeding (Adnet et al., 2012), the presence of cephalic lobes that direct prey into the mouth, and by a set of prebranchial filter plates (Bigelow and Schroeder, 1953; Coles, 1916; Cortés et al., 2008). Mobulids display life history traits that make them vulnerable to overexploitation (Dulvy et al., 2008, 2014; Garcia et al., 2008), i.e. matrotrophic reproduction (nourishment of embryos derived from the mother), large size at birth, slow growth, high maximum age (>30 years in M. alfredi, >20 years in M. birostris and >14 years in M. japonica), delayed age of first reproduction (3–10 years in M. alfredi and possibly 5–6 years in M. japonica) and low fecundity (one pup born every 1–3 years) (reviewed by Couturier et al., 2012; Cuevas-Zimbrón et al., 2012).

Despite their iconic status, the taxonomic history of mobulids is cluttered with competing hypotheses and little resolution. Most notably, and despite the formal separation into Manta and Mobula, it has been suggested that Manta is nested within the genus Mobula (reviewed by Aschliman, 2014). This is based on the analysis of three out of 11 mobulids with the mitochondrial genes NADH2 and NADH4, and the nuclear genes RAG1 and SCFD2 (Aschliman et al., 2012a), and an analysis of six out of 11 mobulids with the mitochondrial gene NADH2 (Naylor et al., 2012a); morphology (Adnet et al., 2012; Aschliman et al., 2012b; Gonzalez-Isais and Dominguez, 2004; Herman et al., 2000); and parasite evolution (Benz and Deets, 1988; Olson et al., 2010). Additionally, for several species it is still not clear whether they comprise distinct lineages or merely represent geographically separated morphological variants of the same species (Marshall and Bennett, 2010; Notarbartolo di Scira, 1987). Manta is currently comprised of two species, the oceanic manta, M. birostris (Walbaum, 1792) and the reef manta M. alfredi (Krefft, 1868), and a tentatively identified but as of yet unclassified third species, present in the Atlantic (Marshall et al., 2009). Mobula contains nine currently recognized species: M. japonica (Müller and Henle, 1841), M. mobular (Bonnatere, 1788), M. tarapacana (Philippi, 1841), M. kuhlii (Müller and Henle, 1841), M. eregoodootkee (Bleecker, 1859), M. hypostoma (Bancroft, 1831), M. rochebrunei (Vailant, 1879); and M. munkiana (Notarbartolo di Scira, 1987). Morphologically, Manta is distinct from Mobula in exhibiting a terminal mouth, a broader head relative to maximum disc width (DW), and morphometrics of the spiracles (Compagno and Last, 1999; Notarbartolo di Scira, 1987) and structure of filter plates (Paig-TRAN et al., 2013). The two Manta species show differences in maximum DW (M. birostris and M. alfredi, 700 and 500 cm respectively), coloration patterns, dentition, denticle and spine morphology (Marshall et al., 2009). Mobula species share a ventral placement of the mouth, and can be distinguished from each other by maximum DW, coloration, skin, presence or absence of a vestigial caudal spine, structure of filter plates (Paig-TRAN et al., 2013), and morphometrics of pectoral fins, tails, cephalic lobes and spiracles (Notarbartolo di Scira, 1987). M. birostris, M. alfredi, M. mobular, M. japonica and M. tarapacana are among the larger rays in the family, with maximum DWs of 700, 500, 520, 370 and 310 cm respectively (Couturier et al., 2012). M.thurstonii has an intermediate maximum DW of 180 cm, and the remaining Mobula species are smaller, with a maximum DW of up to 130 cm (Couturier et al., 2012).

Geographical distribution of mobulids is, in general, correlated with maximum DW. Most species that attain large to intermediate maximum sizes have circumglobal or very wide distributions, with most species reported from the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans (Fig. 1A–E). Smaller species (e.g. M. munkiana, M. hypostoma, M. rochebrunei, M. kuhlii and M. eregoodootkee) all have restricted geographical distributions, with M. munkiana recorded from the Western and Eastern Atlantic respectively, and M. kuhlii and M. eregoodootkee both recorded from the Indo-West Pacific (IWP) (Fig. 1F–H). The only exception to this correlation is M. mobular, which attains a maximum DW comparable to that of M. alfredi (Pellegrin, 1901), but has a geographical range restricted to the Mediterranean Sea (Fig. 1A). However, M. mobular is morphologically highly similar to M. japonica, and although differences in tooth morphology suggest that M. japonica and M. mobular are separate species (Adnet et al., 2012), more detailed studies of morphology and genetics have yet to confirm whether M. japonica merits recognition.

Fossil, morphological and molecular data support the hypothesis that mobulids are one of the most derived groups of elasmobranchs and closely related to rhinopterids (cow nose rays, genus Rhinoptera) within a polyphyletic clade of Myliobatidae (Naylor et al., 2012a; Aschliman et al., 2012a; Claeson et al., 2010; De Carvalho et al., 2004; Dunn et al., 2003; Lovejoy, 1996; McEachran and Aschliman, 2004; McEachran et al., 1996; Nishida, 1990; Shirai, 1996). However, a sister–clade relationship to a myliobatid–rhinopterid clade has also been proposed (Gonzalez-Isais and Dominguez, 2004) solely based on morphological data. Fossil remains show mobulid lineages with tooth morphology intermediate between diphagous (shell-crushing) and non-diphagous mobulids dating back to the Late Paleocene to Early Eocene (58.7–47.8 Mya) (Adnet et al., 2012). Modern mobulids do not occur in the fossil record until the Early Oligocene (~34 Mya) based on the first occurrence of teeth without striations caused by biomechanical stress due to grinding-type feeding (Adnet et al., 2012). Fossils of extant species are much more recent, and date back only to the Late Miocene–Early Pliocene (116.1–3.6 Mya), except one tooth recovered possibly representative of Manta sp., which was tentatively dated as Early Oligocene (33.9–28.1 Mya). Recent records are limited to fossil teeth of M. hypostoma and Manta from the Late Miocene–Early Pliocene (Costa Rica, 11.61–3.6 Mya) (Laurito Mora, 1999), and of Manta from the Early Pliocene (Yorktown, USA, 5.332–3.6 Mya) (Bourdon, 1999), although the latter was classified as reminiscent of M. japonica and M. mobular by Adnet et al. (2012). Fossil teeth have also been recovered reminiscent of M. japonica and M. mobular from the Late Miocene–Early Pliocene (Costa Rica, 11.608–3.6 Mya) (Adnet et al., 2012; Laurito Mora, 1999). No fossil teeth have been attributed to M. alfredi due to its previously uncertain taxonomic status, but based on molecular data and the appearance of the first fossil Manta around 4.8 Mya (Bourdon, 1999; Cappetta and Stringer, 1970; Purdy et al., 2001; but see Adnet et al., 2012) it is thought that M. alfredi and M. birostris diverged within the last 1 My (Kashiwagi et al., 2012).

Phylogenetic analysis of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is a widely used tool for delineating species relationships (Morton, 1994) because of its fast rate of sequence evolution and rapid lineage sorting relative to the nuclear genome (Avise, 1989; Brown et al., 1982; Moore, 1995). However, mtDNA can be uninformative if only small portions of the mitogenome are used (Galtier et al., 2009). This is especially the case in lineages that display slow rates of mutation (Hoelzel et al., 2002; Morin et al., 2010), such as elasmobranchs and cetaceans (Martin et al., 1992; Martin and Palumbi, 1993; Naholz et al., 2008), or when radiations occurred closely spaced in time (Vilstrup et al., 2011; Wielstra and Arntzen, 2011; Yu et al., 2007). Greater resolution can be achieved by increasing the amount of sequence data (Cummings et al., 1995; Morin...
et al., 2010; Vilstrup et al., 2011; Wielstra and Arntzen, 2011; Yu et al., 2007), here the entire mitogenome. The advent of next-generation sequencing (NGS) now makes it easier and cheaper to rapidly and efficiently obtain large mitogenome data sets, in comparison with traditional Sanger sequencing.

In the present study, we: (1) use NGS of entire mitochondrial genomes, conventional Sanger sequencing of two nuclear and two mitochondrial genes to expand the taxon sampling, and supplementary GenBank sequences to reconstruct evolutionary relationships among all currently described mobulid species; (2) estimate divergence times between species based on two fossil dating points, the mitogenome tree and a random local molecular clock; (3) discuss the role of paleoclimatic changes in the evolutionary diversification and global biogeographic distribution of mobulids; and (4) discuss concerns and solutions for conservation of this group of cartilaginous fishes.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample collection and DNA extraction

Tissue samples were collected from all Mobulidae species (Table 1) except M. alfredi, for which GenBank sequences were used. Where possible, multiple samples per species were collected from widely spaced geographic locations. Samples from M. hypostoma (voucher no. MNHN-IC-1911-0207) and M. rochebrunei (voucher no. MNHN-IC-A-9967) were obtained from the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle (Paris, France). A sample from M. mobular was obtained from the Museo di Storia Naturale di Firenze (Florence, Italy). Outgroup taxa, Rhinoptera steindachneri and Myliobatis californica (n = 1 and n = 1) (Dunn et al., 2003), were sampled from Sri Lanka and Mexico respectively (Table 1). Samples were preserved in 90% ethanol, in silica gel, freeze-dried, or
Table 1
Sample information. IUCN Red list codes: Least Concern (LC), Vulnerable (VU), Near Threatened (NT), Endangered (EN) and Data Deficient (DD). Location codes refer to the Southern Sea of Cortez (SSC), Northern Sea of Cortez (NSC), Central West Pacific Ocean (CWPO), Northwest Pacific Ocean (NWPO), Central East Pacific Ocean (CEPO), Southeast Pacific Ocean (SEPO), Northeast Pacific Ocean (NEPO), Central East Pacific Ocean (EAO), Mediterranean Sea (MS) and GenBank sequences (GB). Also see Supplementary Table 1S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Species code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Collector, month, year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta birostris</em></td>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>La Paz, Mexico</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>24°25’50&quot;N</td>
<td>110°20’21&quot;W</td>
<td>Galvan, June, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta birostris</em></td>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>Ende, Indonesia</td>
<td>CWPO</td>
<td>8°51’15&quot;S</td>
<td>121°39’15&quot;E</td>
<td>Poortvliet, February, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta alfredi</em></td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>Neg5Bank # JQ765532:</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>22°40’22.5&quot;S</td>
<td>GenBank # JQ765532:</td>
<td>Poortvliet, February, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Australia, FJ235625</td>
<td></td>
<td>113°29’23.6E</td>
<td>FJ235625 and FJ235624 see Kashiwagi et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mobula mobular</em></td>
<td>MMM</td>
<td>Northern Tyrrenian Sea, Italy</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>43°19’54&quot;N</td>
<td>10°04’47E</td>
<td>Notarbarolo di Sciar &amp; Serena, June, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta japonica</em></td>
<td>MJA</td>
<td>East Taiwan</td>
<td>NWPO</td>
<td>7°12’34&quot;N</td>
<td>79°50’03E</td>
<td>Unknown, April, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta tarapacana</em></td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Nuq5Colombia, Indonesia</td>
<td>CEPO</td>
<td>5°37’20&quot;N</td>
<td>77°42’00W</td>
<td>IATTC, January, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta tarapacana</em></td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Lamakera, Indonesia</td>
<td>CWPO</td>
<td>8°26’07&quot;S</td>
<td>123°05’30E</td>
<td>Dewar, May, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta rochebrunei</em></td>
<td>MKU</td>
<td>Negombo, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>7°12’34&quot;N</td>
<td>79°50’03E</td>
<td>Poortvliet, February, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta kuhlii</em></td>
<td>MKU</td>
<td>Maumere, Indonesia</td>
<td>CWPO</td>
<td>8°37’12&quot;S</td>
<td>122°13’12E</td>
<td>Poortvliet, March, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta kuhlii</em></td>
<td>MKU</td>
<td>Hibberden, South Africa</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>30°35’20&quot;S</td>
<td>30°35’15E</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Sharks Board, February, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta eregoodooteenkee</em></td>
<td>MER</td>
<td>Richards Bay, South Africa</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>28°51’08S</td>
<td>32°02’56E</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Sharks Board, August, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta eregoodooteenkee</em></td>
<td>MER</td>
<td>Zinkwazi, South Africa</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>29°17’08S</td>
<td>31°26’14E</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Sharks Board, September, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta eregoodooteenkee</em></td>
<td>MER</td>
<td>Zinkwazi, South Africa</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>29°17’08S</td>
<td>31°26’14E</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Sharks Board, September, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta thurtoni</em></td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>La Paz, Mexico</td>
<td>NEPO</td>
<td>24°25’30&quot;N</td>
<td>110°20’21W</td>
<td>Croll, June, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta thurtoni</em></td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>Manta, Ecuador</td>
<td>SEPO</td>
<td>0°57’00S</td>
<td>80°42’58W</td>
<td>Galvan, May–September, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta thurtoni</em></td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>Negombo, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>7°12’34&quot;N</td>
<td>79°50’03E</td>
<td>Fernando, June, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta hypostoma</em></td>
<td>MHY</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>29°48’28N</td>
<td>85°46’15W</td>
<td>Naylor et al. (2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta rochebrunei</em></td>
<td>MRO</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>EAO</td>
<td>15°00’0N</td>
<td>18°00’00W</td>
<td>MNHN (voucher no. MNHN-IC-A-0967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta munkiana</em></td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>La Paz, Mexico</td>
<td>SSC1</td>
<td>24°25’50&quot;N</td>
<td>110°20’21W</td>
<td>Croll, June, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manta munkiana</em></td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>La Paz, Mexico</td>
<td>SSC2</td>
<td>24°25’50&quot;N</td>
<td>110°20’21W</td>
<td>Croll, June, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhinepolia steindachneri</em></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Negombo, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>7°12’34&quot;N</td>
<td>79°50’03E</td>
<td>Fernando, September, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Mitogenome data set: High throughput sequencing and alignment

The entire mitogenome was sequenced for a total of 12 samples (Supplementary Table S1) following methods described by (Kollas et al., submitted for publication). Briefly, genomic DNA was sheared to fragments of ~260 bp (when necessary), using a Covaris S2 focused-ultrasonicator (Covaris, Woburn, USA). Library preparation (end repair, adaptator ligation, size selection) was conducted using an AB Library Builder™ System (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) with an Ion Plus Library Kit for AB Library Builder™ System (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA), in combination with an Ion Xpress™ Barcode Adapters 1–16 Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Libraries were amplified using an Ion Plus Library Kit for AB Library Builder™ System Protocol (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA), purified using an Agencourt® AMPure® XP Kit (Agencourt Biosciences, Beverly, USA), then pooled in equimolar amounts and concentrated using a PureLink® PCR Purification Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). The library pool was subsequently enriched using biotinylated single stranded DNA baits (MYbaits-I system, www.mycoarray.com/mybaits/mybaits-custom.html) designed from the complete mitochondrial genome of *M. japonica* (NC_018784), and custom oligonucleotide blocking probes (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA and Thermo Fisher Scientific, Wal- tham, USA) designed to prevent the cross hybridization between Ion Torrent adapters during the hybridization step of the MYbaits protocol. Following enrichment, template preparation was conducted using an Ion PGM™ Template OT2 200 Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) and an Ion OneTouch™ 2 Instrument (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Sequencing was conducted using an Ion PGM™ 200 Sequencing Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) and an Ion 316™ Chip (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) on an Ion Personal Genome Machine® (PGM™) System (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Protocols followed the manufacturer’s instructions in all cases.

Mitogenome sequences of *M. japonica* were generated in a separate Ion PGM run, using PCR amplicons of *M. japonica* from...
the Eastern Atlantic Ocean (EAO), North East Pacific Ocean (NEPO) and Indian Ocean (IO). First, the mitogenome (excluding the control region) was PCR amplified in overlapping amplicons of around 5 kb with primers 72F in combination with 5023R, 3397F in combination with 9023R, 7915F in combination with 12875R and 11915F in combination with 15637R (Table 2S). Each PCR reaction contained 1.5 μl 10X Buffer, 0.3 μl KOD Hot Start DNA Polymerase (Toyobo, Osaka, Japan), 1 mM MgSO4, 0.2 mM of each dNTP, 0.4 μM of forward and reverse primers and 10–100 ng of DNA. The cycling conditions consisted of 94 °C for 2 min, followed by 40 cycles of 20 s at 94 °C, 20 s at 52–54 °C (Supplementary Table 2S) and 3 min at 65 °C, with a final extension of 10 min at 65°C on a GeneAmp v1.6 (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). PCR products were gel-extracted using a Qiagen Gel Extraction kit (Qiagen, Valencia, USA), and 25 ng of each of four amplicons was pooled per sample. Library preparation (shearing, end repair, adapter ligation, size selection) was conducted using an Ion Xpress™ Plus Fragment Library Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) with enzymatic shearing and an Ion Xpress™ Barcode Adapters 1-16 Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Quantitation was conducted using an Ion Library Quantitation Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA), after which equimolar amounts of each library were pooled. Emulsion PCR and enrichment were conducted using an Ion OneTouch™ 200 Template Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) on an Ion OneTouch™ Instrument (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Sequencing was conducted using an Ion PGM™ 200 Sequencing Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) and an Ion 316™ Chip (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA) on an Ion PGM™ System (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA). Protocols followed the manufacturers’ instructions in all cases.

Sequence reads belonging to each barcoded library, from the two NGS runs, were mapped to the reference genome of M. japonica (NC_018784) using CLC Genomics Workbench v6 (CLC bio, Aarhus, Denmark) with default mapping parameters. Of the 15 sequenced samples in the two runs, M. hypostoma (WAO) produced no barcoded reads, and therefore could not be included in the mitogenome data set. For the remaining 14 samples, consensus sequences were generated where coverage was >10 reads. Sections with lower coverage (5–9 reads) were inspected manually and included if all reads at a position were in agreement. Lower coverage areas were marked ‘N’. The control region and flanking regions were excluded due to the presence of long tandem repeats (Poortvliet and Hoarau, 2013). All mitogenome consensus sequences have been deposited in GenBank (Supplementary Table 15). Consensus sequences were aligned in CLC Genomics Workbench v6 (CLC bio, Aarhus, Denmark). The alignment was checked manually, and homo-polymers stretches longer than four base pair were adjusted in length to fit the reading frame. Gaps in the alignment were coded as single events using the simple gap coding method of Simmons and Ochoterena (2000), implemented in the software SeqState 1.4.1. (Müller, 2005).

2.3. COX1/NADH5/RAG1/HEMO data set: PCR amplification, sequencing and sequence alignment

To allow for greater taxon sampling, 2–5 specimens of each species (when available) were PCR amplified and sequenced for two mitochondrial genes (cytochrome oxidase subunit 1, COX1; and NADH dehydrogenase subunit 5, NADH5) and two nuclear genes (recombination activating protein 1, RAG1; and Hemoglobin-alpha, HEMO). A 10–μl PCR reaction contained 0.1 μl HotMaster taq (5 PRIME, Hamburg, Germany), 1 μl PCR buffer (10X), 0.25 mM of each dNTP, 0.2 μM of each primer (Table 15), and 10–100 ng of genomic DNA. Cycling conditions consisted of: 94 °C for 2 min, followed by 40 cycles of 94 °C for 20 s, 54–58 °C for 20 s (Supplementary Table 2S) and 65 °C for 60 s, with a final extension of 65 °C for 10 min. Cleaned PCR products (ExoSap, Amersham, Biosciences) were sequenced in both directions using 0.25 μl PCR primers, with BigDye Terminator v3.1 cycle sequencing kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, USA) following the recommended protocol. Sequences were visualized on an Applied Biosystems 3130xl automated sequencer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, USA). All sequences have been deposited in GenBank (Supplementary Table 15).

To allow for the phylogenetic placement of M. alfredi, for which we had no samples, COX1, NADH5 and RAG1 sequences available from GenBank (Accession no. JQ765532, FJ235625 and FJ235624 respectively) were included in the data set.

DNA from M. mobular (MS), M. hypostoma (WAO) and M. rochebruniei (EAO) was too degraded for PCR amplification. Instead, COX1, NADH2, RAG1 and HEMO were sequenced using biotinylated single stranded DNA baits and Ion PGM technology (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, USA), following methods described in Kollas et al. (submitted for publication) and as briefly outlined above. Baits were designed based on the mitogenome sequence available from GenBank (NC_018784), as well as RAG1 and HEMO sequences generated in this study. NGS of M. hypostoma was unsuccessful and no appropriate sequences were available from GenBank. Therefore we were unable to include this species in this dataset (but see NADH2 data set for phylogenetic analysis of M. hypostoma). NGS of nuclear sequences of M. rochebruniei was also unsuccessful. Therefore we were unable to include this species in this data set (but see mitogenome data set for phylogenetic analysis of M. rochebruniei).

Sequences were aligned and edited using the software Geneious 5.6 (Biomatters, Auckland, New Zealand). A separate alignment was created with only nuclear sequences (RAG1 and HEMO), which we refer to as the ‘nuclear data set’. In cases where the RAG1 and HEMO genes were heterozygous (as inferred from double peaks in chromatograms) at single base positions, the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) codes for the ambiguous nucleotide base calls were used. Gaps in both alignments were coded as single events using the simple gap coding method of Simmons and Ochoterena (2000), implemented in SeqState 1.4.1. (Müller, 2005).

2.4. NADH2 data set: Sequence alignment

To allow for phylogenetic placement of M. hypostoma, a NADH subunit 2 (NADH2) sequence of M. hypostoma (GenBank JQ518837) was aligned with the NADH2 portion of the mitogenome data set using CLC Genomics Workbench v6 (CLC bio, Aarhus, Denmark). The alignment was checked manually, and homo-polymer stretches longer than four base pair were adjusted in length to fit the reading frame. Gaps in the alignment were coded as single events using the simple gap coding method of Simmons and Ochoterena (2000), implemented in SeqState 1.4.1 (Müller, 2005).

2.5. Model selection, phylogenetic analyses and confidence

The optimal partitioning scheme and models of nucleotide substitution for each data set were analyzed using PartitionFinder v1.1.1 (Lanfear et al., 2012), which provides an objective method for the assessment of these criteria, without the need for a priori groupings. The mitogenome alignment was separated into single codon positions and individual rRNAs and tRNAs; the COX1/ NADH5/RAG1/HEMO alignment was separated into single codon positions, except the gene HEMO because, although sequences were straightforward to align, the reading frame could not be assessed reliably due to the presence of several long indels; the nuclear data set was separated into single codon positions; and finally, the NADH2 alignment was separated into single codon positions.
positions. Optimal partitioning and nucleotide substitution models were subsequently analyzed using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) for all data sets. Optimal partitioning and nucleotide substitution models are listed in Supplementary Table 3S.

For each data set (mitogenome, COX1/NADH5/RAG1/HEMO, nuclear and NADH2), Bayesian Inference (BI) topologies were generated using MrBayes v3.2.1 (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001) following the partitioning scheme and models of evolution suggested by PartitionFinder (Supplementary Table 3S) in two independent runs of 10 million generations with 3 chains (one cold, two heated) and sampling every 3000 generations. Where PartitionFinder selected a mixed distribution model of among-site rate variation (1 + G), only a gamma distribution was implemented, as parameters estimated under the 1 + G model can be highly correlated, especially when only a small number of sequences are considered (Sullivan et al., 1999). Convergence of the two parallel runs was examined in Tracer v1.5 (Rambaut and Drummond, 2009), by confirming that ESS values were above 200, and by investigating whether the log-likelihood scores of the two parallel runs converged to similar values following the burn-in period. Posterior probabilities (PP) were estimated by sampling trees from the PP distribution. Post burn-in trees were summarized and a 50% majority rule consensus tree was built in MrBayes v3.2.1. BI branches with PP values of >80 were collapsed using the software Archeopertyx v0.9813 (Han and Zmasek, 2009). Maximum Likelihood (ML) topologies and 1000 bootstrap (BS) replicates were generated with RaxML v7.7.8 (Stamatakis, 2006), giving each partition suggested by PartitionFinder (Table 3S) its own GTR + CAT model of evolution in two independent analyses per alignment.

2.6. Divergence time estimation

Divergence times and substitution rates were estimated using the 13 gene regions of the mitogenome dataset and two fossil calibration points in the software BEAST v1.7.5 (Drummond et al., 2012).

Standard models of evolution implemented in BEAST assume mutual independence among sites. Because secondary structure of tRNA and rRNA regions of the mitogenome can violate this assumption (Dixon and Hillis, 1993), all RNA regions were removed from the mitogenome data set, leaving only the 13 gene regions (this data set is referred to as the ‘mitogenome BEAST data set’). Each gene was separated into single codon positions and the optimal partitioning and evolutionary models were selected based on the BIC selection criteria in the software PartitionFinder v1.1.1 (Lanfear et al., 2012). The resulting optimal partitioning scheme and evolutionary models (Supplementary Table 3S) were used in all subsequent BEAST v1.7.5 analyses. Where PartitionFinder selected a mixed distribution model of among-site rate variation (1 + G), only a gamma distribution was implemented (Sullivan et al., 1999). Where PartitionFinder selected a GTR model of evolution, a HKY model was implemented (see Table 3S), as a GTR model proved too parameter-rich for our data (Drummond et al., 2002).

Exploratory runs with either a lognormal relaxed clock (LRNC) or a random local clock (RLC) (Drummond and Suchard, 2010), both in combination with a birth–death (BD) prior for rates of cladogenesis (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007), were conducted. Both clock models resulted in substantial rate variation between different mobulid clades. Therefore, we chose to conduct further analyses using the random local clock (RLC) model in combination with a BD prior for rates of cladogenesis, as rate variation violates the assumptions of the LRNC model (Drummond and Suchard, 2010). Three runs were conducted of 50 million generations each, with sampling every 5000 generations. The software Tracer v1.5 (Rambaut and Drummond, 2009) was used to quantify effective sample sizes (ESS) for model parameters, and the ‘compare’ command in AWTY (Nylander et al., 2008) was used to assess convergence, with 10% of each run discarded as burn-in. Runs were combined using LogCombiner v1.7.5 (Drummond et al., 2012), and a time tree was obtained using TreeAnnotator v1.7.5 (Drummond et al., 2012).

Based on the oldest occurrence of true Mobula from the Late Oligocene (28.1–23.03 Mya) (Case, 1980; Cicimurri and Knight, 2009) we dated the divergence of basal mobulids to 28.1–23.03 Mya (Supplementary Table 4S). Fossils of Manta from the Late Miocene–Early Pliocene were used to date the split between M. japonica/M. mobular and Manta to 11.61–3.6 Mya (Laurito Mora, 1999) (Supplementary Table 4S). Priors with a normal distribution were used for both calibration points, with the minimum and maximum bounds for each calibration point (e.g. 28.1 and 23.03 respectively, and 11.61 and 3.6 My respectively) implemented with the 95% percentile of the distribution.

Although inadequate by themselves, fossil material from the Pliocene (3.33–3.6 Mya), which were classified as either Manta (Bourdon, 1999) or as reminiscent of M. japonica/M. mobular (Adnet et al., 2012), and fossils reminiscent of M. japonica/M. mobular from the Late Miocene–Early Pliocene (11.61–3.6 Mya) (Laurito Mora, 1999), were used in support of the two key dating points. A single tooth recovered from the Early Oligocene (33.9–28.1) reminiscent of Manta sp. (Picot et al., 2008), but which displays marked differences to the younger form (Adnet et al., 2012), was deemed too uncertain for use as a fossil calibration point for the divergence between Manta and M. japonica/M. mobular.

The species M. hypostoma and M. alfredi were not included in the mitogenome BEAST data set, due to lack of data and samples respectively. Therefore, we manually calculated divergence dates for these species assuming $dAt = 2i/T$, where $dAt$ is the average number of net nucleotide substitutions per nucleotide site between species, $i$ is the substitution rate, and $T$ is divergence time in years. Estimates of $dAt$ between M. hypostoma and M. rochebrunii and between M. birostris and M. alfredi were calculated using the software MACega v5.0 (Tamura et al., 2011) based on NADH2 sequences, and concatenated COX1 and NADH5 sequences for M. hypostoma and M. alfredi respectively, using the Tamura-Nei model as identified by jModelTest v0.1 (Posada, 2008). Estimates of $dAt$ of were obtained from our BEAST analyses (rates of M. rochebrunii and M. birostris for calculations of divergence dates of M. hypostoma and M. alfredi respectively).

3. Results

3.1. Phylogenetic inference and support

Mitogenome data set. NGS sequencing results (percent coverage, coverage depth range and coverage depth average) are reported in Supplementary Table 1S. The alignment consisted of 15387 nucleotides (nts) (11,470 nts protein coding DNA, 1350 nts rRNA and 1564 nts tRNA). The alignment contained a total of 89 indels, ranging from 1 to 9 nts in length. Pairwise sequence divergence among mobulid species ranged from 0.1% between M. japonica and M. mobular, to 14.8% between M. munkiana and M. birostris. The software PartitionFinder identified 11 partitions (Table 3S). The ML and BI trees (Fig. 2) were highly congruent and shared high support values: 8 out of 9 inter-specific nodes show both BI PP and ML BS values: 8 out of 9 inter-specific nodes show both BI PP and ML BS values.
of 7 indels, ranging from 1 to 257 nts in length. Total pairwise sequence divergence ranged between 0–8.8%, 0–9.3%, 0–0.4% and 0–2.8%, for COX1, NADH5, RAG1 and HEMO respectively. The software PartitionFinder identified 5 partitions (Supplementary Table 3S). BI and ML trees (Fig. 3) produced the same three clades as the mitogenome data set and also with high support. Within clade resolution varied, with Clade I forming a polytomy. Within this polytomy, *M. alfredi* was sister species to *M. birostris* with high support (100/100). The data set containing only nuclear sequences (nuclear data set) is generally in agreement with results based on the COX1/NADH5/RAG1/HEMO data set. BI and ML analyses (Supplementary Fig. 1S) recovered Clade II with high support (100/100). All other species were contained in a polytomy.

**NADH2 data set.** The NADH2 data set consisted of 1044 nts and total sequence divergence ranged from 0% between *M. mobular* and *M. japanica* to 20% between *M. hypostoma* and *M. japanica*. The

---

**Fig. 2.** Bayesian phylogeny based on the mitogenome data set. Support values above nodes (BI PP/ML BS). Nodes with BI PP values <80 are collapsed.

**Fig. 3.** Bayesian phylogeny based on the COX1/NADH5/HEMO/RAG1 data set. Support values above nodes (BI PP/ML BS). Nodes with BI PP values <80 are collapsed. The placement of *M. alfredi* as sister species to *M. birostris* is based on GenBank sequences of COX1, NADH5 and RAG1.
software PartitionFinder identified 3 partitions (Supplementary Table 3S). The NADH2 tree (Supplementary Fig. 2S) formed a polytomy, which included all mobulids and outgroup species. Within this polytomy, two out of the three clades found with the mitogenome and COX1/NADH5/RAG1/HEMO data sets are produced here (Clades II and III), also with high support (100/100). *M. hypostoma* falls in Clade III and as sister species to *M. rochebrunei* with high support (100/100).

### 3.2. Divergence time estimation

Tree topologies based on the three mitogenome BEAST runs were congruent, and in agreement with our mitogenome BI and ML analyses. The average estimated mean rate of nucleotide substitution in mobulids was $8.82 \times 10^{-09}$ (95% HPD: $7.15 \times 10^{-09} - 10.77 \times 10^{-09}$). Rate estimates differed slightly among clades (Fig. 4 and Supplementary Table 5S), with the higher boundary of the 95% highest posterior density (HPD) of Clade I (combined 95% HPDs: $1.8 \times 10^{-09} - 12.8 \times 10^{-09}$) being almost twice as high as that of Clades II + III (combined 95% HPDs: $6.6 \times 10^{-09} - 9.8 \times 10^{-09}$).

Using the best fossil dating points for calibration, divergence between *M. californica* and *R. steinachneri* was dated at 48.81 Mya (node 1, Fig. 4), and divergence of the basal mobulids at 30.12 Mya (node 2, Fig. 4). Extant mobulids diverged during two periods: between 18.29 and 17.46 Mya (nodes 5 and 6, Fig. 4), and between 3.66 and 0.36 Mya (nodes 10, 11 and 13, Fig. 4). All rate and date estimates and 95% HPD intervals can be found in Supplementary Table 5S.

4. Discussion

#### 4.1. The molecular clock, age estimates and the fossil record

It is well established that elasmobranchs exhibit nucleotide substitution rates that are slow relative to mammals (Martin et al., 1992). The reasons for this are less clear, although metabolic rate has been suggested as the most likely correlate for slow molecular rates in elasmobranchs (Martin, 1999). Estimates of the number of nucleotide substitutions per site per year ($S \times 10^{-9}$) in elasmobranchs vary between $0.7 \times 10^{-09}$ and $1.15 \times 10^{-09}$ (reviewed by Dudgeon et al., 2012), which is approximately an order of magnitude slower than rates found in mammals. Our estimate of an average rate of $5 \times 10^{-09}$ in mobulids of $8.82 \times 10^{-09}$ (95% HPD: $7.15 \times 10^{-09} - 10.77 \times 10^{-09}$) falls within the range estimated for elasmobranchs.

Shifts in nucleotide substitution rate both within and among lineages are a pervasive phenomenon across the Tree of Life (Britten, 1986; Martin and Palumbi, 1993; Wu and Li, 1985) including within the Carcharhiniformes and Lamniformes (Martin, 1995) and also within the Myliobatiformes (Dunn et al., 2003). Although no specific rates were given, Dunn et al. (2003) compared mitochondrial nucleotide substitution rates among species representing all of the myliobatoid families and found evidence for rate changes in *Torpedo*, *Raja*, *Gymnura*, *Urobatis*, *Potomatrygon*, *Rhinobatos* and *Rhinoptera* as compared to a null distribution. *M. birostris* was also included in that study but did not show a rate change as compared to the null distribution. However, within the Mobulidae we found evidence for a slight positive shift in
nucleotide substitution rate accompanying the divergence of Clade I, and an increase along the *M. kuhlii* lineage within Clade II.

There is currently no generalized explanation for the causes of increased or decreased nucleotide substitution rates. As estimates of branch length are dependent on sequence substitution models, model misspecifications can have a large influence on rate estimates (Kelchner and Thomas, 2007; Revell et al., 2005). Although the Bayesian approach implemented in BEAST does account for model uncertainty by varying model parameters during MCMC searches (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007), we cannot exclude that the inferred shifts in substitution rate are the consequence of model misspecification. However, if small, fragmented and genetically isolated founder populations characterize most speciation events in mobulids, or if effective population sizes strongly fluctuated due to for example paleoclimate variation, changes in effective population size ($N_e$) of incipient species or populations might have some bearing on the shifts in nucleotide substitution rates found in this study. Recent studies indicate that increases in substitution rates can be caused by a reduction in effective population size (Woolfit, 2009). In species with a smaller $N_e$, selection plays a less important role, causing slightly deleterious mutations to be fixed at an elevated rate. The same pattern is repeated across genomic regions with smaller $N_e$ such as regions with low recombination, in which linkage between weakly selected loci reduces the effectiveness of selection (Haddrill et al., 2007; Presgraves, 2005). Conversely, temporally increased substitution rates have also been found in lineages that had undergone population size expansions, due to the fixation of slightly advantageous back-mutations (Charlesworth and Eyre-Walker, 2007). Below, we discuss paleoecological variables that could have affected mobulid effective population sizes.

Based on our two fossil calibration points and the mitogenome-BEAST analysis, we date the divergence of *Mylibatis californica* and *Rhinoptera steindacheri* to $\sim 48$ Mya (node 1, fig. 4), which is in agreement with the occurrence of the first fossil rhinopterids between 56.0 and 33.9 Mya (Cappetta, 1987, 2006). Our estimate of subsequent divergence between *Rhinoptera* and the mobulid lineage (34.88–25.33 Mya, node 2, fig. 4) largely overlaps with an estimate by Aschliman et al. (2012a,b) (29.9–22.6 Mya) based on mitogenomes in combination with fossil calibration points external to the mobulid clade. However, their estimate was later suggested to be too recent (Aschliman, 2014), and to be more in line with estimates by Adnet et al. (2012). Adnet et al. (2012) estimated the divergence between these two lineages at around 50 Mya based on fossil teeth of the oldest putative mobulid *Burnhamia* (59.2–47.8 Mya), now extinct (Cappetta, 1985; Pfeil, 1981; Woodward, 1889), and on the first occurrence of fossil rhinopterids. *Burnhamia* is one of several extinct genera that have been compared or affiliated to mobulids based on their tooth morphologies; however, the taxonomic positions of these genera are still debated. Fossils of *Burnhamia*, which include three extinct species, were originally placed in the genus *Rhinoptera* (Woodward, 1889) but later attributed to a new genus among mobulids based on an apparent absence of biomechanical stress marks on the teeth, as seen in teeth of modern filter feeding mobulids (Cappetta, 1975). Our estimate for the divergence between *Rhinoptera* and the mobulid lineage suggests that *Burnhamia* should be placed outside of the mobulid lineage. However, as discussed earlier, we cannot exclude the possibility that our inferred timing for the rise of the mobulid lineage (\sim 30 Mya) is the consequence of model misspecifications.

Within the extant mobulids, one of our estimates of divergence time is not congruent with the estimate based on the fossil record; fossil teeth of *M. cf. hypostoma* first occurred in the Middle Miocene and Pliocene (11.6–3.6 Mya) (Laurito Mora, 1999), much earlier than our estimate of \sim 1.1 Mya based on the formula $d_\mu = 2/T$. Since we were unable to include mitogenome sequences of *M. hypostoma* in our BEAST analysis, it is possible that our divergence time estimate is too recent, and that the actual divergence of this species is much older. Alternatively, provided that our estimate is correct, tooth morphology of *M. hypostoma* (Adnet et al., 2012) could represent the ancestral state for (*M. hypostoma* + *M. rochebrunei*), with a reversal in the latter species.

### 4.2. Patterns of mobulid evolution

Divergences within the mobulid clade are characterized by long internodes extending from the base of each clade to its subsequent radiation starting around 3.6 Mya. This pattern is most notable in Clades II and III; however, a similar pattern is repeated in Clade I, where early radiations within the clade between 19 and 17 Mya are followed by long interior branches and the subsequent diversification of *Manta* less than 1 Mya. Punctuated patterns are common across the Tree of Life, including all major lineages of batoid rays (Aschliman et al., 2012a). Rapid radiations are often associated with key innovations, meta-community dynamics, environmental change and/or accelerated rates of molecular evolution (reviewed by Crisp and Cook, 2009). Alternatively, long interior branches can be the result of extinction events that prune internal branches while preserving older lineages; or even a combination of extinction alternated by bursts of divergence (Crisp and Cook, 2009). Discriminating among scenarios is difficult, especially when taxon sampling is limited. In that case, the fossil record, in combination with correlations between phylogenetic topologies and paleo-climatic events can provide clues about possible drivers of the observed pattern. For example, Aschliman et al. (2012a) attributed the pattern observed in the batoid ray phylogeny to an extinction event around the K/T boundary, owing to the higher survival rate of older lineages (families) relative to internal branches (genera).

Although fossil remains of mobulids are limited to isolated teeth, and are relatively scarce in marine deposits, five to eight extinct mobulid species are currently counted (reviewed by Adnet et al., 2012). These species are known from Oligocene and Miocene deposits (28.1–11.6 Mya), but had disappeared from the fossil record by 11 Mya. This suggests that the pattern of mobulid radiation is, at least partly, caused by an extinction event during this period. However, the occurrence of three stages of diversification at different rates (e.g. fast/slow/fast), a combination of factors (e.g. rate changes and extinctions), or model misspecifications cannot be excluded. Below, we discuss possible drivers and mechanisms of mobulid speciation.

### 4.3. Mechanisms and drivers of mobulid speciation

Early evolution of mobulids probably occurred during the Oligocene epoch (33.9–23.03 Mya), in the Atlantic and Tethyan Oceans based on locations of recovered fossils (reviewed by Adnet et al., 2012) (fig. 5). The Oligocene was a period marked by large climatic changes, which profoundly affected conditions experienced by pelagic marine organisms. After the global warmth of the Paleocene and Early Eocene, the warm ‘greenhouse’ world of the early Eocene evolved into the glacial ‘icehouse’ conditions of the early Oligocene, with rapid onset of Antarctic glaciation around 34 Mya (Zachos et al., 2001). Cooling of the oceans, in conjunction with the opening of the Drake Passage around the tip of South America, produced regions where cold and nutrient-rich polar water mixed with warmer waters, increasing deep mixing and the intensity of zonal winds. These changes facilitated the upwelling of nutrient-rich deep water greatly boosting productivity in various locations, including in the Tropical and Subtropical Atlantic Ocean (Boersma and Silva, 1991; Suto et al., 2012; Zachos et al., 1996).
The timing of the development of the filter-feeding strategy in batoids – a key innovation within this clade—corresponds with periods of Oligocene upwelling, which was likely a main driver of early mobulid evolution. Although upwelling is not the only source of high productivity in the ocean, it does concentrate resources in a relatively small geographic area, often providing densities of food particles high enough to meet the large energy demands of filter-feeding marine mega fauna (Croll et al., 2005).

This is evident today, as contemporary mobulid distributions largely overlap with areas of high upwelling-related productivity in tropical and subtropical oceans (Fig. 6) and seasonal migration patterns that reflect temporal increases in upwelling (Anderson et al., 2011; Croll et al., 2012; Graham et al., 2012). The upwelling hypothesis has also been proposed for the mysticeti whales, whose early evolution in Southern Oceans coincides with the initiation of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current, and associated high upwelling-related productivity in this region during the Oligocene (Fordyce, 1980).

Pastene et al. (2007) suggested that periodic decreases in upwelling intensity through global warming could have facilitated allopatric speciation among pelagic populations of filter feeders. Upwelling has not been a stable phenomenon, but has waxed and waned following changes in the world’s climate throughout the ages. Periods of global cooling with associated high upwelling intensities were alternated by extended periods of global warming during the Oligocene (Zachos et al., 2001). Hence, hypothetically, global warming may have resulted in fragmentation of the habitat of filter feeders, leading to different subpopulations eventually residing in smaller isolated regions, which may have facilitated speciation as suggested for the common minke whale (Balaenoptera acutorostrata) and Antarctic minke whale (B. bonaerensis) (Pastene et al., 2007). Our divergence estimates coincide broadly with several periods of global warming making such a mechanism conceivable for mobulids. Indeed, the divergence between Clades I and II (node 4, Fig. 4), and of M. tarapacana, M. birostris and M. japonica (nodes 5 and 6, Fig. 4), roughly coincide with the Miocene Climatic Optimum and the warm period leading up to it (~22–15 Ma) (Zachos et al., 2001). Similarly, estimated divergence of M. thurstoni (node 10, Fig. 4) coincides with another period of extended global warming during the Early Pliocene, which lasted from ~6 to 3.5 Ma (Fedorov et al., 2013).

The most recent speciation events between M. eregoodootenkee and M. kuhlii; M. hypostoma and M. rochebrunei; and M. birostris and M. alfredi occurred during the Glacial – Interglacial cycles of the Pleistocene (Kashiwagi et al., 2012; and the present study). Again, there was considerable variation in upwelling intensity and productivity during this period (Pedersen, 1983; Shaari et al., 2013). In addition, a major decrease in sea level during Pleistocene glacial periods may have further reinforced the isolation of populations by causing additional barriers to dispersal through the restriction of shallow seaways, especially in the Indo-West Pacific Ocean Coral Triangle (Pillans et al., 1998).

Molecular phylogenies based only on extant taxa often show an increase in speciation rates towards the present (Nee et al., 1994). This “pull of the present” results from the fact that lineages arising in the recent past are less likely to have become extinct, and therefore are over-represented in the phylogeny (Kubo and Iwasa, 1995; Nee et al., 1994). Although the use of a relaxed molecular clock, which accommodates rate variation over time, corrects for this
issue to a certain degree (Morlon et al., 2011), we cannot exclude that the higher diversification rates during the Pleistocene are the consequence of this phenomenon.

The divergence between East Pacific M. munkiana and Atlantic species M. rochebrunnei between 3.20 and 2.03 (node 13, Fig. 4) is consistent with the closing of the Isthmus of Panama, which most likely took place between 3.1 and 2.8 Mya (Coates et al., 2003; Coates and Obando, 1996). This event created a permanent separation between East Pacific and Atlantic mobulids as is the case for many marine species (Lessios, 2008) including various elasmobranchs (Daly-Engel et al., 2012; Keeney and Heist, 2006; Schultz et al., 2008; Stelbrink et al., 2010).

A genetic study of species boundaries between M. birostris and M. alfredi supported worldwide monophyly of nuclear RAG1 genotypes, but paraphyly of mitochondrial NADH5 genotypes around East Africa (Kashiwagi et al., 2012). The mitochondrial pattern was interpreted as possible secondary contact and introgression. Even if secondary contact occurred before speciation was complete, niche differentiation or possible behavioral incompatibilities could have been further promoted resulting in reproductive isolation. Kashiwagi et al. (2012) hypothesized that habitat specialization probably played an important role in the evolution of M. birostris and M. alfredi, since the two species generally exhibit habitat segregation between near-shore (M. alfredi) and offshore (M. birostris) environments (Marshall et al., 2009). Alternatively, due to the enormous migratory potential of (especially) M. birostris, it is conceivable that behavioral isolation and/or sexual selection for, e.g., size, played a more fundamental role in the divergence of the two species (Edelaar et al., 2008; Head et al., 2013; Weissing et al., 2011). Recently, a hybrid between M. alfredi and M. birostris was identified in the Red Sea, based on sequence analysis of the nuclear gene RAG1, which was heterozygous for two species-specific single nucleotide polymorphisms (Walter et al., 2014). This indicates that reproductive isolation between the two species may be less complete than previously reported.

4.4. Taxonomic issues

Our results regarding paraphyly of the genus Mobula are in agreement with previous studies based on molecular data (Naylor et al., 2012a; Aschliman et al., 2012a,b). Our results based on mitogenomic data are also strongly congruent with data based on tooth morphology, which largely subdivides mobulids into the same clades as our mitogenome data set, with only M. tarapacana showing deviating tooth morphology from the rest of Clade I (Adnet et al., 2012; see Fig. S3).

To be descriptively useful, a genus should be monophyletic, with linear arrangements of species reflecting common ancestry (Wiley and Lieberman, 2011). Given that logic, Manta should be renamed to Mobula, since Mobula (Rafinesque-Schmaltz, 1810) has nomenclatural priority over Manta (Bancroft, 1829). Additionally, since M. mobular is the type species for the current genus Mobula, appropriate genus names for Clades II and III should be reviewed and possibly re-designated. However, Batoid classification is currently in transition, and a change at this stage provides no benefit for the spirit of taxonomic stability. We therefore recommend that the current genus designation be retained, pending confirmation by studies based on other methods, including comparative anatomy of all mobulid species.

Our single sample of M. mobular falls in a group together with M. japonica from the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans, based on both mitogenomic and nuclear data (Figs. 2–4). Genetic divergence between the two putative species is very small (mitogenomic coding region = 0.078–0.237%, nuclear = 0%), and falls within the range of divergence among M. japonica (mitogenomic coding region = 0.061–0.237%, nuclear = 0%). Morphologically, the two species are also highly similar, with small differences pertaining only to maximum DW (M. mobular has a larger maximum DW) morpomorphics (M. mobular reaches a larger DW relative to the rest of the body), and tooth morphology (Adnet et al., 2012; Notarbartolo di Sciara, 1987). Combined, genetic and morphological data challenge the notion that M. mobular and M. japonica are two separate species. However, additional and population-level sampling, combined with genetic analysis and morphological examination are necessary before any conclusions can be drawn about the species status of M. japonica.

4.5. Conservation implications

All mobulids—Manta and Mobula (devil rays) share similar and vulnerable life histories (Hoenig and Gruber, 1990; Stevens, 2000; Dulvy et al., 2014) making them equally susceptible to threats from bycatch and targeted fisheries. Recently, conservation concerns have been raised for mobulids, with population declines recorded for several species (Couturier et al., 2012; Dulvy et al., 2008). Eight out of 11 mobulids are now listed as Near Threatened or worse on the International Union of the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List, with the remaining three species listed as Data Deficient (Table 1). Manta rays are protected in several countries, including Mexico, Ecuador, the Republic of Maldives and the Philippines. Additionally, M. birostris is listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention of Migratory Species (CMS), and is protected by EU regulations (no. 43/2014), and M. birostris, M. alfredi and the putative third Manta species have received protection under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) Appendix II, which was motivated by the desire to avoid utilization by strong export markets for the use of these animals' gill plates in Asian medicines. International protective legislation remains inadequate for Mobula. They are currently not listed by CMS or CITES, and are only protected in the Mediterranean Sea (M. mobular), Ecuador, the Philippines and the Republic of Maldives. Clearly, both Manta and Mobula need strong national and international protective measures in place given their similarities and shared vulnerabilities.

Furthermore, many unknowns remain in projecting the potential effect of climate change on upwelling systems (Bakun, 1990). Based on the IPCC Special Report on Emission Scenario A2, equatorial upwelling systems are projected to decrease by almost 30% by 2100 (Polovina et al., 2011). Such a reduction will potentially have the effect of climate change on upwelling. Regional extinctions, as well as biogeographic shifts in population movements to areas with sufficient food availability are likely outcomes.

In conclusion, the closely shared evolutionary history of mobulids in combination with ongoing threats from fisheries and climate change effects on upwelling and food supply, will promote the case for protection of all species in this vulnerable family of pelagic elasmobranchs.
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