



Comprehensive Analysis of Salamander Hybridization Suggests a Consistent Relationship between Genetic Distance and Reproductive Isolation across Tetrapods

Authors: Melander, Scott Lucas, and Mueller, Rachel Lockridge

Source: Copeia, 108(4) : 987-1003

Published By: The American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1643/CH-19-319>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Comprehensive Analysis of Salamander Hybridization Suggests a Consistent Relationship between Genetic Distance and Reproductive Isolation across Tetrapods

Scott Lucas Melander¹ and Rachel Lockridge Mueller¹

Hybridization between populations along the path to complete reproductive isolation can provide snapshots of speciation in action. Here, we present a comprehensive list of salamander hybrids and estimate genetic distances between the parental hybridizing species using one mitochondrial and one nuclear gene (MT-CYB and RAG1). Salamanders are outliers among tetrapod vertebrates in having low metabolic rates and highly variable sex chromosomes. Both of these features might be expected to impact speciation; mismatches between the mitochondrial and nuclear genomes that encode the proteins for oxidative metabolism, as well as mismatches in heteromorphic sex chromosomes, can lead to reproductive isolation. We compared the genetic distances between hybridizing parental species across four main tetrapod groups that differ in metabolic rates and sex chromosome diversity: salamanders, lizards, mammals, and birds. Our results reveal no significant differences, suggesting that variation in these traits across vertebrates does not translate into predictable patterns of genetic divergence and incompatible loci in hybrids.

SPECIES formation is typically a temporally extended process, occurring over countless generations as one population-level lineage diverges into two independent population-level lineages (de Queiroz, 1998). Because of the long timescales, studying this process is challenging; however, diverging lineages that retain the ability to reproduce can provide snapshots of speciation in action (Harrison and Larson, 2016; Soltani et al., 2017). Classic examples include ring species such as *Ensatina eschscholtzii*, where different steps of speciation can be examined in a single taxon by looking at how the populations distributed around the geographic “ring” interbreed or hybridize (Pereira and Wake, 2009; Devitt et al., 2011). Specifically, hybrids provide an opportunity to identify the key genetic factors that become reproductive barriers when divergent genomes mix (Arnold, 1997; Toro et al., 2002; Harrison and Larson, 2016; Qvarnström et al., 2016). Typically, populations that come into contact and interbreed after isolation will have alleles interact in new, untested ways (Barton and Hewitt, 1985). If the admixture of alleles is intrinsically harmful, such as the hybrid being sterile, these negative interactions are called Dobzhansky–Muller or Bateson–Dobzhansky–Muller incompatibilities (BDMIs) and are a source of reproductive isolation (Bateson, 1909; Dobzhansky, 1937; Muller, 1942; Orr, 1996).

One special case of BDMIs is when the mitochondria and the nucleus are mismatched after hybridization—i.e., mitochondrial discordance (Ellison and Burton, 2008; Sloan et al., 2017; Hill et al., 2019). When the nuclear genome includes contributions from two species, but the mitochondrial genome comes from only one of the two, the gene products encoded by the two organelles cannot always functionally interact, causing reduced fitness and contributing to reproductive isolation. More specifically, this reduced fitness can be reflected in the metabolic costs of being a hybrid, which include increased respiration rates, increased levels of reactive oxygen species (ROS), and increased metabolic rate (Olson et al., 2010; Gvoždík, 2012; Barreto and Burton, 2013; Borowiec

et al., 2016; McFarlane et al., 2016; Prokić et al., 2018). We hypothesize that if an organism has a low metabolic rate to begin with, this change in OXPHOS functionality might have a smaller effect on overall hybrid fitness. This, in turn, could allow hybridization between species with more severely mismatched mitochondrial and nuclear genomes. Tetrapods are a good model system in which to test this hypothesis because of the wide range of metabolic rates that exists in the clade (Pough, 1980; White et al., 2006; Anderson and Gillooly, 2018). Literature reviews summarizing hybrids in birds, mammals, and lizards have been published previously (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Jančúchová-Lásková et al., 2015); birds have the highest metabolic rates, followed by mammals, and then lizards. Salamanders (order Caudata) are an important clade to incorporate into a comparative analysis of tetrapods because they have the lowest metabolic rates (Pough, 1980; Glatten et al., 1992), and there are many reported cases of salamander hybrids. With their low metabolic requirements, we predict that salamander hybrids can tolerate greater levels of genetic divergence—a proxy for mitonuclear mismatch—between parental species before complete reproductive isolation occurs.

Sex chromosomes are also important during speciation and the emergence of reproductive isolation or hybrid incompatibility (Lima, 2014) because of Haldane’s rule, where the heterogametic sex is more likely to be infertile by a variety of potential mechanisms, or the related large X/Z effect, where a disproportionate share of hybrid incompatibilities is found on either the X or Z chromosome (Presgraves, 2008; Lavretsky et al., 2015; Janoušek et al., 2019). In hybrid zones, mutations in sex chromosomes have been shown to limit introgression (Cortés-Ortiz et al., 2019) or even cause complete reproductive isolation between lineages (Johnson and Lachance, 2012; Hooper et al., 2019). Compared to other tetrapod clades, salamanders have variable genetic sex-determining mechanisms with either homomorphic sex chromosomes or heteromorphic sex chromosomes with either ZW or XY systems (Eggert, 2004). ZW and XY systems

¹ Department of Biology, Colorado State University, 251 W Pitkin Street, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523; Email: (SLM) Scott.Melander@colostate.edu; and (RLM) Rachel.Mueller@colostate.edu. Send reprint requests to SLM.

Submitted: 1 November 2019. Accepted: 2 August 2020. Associate Editor: B. Stuart.

© 2020 by the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists DOI: 10.1643/CH-19-319 Published online: 28 December 2020

Table 1. Hybridization in salamanders.

Parental species				
Species 1	Sex chromosome type	Species 2	Sex chromosome type	Resources
Ambystomatidae				
<i>Ambystoma dumerilii</i>		<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>		Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma dumerilii</i>		<i>Ambystoma rivulare</i>		Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i>		<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i>		Lee-Yaw et al., 2014
North Central		Rocky Mountains		
<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i>	ZW*	<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma maculatum</i>		<i>Ambystoma maculatum</i>		Johnson et al., 2015
Eastern		Western		
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	<i>Ambystoma tigrinum</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	Woodcock et al., 2017
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	<i>Ambystoma opacum</i>	ZW*	Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma talpoideum</i>		<i>Ambystoma texanum</i>		Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma texanum</i>	ZW*	<i>Ambystoma tigrinum</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	Brandon, 1977
<i>Ambystoma tigrinum californiense</i>	ZW ^{1.2.3}	<i>Ambystoma mavortium</i>	ZW*	Fitzpatrick et al., 2009 Fitzpatrick and Shaffer, 2004 Riley et al., 2003
Cryptobranchidae				
<i>Andrias davidianus</i>		<i>Andrias japonicus</i>		Fukumoto et al., 2015
Dicamptodontidae				
<i>Dicamptodon ensatus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Dicamptodon tenebrosus</i>	XX ^{PC}	Good, 1989
Hynobiidae				
<i>Hynobius nebulosus</i>		<i>Hynobius nigrescens</i>		Kawamura, 1953
<i>Onychodactylus japonicus</i>		<i>Onychodactylus japonicus</i>		Yoshikawa et al., 2012
S-Tohoku		SW-Honshu		
<i>Salamandrella keyserlingii</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Salamandrella tridactyla</i>	XX ^{PC}	Malyarchuk et al., 2015
Plethodontidae				
<i>Aneides klamathensis</i>		<i>Aneides flavipunctatus</i>		Reilly and Wake, 2019
<i>Batrachoseps gavilanensis</i>		<i>Batrachoseps luciae</i>		Jockusch and Wake, 2002
<i>Bolitoglossa franklini</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Bolitoglossa lincolni</i>	XX ^{PC}	Wake et al., 1980
<i>Desmognathus carolinensis</i>		<i>Desmognathus orestes</i>		Mead and Tilley, 2000
<i>Desmognathus conanti</i>	XX*	<i>Desmognathus fuscus</i>	XX ^{PC}	Bonett, 2002
<i>Desmognathus fuscus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Desmognathus ochrophaeus</i>	XX ^{PC}	Sharbel et al., 1995
<i>Desmognathus fuscus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Desmognathus santeetlah</i>	XX*	Tilley, 1988
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii croceator</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii platensis</i>	XX ^{PC}	Pereira and Wake, 2009
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii eschscholtzii</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii klauberi</i>	XX ^{PC}	Devitt et al., 2011
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii oregonensis</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii picta</i>	XX ^{PC}	Pereira and Wake, 2009
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii oregonensis</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii xanthoptica</i>	XX ^{PC}	Pereira and Wake, 2009
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii platensis</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii xanthoptica</i>	XX ^{PC}	Alexandrino et al., 2005 Sweet, 1984
<i>Eurycea bislineata</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Eurycea cirrigera</i>	XX ^{PC}	Guttman and Karlin, 1986
<i>Eurycea cirrigera</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Eurycea wilderae</i>	XX*	Kozak, 2003
<i>Eurycea neotenes</i>		<i>Eurycea tridentifera</i>		Kozak and Montanucci, 2001
<i>Hydromantes ambrosii</i>	XY ^{1.2.3}	<i>Hydromantes italicus</i>	XY ^{1.2.3}	Lunghi et al., 2018 Ficetola et al., 2019
<i>Plethodon aureolus</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon shermani</i>	XX ^{PC}	Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chattahoochee</i>		<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>		Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chattahoochee</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon shermani</i>	XX ^{PC}	Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chattahoochee</i>		<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>		Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon cheoah</i>		<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>		Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>		<i>Plethodon cylindraceus</i>		Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon metcalfi</i>	XX ^{PC}	Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>		<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>		Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon cinereus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon electromorphus</i>	XX*	Lehtinen et al., 2016
<i>Plethodon cylindraceus</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon glutinosus</i>	XX ^{PC}	Highton and Peabody, 2000
<i>Plethodon dorsalis</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon ventralis</i>	XX*	Highton, 1997 Duncan and Highton, 1979
<i>Plethodon electromorphus</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon richmondi</i>	XX ^{PC}	Highton, 1999
<i>Plethodon fourchensis</i>	XX*	<i>Plethodon ouachitae</i>	XX ^{PC}	Shepard et al., 2011

Table 1. Continued.

Parental species				
Species 1	Sex chromosome type	Species 2	Sex chromosome type	Resources
<i>Plethodon glutinosus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon jordani</i>	XX ^{PC}	Hairston et al., 1992
<i>Plethodon glutinosus</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon kentucki</i>	XX*	Kuchta et al., 2016
<i>Plethodon hoffmani</i>		<i>Plethodon virginia</i>		Hairston et al., 1992
				Highton, 2009
				Dawley, 1987
<i>Plethodon jordani</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon metcalfi</i>	XX ^{PC}	Chatfield et al., 2010
<i>Plethodon jordani</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>	XX*	Chatfield et al., 2010
<i>Plethodon metcalfi</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>	XX*	Chatfield et al., 2010
<i>Plethodon shermani</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Plethodon teyahalee</i>	XX*	Highton and Peabody, 2000
Proteidae				
<i>Necturus maculosus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	<i>Necturus aff. lewisi</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	Nelson et al., 2017
Salamandridae				
<i>Chioglossa lusitanica</i>		<i>Chioglossa lusitanica</i>		Sequeira et al., 2005
Northern		Southern		
<i>Cynops pyrrhogaster</i>		<i>Cynops pyrrhogaster</i>		Tominaga et al., 2018
Central		Western		
<i>Lissotriton helveticus</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i>	XY ^{2,3}	Johanet et al., 2011
<i>Lissotriton montandoni</i>	XY*	<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i>	XY ^{2,3}	Babik et al., 2005
				Zieliński et al., 2013
<i>Lissotriton vulgaris kosswigi</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Lissotriton vulgaris vulgaris</i>	XY ^{2,3}	Nadachowska and Babik, 2009
<i>Lyciasalamandra antalyana</i>		<i>Lyciasalamandra billae</i>		Johannesen et al., 2006
<i>Notophthalmus viridescens</i>		<i>Notophthalmus viridescens dorsalis</i>		Takahashi et al., 2011
<i>Ommatotriton ophryticus</i>		<i>Ommatotriton nesterovi</i>		van Riemsdijk et al., 2018
<i>Ommatotriton ophryticus</i>		<i>Ommatotriton vittatus</i>		Yoshikawa et al., 2010
				van Riemsdijk et al., 2018
<i>Pleurodeles nebulosus</i>	ZW*	<i>Pleurodeles poireti</i>	ZW ^{2,3}	Escoriza et al., 2016
<i>Salamandra salamandra gallaica</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Salamandra salamandra bernardezi</i>	XX ^{PC}	García-París et al., 2003
<i>Salamandra fastuosa</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Salamandra terrestris</i>	XX ^{PC}	Ventura et al., 2015
				Canestrelli et al., 2014
				García-París et al., 2003
<i>Salamandrina perspicillata</i>	XX*	<i>Salamandrina terdigitata</i>	XX ^{PC}	Hauswaldt et al., 2011
				Mattoccia et al., 2011
				Arntzen et al., 2009
<i>Taricha rivularis</i>	XX*	<i>Taricha sierrae</i>	XX ^{PC}	Twitty, 1963
<i>Taricha rivularis</i>	XX*	<i>Taricha torosa</i>	XX ^{PC}	Twitty, 1963
<i>Taricha torosa</i>	XX ^{PC}	<i>Taricha sierrae</i>	XX ^{PC}	Kuchta, 2007
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Triturus dobrogicus</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Triturus ivanbureschi</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	XY ^{2,3}	<i>Triturus macedonicus</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	<i>Triturus dobrogicus</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	<i>Triturus ivanbureschi</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	<i>Triturus macedonicus</i>	XY*	Arntzen et al., 2014
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	<i>Triturus marmoratus</i>	XY ^{1,2,3}	Visser et al., 2017
<i>Triturus ivanbureschi</i>		<i>Triturus macedonicus</i>		Vučić et al., 2018

¹ Evans et al., 2012² Hillis and Green, 1990³ Perkins et al., 2019

* Predicted sex chromosome type

^{PC} Personal correspondence, Stan Sessions, 2019

are both found within multiple families, indicating that sex chromosomes are evolutionarily dynamic in salamanders; this makes the clade a good system for studying the effects of heteromorphic sex chromosome evolution on reproductive isolation (Charlesworth et al., 2005; Evans et al., 2012).

There are numerous studies published on hybrids in salamanders, both from long-term stable hybrid zones and conservation efforts (Fitzpatrick and Shaffer, 2004; Fukumoto et al., 2015). With a few notable exceptions (e.g., Twitty, 1963; Brandon, 1977; Gvoždík, 2012; Prokić et al., 2018),

there have not been extensive published experimental crosses in salamanders like those done in other vertebrate clades (e.g., toads, Blair, 1972; Malone and Fontenot, 2008). Here, we summarize the known cases of hybridization in salamanders. We then use this dataset to compare the genetic distances across which viable hybrids can form in different tetrapod groups and test whether differences in metabolic rate and sex chromosomes impact hybridization.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Compilation of salamander hybrids.—The first goal was the establishment of a comprehensive list of published salamander hybrids, which did not exist when we began this research (Table 1). Taxonomy is continually revised to provide scientific names that convey accurate information about species boundaries as well as the evolutionary relationships among species. Making these species designations is a rich discipline, with disagreements among taxonomists requiring different levels of divergence or isolation between populations before they are formally named as species (Highton, 1998; Kuchta and Wake, 2016). For our literature review, we used a general lineage concept of species where a species equates to a segment of a population-level evolutionary lineage (de Queiroz, 1998). We chose to include populations far enough along their own evolutionary trajectories that when secondary contact occurred, the populations did not completely admix into a single population. By doing this, we were able to include several instances of hybridization in which the hybridizing populations have not been formally named as species. We included cases where secondary contact occurred because of human-mediated introductions, and we also included laboratory crosses. Hybridization that resulted in polyploidy was excluded to eliminate the confounding variable of increased ploidy levels. Species with evidence of historical, but not ongoing, hybridization were also excluded. This compilation of hybridizing species represents extant salamanders that are known to have had the opportunity to hybridize and done so successfully; there are undoubtedly pairs of lineages that would be able to hybridize, given the opportunity (either with or without human mediation), as well as undetected instances of natural hybridization. The criteria we chose allowed us to compile the maximum amount of information about hybrid salamanders from the literature, as well as make comparisons with existing literature surveys on birds, mammals, and lizards that applied similar criteria (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Jančúchová-Lásková et al., 2015).

Database searches were performed using the terms salamander, newt, hybrid, and contact zone. Databases used were JSTOR, Web of Science, and Wildlife and Ecology Studies Worldwide. Using the same terms, additional sources were found with the search engine Google Scholar. The searches were undertaken from January 2018 to February 2020 and included research published between 1979–2020. Many taxonomic changes occurred during this 40-year period; whenever there was a conflict in species name, the current listing on AmphibiaWeb (<https://amphibiaweb.org>) was used to resolve the issue.

Intensity of research on different salamander families.—To check whether or not the reported number of hybrids within each salamander family was a function of the intensity of

publication, a general review was also conducted on how well each family of salamanders is represented in the literature (Fig. 1). Using the Web of Science database, searches were performed using terms based on variations on the salamander family names with two to three search terms used per family. Terms used were: Ambystomatidae (ambystomatid and *Ambystoma*), Amphiumidae (amphiumid and *Amphiuma*), Cryptobranchidae (cryptobranchid and *Cryptobranchus*), Dicamptodontidae (dicamptodontid and *Dicamptodon*), Hynobiidae (hynobiid and *Hynobius*), Plethodontidae (plethodontid and *Plethodon*), Proteidae (proteid), Rhyacotritonidae (rhyacotritonid and *Rhyacotriton*), Salamandridae (salamandrid and *Salamandra*), and Sirenidae (sirenid). The genus names *Proteus* and *Siren* were excluded due to their use in Greek mythology; because the corresponding salamander families are small, missing papers is unlikely. The number of articles per family was standardized by dividing by the number of species in each family based on AmphibiaWeb as of July 2020 (<https://amphibiaweb.org>). To test whether the reported number of hybrids within each salamander family was related to the intensity of publication, a Kendall correlation coefficient was calculated comparing papers per species and hybrids per species for each family.

Genetic distances between hybridizing species of salamanders.

The genetic distances across the parental species for each hybridizing salamander pair were estimated using the mitochondrial gene cytochrome *b* (MT-CYB; Fig. 2A). MT-CYB has long been used as a phylogenetic and phylogeographic marker for salamanders, so there is wide coverage for many different species (Johns and Avise, 1998). MT-CYB has also been used as a proxy for overall genetic distance in summaries of hybridizing pairs of species in other vertebrate groups (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Jančúchová-Lásková et al., 2015). For each parental species, the longest high-quality sequence was downloaded from NCBI GenBank (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/>). In some cases, this involved extracting the MT-CYB sequence from a complete mitochondrial genome sequence. When multiple equally long, high-quality sequences were available, one was selected at random. Of the 76 salamander species pairs known to hybridize, MT-CYB sequence data were available for 62 (Table 2). For each hybridizing pair, a pairwise alignment was calculated with default ClustalW settings implemented in MEGA X (Kumar et al., 2018). Each alignment was then trimmed to the first and last overlapping nucleotide position. After trimming, the alignments ranged from 345 to 1,141 base pairs. The genetic distances were estimated with PAUP * Version 4.0a (Swofford, 2002) using the HKY85 + Γ nucleotide substitution model (Hasegawa et al., 1985). In order to maximize the amount of sequence data used, the Γ distribution shape parameter α was estimated using the MEGA X maximum likelihood model selector based on a ClustalW alignment of all 81 salamander MT-CYB sequences used in this study (Kumar et al., 2018).

In order to test how representative MT-CYB genetic distances are in describing the overall genetic divergence between species, the substitution rate of mitochondrial genes versus nuclear genes was compared (Fig. 2B). This was accomplished by dividing the genetic distance of the mitochondrial gene MT-CYB by the genetic distance of the nuclear gene recombination activating 1 (RAG1) for the parental species that hybridize (Table 2). RAG1 was selected since the gene has widespread use in phylogenetic studies




Fig. 1. Salamander hybrids are found in most families (Pyron and Wiens, 2011). About 12.1% of salamanders are known to hybridize with over half belonging to Plethodontidae. There was no significant correlation between the number of papers per species and the proportion of salamanders found to hybridize (Kendall's rank correlation $P = 0.236$).

and was available for the most taxa (Chiari et al., 2009). For every parental species available, the longest high-quality RAG1 sequence was downloaded from GenBank. When multiple equally long, high-quality sequences were available, one was selected at random. RAG1 genetic distances between parental species that hybridize were then estimated using the same methods as for MT-CYB genetic distances.

Genetic distances between hybridizing species of salamanders compared with hybrids in other tetrapod groups.—The MT-CYB genetic distances between hybridizing parental species of salamanders were compared to those of birds, mammals, and lizards (i.e., squamate reptiles excluding snakes). These tetrapod groups were selected because they span part of the range of vertebrate metabolic rates (Pough, 1980; White et al.,

2006; Anderson and Gillooly, 2018) and because of the existence of published summaries of known hybrids that include natural, human-introduced, and lab-crossed hybridization events (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Jančúchová-Lásková et al., 2015). A hybrid toad summary was excluded because it focused only on experimental crosses (Blair, 1972; Malone and Fontenot, 2008). In some tetrapod groups, many closely related species hybridize, or a single species hybridizes several times. This creates a potential bias when looking at many pairwise comparisons as a single taxon becomes overrepresented, and the results become dependent on a few select taxa (Fitzpatrick, 2004). Previously published work in mammals and birds resolved this issue by removing repeated taxa to remove nonindependence (Fitzpatrick, 2004), so the




Fig. 2. (A) Histogram of cytochrome *b* (MT-CYB) genetic distance estimates (HKY85 + Γ) between salamanders that hybridize. Graph bin width is 0.0125. (B) Ratio of mitochondrial MT-CYB genetic distance to nuclear recombination activating 1 (RAG1) genetic distance between parental species of salamanders that hybridize on a log scale. The ratio of genetic distance ranged from 0.6 to 162 with the majority of species pairs having a higher mitochondrial genetic distance (median = 21.1).

Table 2. Hybrid pairs and accession numbers for MT-CYB and RAG1. Lists of bird hybrids and mammal hybrids modified from Fitzpatrick (2004). Lizards modified from Jančúchová-Lásková et al. (2015). Only the highest distance per genus was used in salamanders (*) for the cross-clade comparison (Fig. 3).

Species 1	Accession number		Species 2	Accession number		Genetic distance (HKY85 + Γ)	
	MT-CYB	RAG1		MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB	MT-CYB/RAG1
Birds							
<i>Acrocephalus scirpaceus</i>	LT671508.1		<i>A. pdlustris</i>	AJ004774.1		0.121	
<i>Aegyptius monachus</i>	AY987266.1	EF078711.1	<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	AY987261.1	EU496474.1	0.120	0.005
<i>Agapornis nigrigenis</i>	AF001328.1	GQ505193.1	<i>Melopsittacus undulatus</i>	DQ467903.1	DQ143354.1	0.265	0.036
<i>Alectura lathamii</i>	KF833611.1	AF294687.2	<i>Gallus gallus</i>	L08376.1	NM001031188.1	0.366	0.075
<i>Branta canadensis</i>	EU585629.1		<i>Cairina moschata</i>	L08385.1		0.235	
<i>Bugeranus carunculatus</i>	U27556.1		<i>Grus canadensis</i>	EU166997.1		0.074	
<i>Buteo buteo</i>	X86741.1	EU345528.1	<i>Pernis apivorus</i>	X86758.1	EF078753.1	0.185	0.018
<i>Carduelis chloris</i>	AY495384.1		<i>Emberiza citrinella</i>	AY495392.1		0.221	
<i>Ciconia ciconia</i>	KJ456229.1		<i>C. nigra</i>	U72771.1		0.184	
<i>Cathartes aura</i>	EU166984.1	EF078766.1	<i>Coragyps atratus</i>	KX534417.1	KM876315.1	0.167	0.008
<i>Columba livia</i>	KC675192.1	AY228768.1	<i>Leucosarcia melanoleuca</i>	AF483327.1	EF373512.1	0.239	0.036
<i>Diphyllodes magnificus</i>	X74255.1		<i>Paradisaea minor</i>	U25737.1		0.159	
<i>Egretta garzetta</i>	MH645659.1		<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>	AF193829.1		0.143	
<i>Falco columbarius</i>	EU233049.1	EU233167.1	<i>F. tinnunculus</i>	EU233121.1	EU233241.1	0.140	0.006
<i>Ficedula albicollis</i>	DQ674491.1	XM005046928.1	<i>F. hypoleuca</i>	KJ930552.1	DQ466798.1	0.042	0.004
<i>Garrulus glandarius</i>	AB242559.1		<i>Perisoreus infaustus</i>	U86042.1		0.247	
<i>Hirundo rustica</i>	DQ119526.1	AY443290.1	<i>H. pyrrhonota</i>	AF074591.1	AY056997.1	0.181	0.010
<i>Larus canus</i>	AB208756.1		<i>L. ridibundus</i>	FM209923.1		0.056	
<i>Phylloscopus collybita</i>	HQ608821.1		<i>P. trochilus</i>	MH079362.1		0.146	
<i>Pterocnemia pennata</i>	U76054.1		<i>Rhea americana</i>	L78808.1		0.084	
<i>Regulus calendula</i>	AY329472.1	AY057028.1	<i>R. satrapa</i>	AJ004329.1	AY443327.1	0.002	0.017
<i>Scolopax rusticola</i>	KM434134.1	AY228802.1	<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>	KM577158.1; 13657–14802	AY339126.1	0.260	0.052
<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	AF197835.1	KC789829.1	<i>T. philomelos</i>	AY495411.1	AY307214.1	0.196	0.013
Lizards							
<i>Amblyrhynchus cristatus</i>	AY948118.1	KR350710.1	<i>Conolophus subcristatus</i>	AY948122.1	KR350708.1	0.219	0.008
<i>Anolis aeneus</i>	EU557103.1	JN112592.1	<i>A. trinitatis</i>	AF493592.1	JN112645.1	0.286	0.009
<i>Carlia rubrigularis</i> NORTH	AF181042.1		<i>C. rubrigularis</i> South	AF181056.1		0.229	
<i>Crotaphytus bicinctores</i>	EU037682.1	MK780621.1	<i>C. collaris</i>	EU037482.1	FJ356749.1	0.137	0.007
<i>Gtenosaura bakeri</i>	GU331976.1		<i>C. similis</i>	GU331975.1		0.184	
<i>Gambelia sila</i>	EU037370.1		<i>G. wislizenii</i>	EU037415.1		0.026	
<i>Iberolacerta galani</i>	HQ234901.1	KY762187.1	<i>I. monticola</i>	HQ234897.1	EF632220.1	0.050	0.001
<i>Iguana delicatissima</i>	KX610607.1		<i>I. iguana</i>	AF020251.1		0.172	
<i>Kentropyx calcarata</i>	JQ639739.1		<i>K. striata</i>	JQ639672.1		0.223	
<i>Lacerta agilis</i>	AF373032.1	EF632222.1	<i>L. schreiberi</i>	AF372103.1	KY762190.1	0.310	0.017
<i>Lacerta pater</i>	AF378964.1		<i>Timon lepidus</i>	JX626302.1		0.204	
<i>Leiolepis guttata</i>	NC014179.1		<i>L. reevesii</i>	EU305052.1		0.339	
<i>Liolaemus bibronii</i>	JN410531.1		<i>L. gracilis</i>	JN410538.1		0.177	
<i>Nactus multicarinatus</i>	KC581486.1	HM997172.1	<i>N. pelagicus</i>	KC581545.1	EU054275.1	0.081	0.004
<i>Oligosoma otagense</i>	JN999970.1	EU568093.1	<i>O. waimatense</i>	JN999978.1	EU568094.1	0.114	0.001
<i>Phrynocephalus putjatai</i>	KF691634.1	KC551413.1	<i>P. vlangalii</i>	KF691642.1	KJ195972.1	0.058	0.005

Table 2. Continued.

Species 1	Accession number		Species 2	Accession number		Genetic distance (HKY85 + Γ)		
	MT-CYB	RAG1		MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB/RAG1
<i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i>	AY141087.1	DQ385423.1	<i>P. coronatum</i>	AY141097.1	FJ356738.1	0.291	0.030	9.8
<i>Plestiodon japonicus</i>	EU203134.1	HM161196.1	<i>P. latiscutatus</i>	EU203035.1	HM161203.1	0.175	0.004	47.2
<i>Podarcis melisellensis</i>	AY185036.1		<i>P. sicula</i>	AY770890.1		0.292		
<i>Zootoca vivipara carolinensis</i>	AY714929.1		<i>Z. vivipara vivipara</i>	AY714913.1		0.069		
Mammals								
<i>Alcelaphus buselaphus</i>	AJ222681.1		<i>Damaliscus lunatus</i>	AF016635.1		0.161		
<i>Arctocepalus pusillus</i>	AM181018.1		<i>Zalophus californianus</i>	AM422164.1		0.088		
<i>Bos bison</i>	AF036273.1		<i>B. indicus</i>	AF419237.2		0.089		
<i>Camelus bactrianus</i>	XM010964664.1		<i>C. dromedarius</i>	KU509220.1	XM011000597.1	0.170	0.004	48.2
<i>Capra caucasica</i>	AF034738.1		<i>C. sibirica</i>	KF990328.1		0.110		
<i>Cervus elaphus</i>	AB001612.1		<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>	AF091630.1		0.226		
<i>Chinchilla brevicaudata</i>	AF464756.1		<i>C. lanigera</i>	AF122820.1		0.069		
<i>Equus caballus</i>	DQ223535.1	NM001256901.1	<i>E. grevyi</i>	X56282.1	AY239184.1	0.118	0.009	13.1
<i>Eulemur macaco</i>	AF081049.1	HM759153.1	<i>E. mongoz</i>	AF081051.1	EU342315.1	0.140	0.005	27.4
<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>	GU167293.1		<i>Phoca hispida</i>	X82304.1		0.043		
<i>Hylobates agilis</i>	AJ010583.1		<i>H. hoolek</i>	Y13304.1		0.178		
<i>Kobus kob</i>	AF052939.1		<i>K. megaceros</i>	AJ222686.1		0.136		
<i>Lama guanicoe</i>	U06428.1		<i>Vicugna vicugna</i>	U06430.1		0.083		
<i>Lepus europaeus</i>	AY745112.1		<i>L. timidus</i>	AJ279424.1		0.152		
<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	AF295584.1	XM005578172.2	<i>Mandrillus sphinx</i>	U068151.1	HM759046.1	0.328	0.001	353.2
<i>Martes martes</i>	AF154975.1		<i>M. putorius</i>	X94925.1		0.218		
<i>Mastomys natalensis</i>	JX292865.1	DQ023475.1	<i>Mus musculus</i>	AY057804.1	NM009019.2	0.317	0.055	5.7
<i>Microtus californicus</i>	AF163891.1	KC953523.1	<i>M. montanus</i>	AF119280.1	KC953524.1	0.189	0.0173	10.9
<i>Ovis aries</i>	AF034730.1	XM012134165.2	<i>O. canadensis</i>	EU365985.1	AY239177.1	0.089	0.006	14.1
<i>Panthera leo</i>	X82300.1	AB109364.1	<i>P. pardus</i>	JF720058.1	XM019470137.1	0.107	0.002	58.2
<i>Pecari tajacu</i>	DQ179055.1		<i>Tayassu pecari</i>	AY534303.1		0.073		
<i>Peromyscus difficilis</i>	AF155394.1		<i>P. truei</i>	FJ800579.1		0.221		
<i>Spermophilus major</i>	AF157903.1		<i>S. pygmaeus</i>	AF157907.1		0.158		
<i>Ursus americanus</i>	U23556.1	DQ240717.1	<i>U. arctos</i>	U18870.1	XM026511863.1	0.172	0.008	21.0
<i>Vulpes lagopus</i>	LT559489.1	GU167551.1	<i>V. vulpes</i>	AY928669.1	XM026012934.1	0.181	0.179	1.0
Salamanders								
<i>Ambystoma dumerilii</i>	AY659994.1		<i>A. mexicanum</i>	AY659991.1		0.053		
<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i>	EF036633.1		<i>A. mexicanum</i>	AY659991.1		0.208		
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>	AY659991.1		<i>A. tigrinum</i>	AY659992.1		0.075		
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i>	AY659991.1	AY323752.1	<i>A. opacum</i>	AY691730.1	AY650130.1	0.256*	0.030*	8.4*
<i>Ambystoma talpoideum</i>	MG822788.1		<i>A. texanum</i>	GU078471.1		0.263		
<i>Ambystoma texanum</i>	GU078471.1		<i>A. tigrinum</i>	AY659992.1		0.172		
<i>Andrias davidianus</i>	KU131042.1	MH106790.1	<i>A. japonicus</i>	AB208679.1	AY583346.1	0.099*	0.004*	21.1*
<i>Batrachoseps gavalanensis</i>	KM203055.1	KM202898.1	<i>B. luciae</i>	KM203053.1	KM202878.1	0.187*	0.011*	17.1*
<i>Bolitoglossa franklini</i>	MK165231.1	KC614439.1	<i>B. lincolni</i>	GU725464.1	KC614440.1	0.030*	0.003*	12.0*
<i>Desmognathus carolinensis</i>	EU314306.1	KR732369.1	<i>D. orestes</i>	EU314288.1	KR827015.1	0.161	0.003	57.6
<i>Desmognathus conanti</i>	KY659020.1	KR732370.1	<i>D. fuscus</i>	AY728227.1	KR732372.1	0.236*	0.011*	20.7*
<i>Desmognathus fuscus</i>	AY728227.1	KR732372.1	<i>D. ochrophaeus</i>	EU314289.1	KR732377.1	0.165	0.013	12.9

Table 2. Continued.

Species 1	Accession number		Species 2	Accession number		Genetic distance (HKY85 + I*)		
	MT-CYB	RAG1		MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB/RAG1
<i>Desmognathus fuscus</i>	AY728227.1	KR732372.1	<i>D. santeetlah</i>	EU314270.1	KR732384.1	0.196	0.012	16.3
<i>Dicamptodon ensatus</i>	AY734600.1	EF107335.1	<i>D. tenebrosus</i>	AAW70411.1	AY650132.1	0.044*	0.005*	8.0*
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii croceater</i>	L75796.1		<i>E. eschscholtzii platensis</i>	FJ151995.1		0.063		
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii eschscholtzii</i>	FJ151951.1		<i>E. eschscholtzii klauberi</i>	L75801.1		0.181		
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii oregonensis</i>	FJ151696.1		<i>E. eschscholtzii picta</i>	FJ151670.1		0.059		
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii oregonensis</i>	FJ151696.1		<i>E. eschscholtzii xanthoptica</i>	FJ151887.1		0.223		
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii platensis</i>	FJ151995.1		<i>E. eschscholtzii xanthoptica</i>	FJ151887.1		0.177		
<i>Eurycea bislineata</i>	NC03217.1	AY691706.1	<i>E. cirrigera</i>	NC035494.1	FJ750236.1	0.124*	0.017*	7.5*
<i>Eurycea cirrigera</i>	AY750236.1	FJ750236.1	<i>E. wilderae</i>	JQ920621.1	JQ920766.1	0.101	0.021	4.9
<i>Eurycea neotenes</i>	AY528400.1	AY650122.1	<i>E. tridentifera</i>	AY014848.1	KF562669.1	0.009	0.010	0.9
<i>Hydromantes ambrosii</i>	FJ602258.1	FJ602321.1	<i>H. italicus</i>	FJ602299.1	EU275791.1	0.059*	0.0008*	71.9*
<i>Hynobius nebulosus</i>	HM036356.1	AY650144.1	<i>H. nigrescens</i>	JQ929922.1	KJ715356.1	0.309*	0.010*	32.0*
<i>Lissotriton helveticus</i>	DQ821238.1		<i>L. vulgaris</i>	EU880339.1		0.360		
<i>Lissotriton montandoni</i>	DQ821254.1		<i>L. vulgaris</i>	EU880339.1		0.010		
<i>Ommatotriton nesterovi</i>	KX682106.1		<i>O. ophryticus</i>	DQ821267.1		0.011		
<i>Ommatotriton ophryticus</i>	DQ821267.1		<i>O. vittatus</i>	EU880338.1		0.014		
<i>Plethodon aureolus</i>	DQ994914.1	DQ995012.1	<i>P. shermani</i>	DQ994985.1	DQ995063.1	0.166	0.002	73.9
<i>Plethodon chatahochee</i>	DQ994919.1	DQ995014.1	<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1	DQ995068.1	0.047	0.003	13.5
<i>Plethodon chatahochee</i>	DQ994919.1	DQ995014.1	<i>P. chlorobryonis</i>	DQ994923.1	DQ995016.1	0.051	0.003	15.3
<i>Plethodon chatahochee</i>	DQ994919.1	DQ995014.1	<i>P. shermani</i>	DQ994985.1	DQ995063.1	0.051	0.002	24.7
<i>Plethodon cheoah</i>	DQ994921.1		<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1		0.046		
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>	DQ994923.1		<i>P. cylindraceus</i>	DQ994928.1		0.016		
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>	DQ994923.1		<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1		0.011		
<i>Plethodon chlorobryonis</i>	DQ994923.1		<i>P. metcalfi</i>	DQ994956.1		0.160		
<i>Plethodon cinereus</i>	AY378042.1	AY691703.1	<i>P. electromorphus</i>	AY378060.1	DQ995024.1	0.151	0.013	11.3
<i>Plethodon cylindraceus</i>	DQ994928.1	DQ995022.1	<i>P. glutinosus</i>	DQ994937.1	DQ995027.1	0.169	0.003	56.1
<i>Plethodon dorsalis</i>	QQ464404.1	DQ995023.1	<i>P. ventralis</i>	DQ994993.1	DQ995071.1	0.034	0.003	9.83
<i>Plethodon electromorphus</i>	AY378060.1	DQ995024.1	<i>P. richmondi</i>	AY378072.1	DQ995051.1	0.081	0.002	39.2
<i>Plethodon fourchensis</i>	FJ611481.1	DQ995026.1	<i>P. ouachitae</i>	FJ266744.1	AY691704.1	0.179	0.002	86.9
<i>Plethodon glutinosus</i>	DQ994937.1	DQ995027.1	<i>P. jordani</i>	DQ994947.1	DQ995032.1	0.184	0.002	82.0
<i>Plethodon glutinosus</i>	DQ994937.1	DQ995027.1	<i>P. kentucki</i>	DQ994948.1	DQ995033.1	0.186*	0.005*	34.9*
<i>Plethodon hoffmani</i>	AY378047.1	DQ995029.1	<i>P. virginia</i>	AY378049.1	DQ995072.1	0.047	0.0007	68.4
<i>Plethodon jordani</i>	DQ994947.1	DQ995032.1	<i>P. metcalfi</i>	DQ994956.1	DQ995040.1	0.076	0.0007	111.2
<i>Plethodon jordani</i>	DQ994947.1	DQ995032.1	<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1	DQ995068.1	0.162	0.002	84.6
<i>Plethodon metcalfi</i>	DQ994956.1		<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1		0.156		
<i>Plethodon shermani</i>	DQ994985.1	DQ995063.1	<i>P. tayloralee</i>	DQ994990.1	DQ995068.1	0.003	0.001	3.3
<i>Salamandra salamandra bernardezi</i>	DQ092219.1		<i>S. salamandra gallaica</i>	KX094979.1		0.024		
<i>Salamandra salamandra fastuosa</i>	DQ221234.1		<i>S. salamandra terrestris</i>	AY222503.1		0.006		
<i>Salamandrella keyserlingii</i>	AY593141.1	AY650145.1	<i>S. schrenckii</i>	AB363608.1	KJ855096.1	0.153*	0.004*	41.6*
<i>Salamandrina perspicillata</i>	DQ821207.1	HQ915345.1	<i>S. terdigitata</i>	EU880332.1	HQ915218.1	0.004*	0.007*	0.6*
<i>Taricha rivularis</i>	EU880334.1	AY650133.1	<i>T. torosa</i>	DQ196247.1	EF107340.1	0.161*	0.007*	21.9*
<i>Taricha rivularis</i>	EU880334.1		<i>T. sierrae</i>	DQ196282.1		0.167		
<i>Taricha sierrae</i>	DQ196282.1		<i>T. torosa</i>	DQ196247.1		0.123		

Table 2. Continued.

Species 1	Accession number		Species 2	Accession number		Genetic distance (HKY85 + Γ)		
	MT-CYB	RAG1		MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB	RAG1	MT-CYB/RAG1
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	NC 015788.1		<i>T. cristatus</i>	HQ697273.1		0.102		
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	NC 015788.1		<i>T. dobrogicus</i>	HQ697274.1		0.104		
<i>Triturus carnifex</i>	NC 015788.1		<i>T. macedonicus</i>	HQ697278.1		0.058		
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	HQ697273.1		<i>T. dobrogicus</i>	HQ697274.1		0.114		
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	HQ697273.1		<i>T. marmoratus</i>	HQ697279.1		0.263		
<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	HQ697273.1		<i>T. macedonicus</i>	HQ697278.1		0.115		
<i>Triturus marmoratus</i>	HQ697279.1		<i>T. pygmaeus</i>	HQ697280.1		0.048		

list of hybrids for salamanders and lizards was also pared down to make results comparable. For salamanders, the dataset was pared down to a single pair that can hybridize per genus; all genera are monophyletic. When a genus had multiple hybridizing species pairs, the pair with the greatest MT-CYB genetic distance was used. The list of hybrids for lizards was also pared down to the largest MT-CYB genetic distance per genus based on previously published work (Jančúchová-Lásková et al., 2015). MT-CYB genetic distances between the parental species for each hybridizing species pair were calculated for birds, mammals, and lizards using the same methods as for salamanders (Fig. 3, Table 2). For each of the tetrapod groups, a different Γ distribution shape parameter α was estimated using all MT-CYB sequences included in this study (46 birds, 50 mammals, and 40 lizards; Kumar et al., 2018). A Kruskal-Wallis test was then used to determine if the genetic distance across parental species that hybridize differs among the tetrapod groups. Effect size was calculated and reported in terms of η^2 .

In order to test how representative MT-CYB genetic distances are in describing the overall genetic divergence between species, the substitution rate of mitochondrial genes relative to the substitution rate of nuclear genes was compared across the four vertebrate clades (Fig. 4). This was accomplished by dividing the genetic distance of the mitochondrial gene MT-CYB by the genetic distance of the nuclear gene RAG1 for the parental species that hybridize (Table 2). RAG1 genetic distances between the parental species for each hybridizing species pair were calculated for birds, mammals, and lizards using the same methods as for salamanders. A Kruskal-Wallis test was used to determine if the ratio of MT-CYB/RAG1 genetic distances differed among the four tetrapod groups. A Kruskal-Wallis test was also used to determine if RAG1 genetic distance differed among the four tetrapod groups. Effect size was calculated for both tests and reported in terms of η^2 .

Relationship between sex chromosomes and hybridization in salamanders.—A list of the salamanders that have heteromorphic sex chromosomes was generated to see if the presence of heteromorphic sex chromosomes impacted hybridization. Salamanders with heteromorphic sex chromosomes were identified by using two published reviews and a recently published amphibian karyotype database (Hillis and Green, 1990; Evans et al., 2012; Perkins et al., 2019). In the available literature, it is not always apparent whether a salamander species is known to have homomorphic sex chromosomes or if the species was merely never confirmed as having heteromorphic sex chromosomes (Perkins et al., 2019). To further clarify, additional unpublished information on salamanders that are known to have homomorphic sex chromosomes was obtained (S. Sessions, pers. comm., 19 June 2019). MT-CYB genetic distances between parental species with heteromorphic sex chromosomes that hybridize were compared to the genetic distances between parental species with homomorphic sex chromosomes that hybridize using a t-test (Fig. 5). A comparison was also made between the overall percentage of salamanders known to hybridize and the percentage of salamanders with heteromorphic sex chromosomes known to hybridize using a one-sided exact test of goodness-of-fit. The overall results were similar whether the analyses were performed using only the species confirmed to have homomorphic sex chromosomes (based




Fig. 3. Cytochrome *b* (MT-CYB) genetic distances between parental species that hybridize in different tetrapod groups. Kruskal-Wallis H test showed no significant differences across the groups ($P = 0.661$). Salamanders are not hybridizing across greater genetic distances.

on personal communication) or using the larger dataset that assumed that all salamanders that have not been reported to have heteromorphic sex chromosomes have homomorphic sex chromosomes.

RESULTS

Hybrids in salamanders.—Our literature review found 81 pairs of genetically distinct salamander lineages that hybridize in nature (Table 1). These lineages represent 12.1% of named salamander species and seven out of ten salamander families (Fig. 1). The seven families represented include Plethodontidae (42 species), Salamandridae (29 species), Ambystomatidae (9 species), Hynobiidae (5 species), Cryptobranchidae (2 species), Dicamptodontidae (2 species), and Proteidae (2 species; Fig. 1). Many pairs that hybridize come from Plethodontidae and Salamandridae, consistent with these being the two largest families of salamanders (486 and 125 species, respectively; <https://amphibiaweb.org>). The third largest salamander family (Hynobiidae with 82 species) contains proportionally fewer hybrids with only three recorded pairs that can hybridize (Fig. 1). The families Amphiumidae, Rhyacotritonidae, and Sirenidae have no recorded cases of hybrids. These families of salamanders contain very few species with the largest of the three, Sirenidae, only containing five species. There is no case of

hybridization occurring between species of different genera. Overall, these results are consistent with those of another recently published study (Patton et al., 2020).

Intensity of research on different salamander families.—We identified a total of 32,499 papers published using the salamander family related terms. Out of the large salamander families, the family with the highest number of papers per species, Ambystomatidae, did not have the highest number of reported hybrids (Fig. 1). However, *Ambystoma mexicanum* is a contributor to the high papers-per-species count because it is a model lab animal and makes up a quarter (2,694) of the Web of Science results for Ambystomatidae (Fig. 1; Voss et al., 2010). Two of the families with the highest numbers of species have the lowest intensity of publication: Hynobiidae (21 papers per species) and Plethodontidae (13 papers per species). There are proportionally more papers published for families with fewer species: Amphiumidae (270 papers per species), Cryptobranchidae (252 papers per species), Proteidae (249.5 papers per species), Dicamptodontidae (107 papers per species), Sirenidae (79 papers per species), and Rhyacotritonidae (44 papers per species). There was no significant correlation between the number of papers per species and the number of salamanders found to hybridize per family (Kendall's rank correlation $P = 0.236$). We




Fig. 4. Genetic distance ratio of mitochondrial cytochrome *b* (MT-CYB) to nuclear recombination activating 1 (RAG1) for pairs of species that hybridize in major tetrapod clade on a log scale. Kruskal-Wallis H test showed no strong significant differences across the four groups ($P = 0.108$).




Fig. 5. Genetic distances between salamanders that hybridize with heteromorphic sex chromosomes (median = 0.109) and salamanders that hybridize without sex chromosomes (median = 0.152). There is no significant difference ($P = 0.5293$) between salamanders with sex chromosomes and salamanders without sex chromosomes.

acknowledge that studies of salamanders address far more biological questions than only those that are relevant to hybrid identification. Further analyses based on refined literature searches that target only the most pertinent disciplines (e.g., phylogeography, systematics) would provide a stronger test of the relationship between research effort and hybrid identification.

Salamander hybrid genetic distances.—For the 62 parental pairs of salamanders that have published MT-CYB sequence data, the mean genetic distance was 0.117 (Table 2). *Lissotriton vulgaris* X *Lissotriton helveticus* had the largest genetic distance of 0.360, while *Plethodon teyahalee* X *Plethodon shermani* had the smallest distance of 0.003 (Table 2). For the 33 parental pairs of salamanders that have published RAG1 data, the mean genetic distance was 0.00657 (range 0.000683 to 0.0306; Table 2). The genetic distance ratio of the mitochondrial gene MT-CYB over the nuclear gene RAG1 between salamanders that hybridize was highly variable (Fig. 2B). The ratio ranged from 0.6x to 162x with most species pairs having a higher mitochondrial genetic distance (median ratio = 21.1).

Genetic distances between parental species that hybridize in different tetrapod groups.—After paring down the salamanders and lizards to the pair that can hybridize with the highest genetic distance per genus, the across-tetrapod comparison included 23 pairs of hybrids for birds, 20 pairs for lizards, 25 pairs for mammals, and 18 pairs for salamanders (Table 2). The median MT-CYB genetic distances

for the groups were: lizards (0.181), birds (0.167), salamanders (0.160), and mammals (0.152; Fig. 3). There were no significant differences in distributions of genetic distance among the four groups ($\chi^2 = 1.5922$, $P = 0.66$, $\eta^2 = -0.0172$). Across all tetrapods, birds had both the lowest and highest genetic distances with *Regulus calendula* X *Regulus satrapa* (0.002) and *Gallus gallus* X *Alectura lathamii* (0.366). Using the pared down list of hybrids, RAG1 sequences were available for 12 pairs of hybrids for birds, 10 pairs for lizards, 10 pairs for mammals, and 13 pairs for salamanders (Table 2). The median RAG1 genetic distances for the four groups were: birds (0.0151), mammals (0.00722), salamanders (0.00651), and lizards (0.00600). There were no significant differences among the four tetrapod groups ($\chi^2 = 5.8748$, $P = 0.12$; $\eta^2 = 0.0701$). The median MT-CYB/RAG1 genetic distance ratio for the four groups were: lizards (23.4), salamanders (20.7), mammals (17.6), and birds (10.6; Fig. 4). There were no significant differences among the four tetrapod groups ($\chi^2 = 6.0734$, $P = 0.11$; $\eta^2 = 0.075$).

Relationship between sex chromosomes and hybridization in salamanders.—Forty-eight species of salamanders in seven families have been discovered with heteromorphic sex chromosomes (Ambystomatidae, Hynobiidae, Plethodontidae, Proteidae, Salamandridae, Sirenidae, and Proteidae; Table 3). Salamander families are not characterized by a single type of sex chromosome; different members of Salamandridae and Plethodontidae have ZZ/ZW and XX/XY systems. Out of the salamanders with known heteromorphic sex chromosomes, 12/48 are known to hybridize with a different species (Table 3). There is no difference between the percentage of salamanders that hybridize with known heteromorphic sex chromosomes and the known overall salamander hybridization rate ($P = 0.99$). Also, the genetic distances between parental salamanders that hybridize with known heteromorphic sex chromosomes (median = 0.109) and parental salamanders that hybridize with homomorphic sex chromosomes (median = 0.152) are not significantly different ($P = 0.53$; Fig. 5). Based on these analyses, there is no indication that the presence of heteromorphic sex chromosomes hinders hybridization in salamanders.

DISCUSSION

Overall, we found that hybridization is widespread throughout the salamander clade, occurring in both the biggest and smallest families (Fig. 1). The largest four families (Ambystomatidae, Hynobiidae, Plethodontidae, and Salamandridae) account for nearly 96% of all salamander species and account for over 91% of the hybrids (Fig. 1). With respect to geographic location, known hybrids are widespread in the Northern temperate zone, occurring in North America, Europe, and Asia. In contrast, there is only one reported case of salamanders hybridizing in the tropics, occurring between *Bolitoglossa franklini* and *B. lincolni* (Table 1). *Bolitoglossa* is the largest genus of salamanders (134 species), and it occurs exclusively in the tropics. More generally, close to half of all salamander diversity occurs in the tropics, suggesting that the low reported number of tropical hybrids is not a result of low tropical species diversity (<https://amphibiaweb.org>). If the low reported number of hybrids is an accurate reflection of the underlying biological reality, it

Table 3. Heteromorphic sex chromosomes in salamanders.

Species	Family	Sex chromosome type	Hybrid (Yes/No)
<i>Ambystoma jeffersonianum</i> ³	Ambystomatidae	ZW	No
<i>Ambystoma laterale</i> ^{1,2,3}	Ambystomatidae	ZW	No
<i>Ambystoma mexicanum</i> ^{1,2,3}	Ambystomatidae	ZW	Yes
<i>Ambystoma tigrinum</i> ^{1,2,3}	Ambystomatidae	ZW	Yes
<i>Hynobius hidamontanus</i> ^{1,3}	Hynobiidae	ZW	No
<i>Hynobius quelpaertensis</i> ^{1,3}	Hynobiidae	ZW	No
<i>Hynobius tokyoensis</i> ³	Hynobiidae	ZW	No
<i>Aneides ferreus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	ZW	No
<i>Bolitoglossa subpalmata</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Chiropoterotriton dimidiatus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	ZW	No
<i>Cryptotriton veraepacis</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Dendrotriton bromeliacus</i> ^{2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Dendrotriton cuchumatanus</i> ²	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Dendrotriton rabbi</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Dendrotriton xolocacae</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Hydromantes ambrosii</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	Yes
<i>Hydromantes flavus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Hydromantes imperialis</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Hydromantes italicus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	Yes
<i>Hydromantes genei</i> ³	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Hydromantes supramontis</i> ^{1,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Nototriton abscondens</i> ^{1,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Nototriton picadoi</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Nototriton richardi</i> ¹	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Oedipina cyclocauda</i> ¹	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Oedipina parvipes</i> ^{1,2}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Oedipina poelzi</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Oedipina pseudouniformis</i> ¹	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Oedipina uniformis</i> ^{2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Thorius dubitus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Thorius pennatulus</i> ^{2,3}	Plethodontidae	XY	No
<i>Necturus alabamensis</i> ³	Proteidae	XY	No
<i>Necturus beyeri</i> ^{1,2,3}	Proteidae	XY	No
<i>Necturus lewisi</i> ^{1,2,3}	Proteidae	XY	Yes
<i>Necturus maculosus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Proteidae	XY	Yes
<i>Necturus punctatus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Proteidae	XY	No
<i>Ichthyosaura alpestris</i> ³	Salamandridae	XY	No
<i>Lissotriton boscai</i> ³	Salamandridae	XY	No
<i>Lissotriton helveticus</i> ^{2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	Yes
<i>Lissotriton italicus</i> ^{2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	No
<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i> ^{2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	Yes
<i>Pleurodeles poireti</i> ^{1,2,3}	Salamandridae	ZW	Yes
<i>Pleurodeles waltl</i> ^{1,2,3}	Salamandridae	ZW	No
<i>Triturus carnifex</i> ^{2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	Yes
<i>Triturus cristatus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	Yes
<i>Triturus karelinii</i> ^{1,3}	Salamandridae	XY	No
<i>Triturus marmoratus</i> ^{1,2,3}	Salamandridae	XY	Yes
<i>Siren intermedia</i> ^{1,2}	Sirenidae	ZW	No

¹ Evans et al., 2012² Hillis and Green, 1990³ Perkins et al., 2019

may reflect general differences in mechanisms underlying the origin and maintenance of species in temperate versus tropical areas worthy of further investigation (Kozak and Wiens, 2010). However, low reported numbers of hybrids could also mean that additional cases have yet to be discovered and described. Additional research will allow discrimination between these two possibilities.

Both the mitochondrial genetic distances (estimated with MT-CYB) and the nuclear genetic distances (estimated with RAG1) between parental species of salamanders that hybridize spanned two orders of magnitude (0.003 to 0.360 and 0.0007 to 0.020, respectively). The ratio of genetic distances between these two genes provides an estimate of the difference in substitution rates of the two genomes. In

vertebrates, the mitochondrial genome typically has a higher substitution rate than the nuclear genome (Brown et al., 1979). However, this ratio is variable across genes and species in all of the major vertebrate clades including amphibians, where the majority of the estimates are from frogs (Allio et al., 2017). Our salamander estimates (0.6 to 162, median = 21.1) are consistent with existing estimates for other vertebrate taxa, suggesting similar relative evolutionary rates between the two genomes. Because the MT-CYB and RAG1 sequences used are short (345–1,141 bp and 556–1,510 bp, respectively) and represent single loci, some of the variation in genetic distance estimates reflects sampling error.

The ratio between mitochondrial and nuclear genetic distances can also be used to identify candidate examples where loci have introgressed from one parental species to another. In our dataset, potential cases of mitochondrial introgression would show a ratio much less than the median (i.e., <21.1). These potential cases include *Salamandrina perspicillata* X *Salamandrina terdigitata* (MT-CYB / RAG1 ratio = 0.6) and *Eurycea neotenes* X *Eurycea tridentifera* (MT-CYB / RAG1 ratio = 0.9; Table 2). In phylogeographic studies, hybridization between *Salamandrina perspicillata* and *S. terdigitata* was identified to have limited mitochondrial introgression (Mattoccia et al., 2011). Additional cline-based analysis of mitochondrial and nuclear introgression across the hybrid zones of salamanders with extreme mitochondrial/nuclear genetic distance ratios would be informative.

Within each tetrapod group, the genetic distance between parental species that hybridize is highly variable, but we found no significant differences in genetic distances among the groups. In addition, there were no significant differences in the ratio of mitochondrial to nuclear genetic distances among the groups. Taken together, these results suggest that speciating lineages of salamanders retain the ability to hybridize at similar overall genetic divergence levels as speciating lineages in other tetrapod groups. Thus, the differences in metabolic rates across tetrapods do not appear to translate into predictable patterns of overall genetic divergence and incompatible loci in hybrids. This pattern may reflect a similar evolved match between metabolic “supply and demand” (i.e., ATP use and ATP synthesis; Darveau et al., 2002) in all tetrapod clades, irrespective of overall metabolic rates, such that increased metabolic costs in hybrids have equal detrimental effects on fitness. Cline analyses of OXPHOS-specific loci, combined with OXPHOS functional data in parental species and hybrids, would allow more rigorous testing of this hypothesis.

The presence of heteromorphic sex chromosomes does not appear to deter salamanders from hybridizing (Fig. 3). This pattern suggests that, despite evolutionary lability in amphibian sex chromosomes (Hillis and Green, 1990; Evans et al., 2012; Sessions et al., 2016), the underlying genetic sex-determining factors might be sufficiently conserved to not be a barrier to reproduction. Consistent with this explanation, for some salamanders, the difference between the heteromorphic sex chromosomes is extremely small (Schartl et al., 2016; Keinath et al., 2018), showing that the selective pressures might be similar on each chromosome or that the region of suppressed recombination on the X or Z chromosomes is small (unlike in birds or mammals; Schartl et al., 2016). Additionally, evidence that cryptobranchid salamander homomorphic sex chromosomes have been conserved for nearly 60 million years (Hime et al., 2019) suggests that

the underlying genes for determining sex may be highly conserved. Finally, we note that the relationship between sex chromosome morphology and reproductive isolation is complex; in some cases, even homomorphic sex chromosomes show a large X/Z effect (e.g., *Hyla arborea* X *H. orientalis*, Dufresnes et al., 2016).

In conclusion, this comprehensive analysis of salamander hybrids revealed hybrids throughout the clade with a wide range of genetic divergences between parental species. Despite being outliers among tetrapods in metabolic rate and sex chromosome diversity, both of which were predicted to impact the relationship between genetic divergence and reproductive isolation, our analyses suggest that salamanders hybridize across similar levels of genetic divergence to the other examined tetrapod groups. This study further demonstrates the power of comparative studies of hybridization as an approach to understanding the process of speciation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the members of Scott Melander’s master’s thesis committee: D. Sloan, W. Black IV, and G. Ebel, as well as members of the Sloan and Mueller labs, for their time and advice as this research grew and developed into its final product. We thank S. Sessions for providing unpublished data and guidance. Colorado State University provided financial support.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alexandrino, J., S. J. E. Baird, L. Lawson, J. R. Macey, C. Moritz, and D. B. Wake. 2005. Strong selection against hybrids at a hybrid zone in the *Ensatina* ring species complex and its evolutionary implications. *Evolution* 59: 1334–1347.
- Allio, R., S. Donega, N. Galtier, and B. Nabholz. 2017. Large variation in the ratio of mitochondrial to nuclear mutation rate across animals: implications for genetic diversity and the use of mitochondrial DNA as a molecular marker. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 34:2762–2772.
- Anderson, D. M., and J. F. Gillooly. 2018. Comparing the temperature dependence of mitochondrial respiration among vertebrates. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 19: 659–668.
- Arnold, M. L. 1997. *Natural Hybridization and Evolution*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Arntzen, J. W., R. Jehle, F. Bardakci, T. Burke, and G. P. Wallis. 2009. Asymmetric viability of reciprocal-cross hybrids between crested and marbled newts (*Triturus cristatus* and *T. marmoratus*). *Evolution* 63:1191–1202.
- Arntzen, J. W., B. Wielstra, and G. P. Wallis. 2014. The modality of nine *Triturus* newt hybrid zones assessed with nuclear, mitochondrial and morphological data: modality of hybrid zones. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 113:604–622.
- Babik, W., W. Branicki, J. Crnobrnja-Isailović, D. Cogălniceanu, I. Sas, K. Olgun, N. A. Poyarkov, M. Garcia-Paris, and J. W. Arntzen. 2005. Phylogeography of two European newt species—discordance between mtDNA and morphology. *Molecular Ecology* 14:2475–2491.
- Barreto, F. S., and R. S. Burton. 2013. Elevated oxidative damage is correlated with reduced fitness in interpopulation hybrids of a marine copepod. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 280:20131521.

- Barton, N. H., and G. M. Hewitt. 1985. Analysis of hybrid zones. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 16:113–148.
- Bateson, W. 1909. Heredity and variation in modern lights, p. 85–101. *In: Darwin and Modern Science*. A. C. Seward (ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Blair, W. F. 1972. *Evolution in the Genus Bufo*. University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.
- Bonett, R. M. 2002. Analysis of the contact zone between the dusky salamanders *Desmognathus fuscus fuscus* and *Desmognathus fuscus conanti* (Caudata: Plethodontidae). *Copeia* 2002:344–355.
- Borowiec, B. G., K. D. Crans, F. Khajali, N. A. Pranckevicius, A. Young, and G. R. Scott. 2016. Interspecific and environment-induced variation in hypoxia tolerance in sunfish. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology* 198:59–71.
- Brandon, R. A. 1977. Interspecific hybridization among Mexican and United States salamanders of the genus *Ambystoma* under laboratory conditions. *Herpetologica* 33:133–152.
- Brown, W. M., M. George, and A. C. Wilson. 1979. Rapid evolution of animal mitochondrial DNA. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 76:1967–1971.
- Canestrelli, D., R. Bisconti, and G. Nascetti. 2014. Extensive unidirectional introgression between two salamander lineages of ancient divergence and its evolutionary implications. *Scientific Reports* 4:1–7.
- Charlesworth, D., B. Charlesworth, and G. Marais. 2005. Steps in the evolution of heteromorphic sex chromosomes. *Heredity* 95:118–128.
- Chatfield, M. W. H., K. H. Kozak, B. M. Fitzpatrick, and P. K. Tucker. 2010. Patterns of differential introgression in a salamander hybrid zone: inferences from genetic data and ecological niche modelling: differential introgression in a salamander hybrid zone. *Molecular Ecology* 19:4265–4282.
- Chiari, Y., A. van der Meijden, O. Madsen, M. Vences, and A. Meyer. 2009. Base composition, selection, and phylogenetic significance of indels in the recombination activating gene-1 in vertebrates. *Frontiers in Zoology* 6:32.
- Cortés-Ortiz, L., M. D. Nidiffer, J. Hermida-Lagunes, F. García-Orduña, A. Rangel-Negrín, D. M. Kitchen, T. J. Bergman, P. A. D. Dias, and D. Canales-Espinosa. 2019. Reduced introgression of sex chromosome markers in the Mexican howler monkey (*Alouatta palliata* × *A. pigra*) hybrid zone. *International Journal of Primatology* 40:114–131.
- Darveau, C.-A., R. K. Suarez, R. D. Andrews, and P. W. Hochachka. 2002. Allometric cascade as a unifying principle of body mass effects on metabolism. *Nature* 417:166–170.
- Dawley, E. M. 1987. Species discrimination between hybridizing and non-hybridizing terrestrial salamanders. *Copeia* 1987:924–931.
- De Queiroz, K. 1998. The general lineage concept of species, species criteria, and the process of speciation, p. 57–75. *In: Endless Forms: Species and Speciation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Devitt, T. J., S. J. Baird, and C. Moritz. 2011. Asymmetric reproductive isolation between terminal forms of the salamander ring species *Ensatina eschscholtzii* revealed by fine-scale genetic analysis of a hybrid zone. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 11:245.
- Dobzhansky, T. 1937. *Genetics and the Origin of Species*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Dufresnes, C., T. Majtyka, S. J. E. Baird, J. F. Gerchen, A. Borzée, R. Savary, M. Ogielska, N. Perrin, and M. Stöck. 2016. Empirical evidence for large X-effects in animals with undifferentiated sex chromosomes. *Scientific Reports* 6:21029.
- Duncan, R., and R. Highton. 1979. Genetic relationships of the eastern large *Plethodon* of the Ouachita Mountains. *Copeia* 1979:95–110.
- Eggert, C. 2004. Sex determination: the amphibian models. *Reproduction Nutrition Development* 44:539–549.
- Ellison, C. K., and R. S. Burton. 2008. Interpopulation hybrid breakdown maps to the mitochondrial genome. *Evolution* 62:631–638.
- Escoriza, D., J. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, J. Ben Hassine, and I. Martínez-Solano. 2016. Genetic assessment of the threatened microendemic *Pleurodeles poireti* (Caudata, Salamandridae), with molecular evidence for hybridization with *Pleurodeles nebulosus*. *Conservation Genetics* 17:1445–1458.
- Evans, B. J., R. A. Pyron, and J. J. Wiens. 2012. Polyploidization and sex chromosome evolution in amphibians, p. 385–410. *In: Polyploidy and Genome Evolution*. P. S. Soltis and D. E. Soltis (eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Ficetola, G. F., E. Lunghi, R. Cimmaruta, and R. Manenti. 2019. Transgressive niche across a salamander hybrid zone revealed by microhabitat analyses. *Journal of Biogeography* 46:1342–1354.
- Fitzpatrick, B. M. 2004. Rates of evolution of hybrid inviability in birds and mammals. *Evolution* 58:1865–1870.
- Fitzpatrick, B. M., J. R. Johnson, D. K. Kump, H. B. Shaffer, J. J. Smith, and S. R. Voss. 2009. Rapid fixation of non-native alleles revealed by genome-wide SNP analysis of hybrid tiger salamanders. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9:176.
- Fitzpatrick, B. M., and H. B. Shaffer. 2004. Environment-dependent admixture dynamics in a tiger salamander hybrid zone. *Evolution* 58:1282–1293.
- Fukumoto, S., A. Ushimaru, and T. Minamoto. 2015. A basin-scale application of environmental DNA assessment for rare endemic species and closely related exotic species in rivers: a case study of giant salamanders in Japan. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 52:358–365.
- García-París, M., M. Alcobendas, D. Buckley, and D. B. Wake. 2003. Dispersal of viviparity across contact zones in Iberian populations of fire salamanders (*Salamandra*) inferred from discordance of genetic and morphological traits. *Evolution* 57:129–143.
- Glatten, R. J., K. J. Miller, and R. J. Full. 1992. Energetics at rest and during locomotion, p. 314–377. *In: Environmental Physiology of the Amphibians*. M. E. Feder (ed.). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Good, D. A. 1989. Hybridization and cryptic species in *Dicamptodon* (Caudata: *Dicamptodontidae*). *Evolution* 43:728–744.
- Guttman, S. I., and A. A. Karlin. 1986. Hybridization of cryptic species of two-lined salamanders (*Eurycea bislineata* complex). *Copeia* 1986:96–108.

- Gvoždík, L. 2012. Metabolic costs of hybridization in newts. *Folia Zoologica* 61:197–201.
- Hairston, N. G., R. H. Wiley, C. K. Smith, and K. A. Kneidel. 1992. The dynamics of two hybrid zones in Appalachian salamanders of the genus *Plethodon*. *Evolution* 46:930–938.
- Harrison, R. G., and E. L. Larson. 2016. Heterogeneous genome divergence, differential introgression, and the origin and structure of hybrid zones. *Molecular Ecology* 25:2454–2466.
- Hasegawa, M., H. Kishino, and T. Yano. 1985. Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular clock of mitochondrial DNA. *Journal of Molecular Evolution* 22:160–174.
- Hauswaldt, J. S., C. Angelini, A. Pollok, and S. Steinfartz. 2011. Hybridization of two ancient salamander lineages: molecular evidence for endemic spectacled salamanders on the Apennine Peninsula: hybridization in *Salamandrina*. *Journal of Zoology* 284:248–256.
- Highton, R. 1997. Geographic protein variation and speciation in the *Plethodon dorsalis* complex. *Herpetologica* 53:345–356.
- Highton, R. 1998. Is *Ensatina eschscholtzii* a ring-species? *Herpetologica* 54:254–278.
- Highton, R. 1999. Hybridization in the contact zone between *Plethodon richmondi* and *Plethodon electromorphus* in northern Kentucky. *Herpetologica* 55:91–105.
- Highton, R. 2009. Microgeographic protein morphological variation in the woodland salamanders *Plethodon hoffmani* and *Plethodon virginia*, and hybridization between the two species, p. 59–100. *In*: A Lifetime of Contributions to Myriapodology and the Natural History of Virginia: A Festschrift in Honor of Richard L. Hoffman's 80th Birthday. S. M. Roble and J. C. Mitchell (eds.). Virginia Museum of Natural History, Martinsville, Virginia.
- Highton, R., and R. B. Peabody. 2000. Geographic protein variation and speciation in salamanders of the *Plethodon jordani* and *Plethodon glutinosus* complexes in the Southern Appalachian Mountains with the description of four new species, p. 31–93. *In*: Biology of Plethodontid Salamanders. R. C. Bruce, R. G. Jaeger, and L. D. Houck (eds.). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
- Hill, G. E., J. C. Havird, D. B. Sloan, R. S. Burton, C. Greening, and D. K. Dowling. 2019. Assessing the fitness consequences of mitonuclear interactions in natural populations. *Biological Reviews* 94:1089–1104.
- Hillis, D. M., and D. M. Green. 1990. Evolutionary changes of heterogametic sex in the phylogenetic history of amphibians. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 3:49–64.
- Hime, P. M., J. T. Briggler, J. S. Reece, and D. W. Weisrock. 2019. Genomic data reveal conserved female heterogamety in giant salamanders with gigantic nuclear genomes. *Genes Genomes Genetics* 9:3467–3476.
- Hooper, D. M., S. C. Griffith, and T. D. Price. 2019. Sex chromosome inversions enforce reproductive isolation across an avian hybrid zone. *Molecular Ecology* 28:1246–1262.
- Janáčková-Lásková, J., E. Landová, and D. Frynta. 2015. Are genetically distinct lizard species able to hybridize? A review. *Current Zoology* 61:155–180.
- Janoušek, V., J. Fischerová, L. Mořkovský, J. Reif, M. Antczak, T. Albrecht, and R. Reifová. 2019. Postcopulatory sexual selection reduces Z-linked genetic variation and might contribute to the large Z effect in passerine birds. *Heredity* 122:622–635.
- Jockusch, E. L., and D. B. Wake. 2002. Falling apart and merging: diversification of slender salamanders (Plethodontidae: *Batrachoseps*) in the American West. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 76:361–391.
- Johanet, A., J. Secondi, and C. Lemaire. 2011. Widespread introgression does not leak into allotopy in a broad sympatric zone. *Heredity* 106:962–972.
- Johannesen, J., B. Johannesen, E. M. Griebeler, I. Baran, M. R. Tunc, A. Kiefer, and M. Veith. 2006. Distortion of symmetrical introgression in a hybrid zone: evidence for locus-specific selection and uni-directional range expansion. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 19:705–716.
- Johns, G. C., and J. C. Avise. 1998. A comparative summary of genetic distances in the vertebrates from the mitochondrial cytochrome b gene. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 15:1481–1490.
- Johnson, B. B., T. A. White, C. A. Phillips, and K. R. Zamudio. 2015. Asymmetric introgression in a spotted salamander hybrid zone. *Journal of Heredity* 106:608–617.
- Johnson, N. A., and J. Lachance. 2012. The genetics of sex chromosomes: evolution and implications for hybrid incompatibility. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1256:E1–E22.
- Kawamura, T. 1953. Studies on hybridization in amphibians. V. Physiological isolation among four *Hynobius* species. *Journal of Science of the Hiroshima University* 14:73–116.
- Keinath, M. C., N. Timoshevskaya, V. A. Timoshevskiy, S. R. Voss, and J. J. Smith. 2018. Miniscule differences between sex chromosomes in the giant genome of a salamander. *Scientific Reports* 8:17882.
- Kozak, K. H. 2003. Sexual isolation and courtship behavior in salamanders of the *Eurycea bislineata* species complex, with comments on the evolution of the mental gland and pheromone delivery behavior in the Plethodontidae. *Southeastern Naturalist* 2:281–292.
- Kozak, K. H., and R. R. Montanucci. 2001. Genetic variation across a contact zone between montane and lowland forms of the two-lined salamander (*Eurycea bislineata*) species complex: a test of species limits. *Copeia* 2001:25–34.
- Kozak, K. H., and J. J. Wiens. 2010. Accelerated rates of climatic-niche evolution underlie rapid species diversification. *Ecology Letters* 13:1378–1389.
- Kuchta, S. R. 2007. Contact zones and species limits: hybridization between lineages of the California newt, *Taricha torosa*, in the Southern Sierra Nevada. *Herpetologica* 63:332–350.
- Kuchta, S. R., A. D. Brown, P. E. Converse, and R. Highton. 2016. Multilocus phylogeography and species delimitation in the Cumberland plateau salamander, *Plethodon kentucki*: incongruence among data sets and methods. *PLoS ONE* 11: e0150022.
- Kuchta, S. R., and D. B. Wake. 2016. Wherefore and whither the ring species? *Copeia* 104:189–201.
- Kumar, S., G. Stecher, M. Li, C. Knyaz, and K. Tamura. 2018. MEGA X: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis across computing platforms. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 35:1547–1549.
- Lavretsky, P., J. M. Dacosta, B. E. Hernández-Baños, A. Engilis, M. D. Sorenson, and J. L. Peters. 2015. Speciation

- genomics and a role for the Z chromosome in the early stages of divergence between Mexican ducks and mallards. *Molecular Ecology* 24:5364–5378.
- Lee-Yaw, J. A., C. G. C. Jacobs, and D. E. Irwin. 2014. Individual performance in relation to cytonuclear discordance in a northern contact zone between long-toed salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum*) lineages. *Molecular Ecology* 23:4590–4602.
- Lehtinen, R. M., A. F. Steratore, M. M. Eyre, E. S. Cassagnol, M. L. Stern, and H. A. Edgington. 2016. Identification of widespread hybridization between two terrestrial salamanders using morphology, coloration, and molecular markers. *Copeia* 104:132–139.
- Lima, T. G. 2014. Higher levels of sex chromosome heteromorphism are associated with markedly stronger reproductive isolation. *Nature Communications* 5:4743.
- Lunghi, E., O. Guillaume, P. Blaimont, and R. Manenti. 2018. The first ecological study on the oldest allochthonous population of European cave salamanders (*Hydromantes* sp.). *Amphibia-Reptilia* 39:113–119.
- Malone, J. H., and B. E. Fontenot. 2008. Patterns of reproductive isolation in toads. *PLoS ONE* 3:e3900.
- Malyarchuk, B. A., M. V. Derenko, and G. A. Denisova. 2015. Phylogenetic relationships among Asiatic salamanders of the genus *Salamandrella* based on variability of nuclear genes. *Russian Journal of Genetics* 51:91–97.
- Mattoccia, M., S. Marta, A. Romano, and V. Sbordoni. 2011. Phylogeography of an Italian endemic salamander (genus *Salamandrina*): glacial refugia, postglacial expansions, and secondary contact. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 104:903–992.
- McFarlane, S. E., P. M. Sirkiä, M. Ålund, and A. Qvarnström. 2016. Hybrid dysfunction expressed as elevated metabolic rate in male *Ficedula* flycatchers. *PLoS ONE* 11:e0161547.
- Mead, L. S., and S. G. Tilley. 2000. Ethological isolation and variation in allozymes and dorsolateral pattern between parapatric forms in the *Desmognathus ochrophaeus* complex, p. 181–198. *In: Biology of Plethodontid Salamanders*. R. C. Bruce, R. G. Jaeger, and L. D. Houck (eds.). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
- Muller, H. J. 1942. Isolating mechanisms, evolution, and temperature. *Biology Symposium* 6:71–125.
- Nadachowska, K., and W. Babik. 2009. Divergence in the face of gene flow: the case of two newts (Amphibia: *Salamandridae*). *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 26:829–841.
- Nelson, S. K., M. L. Niemiller, and B. M. Fitzpatrick. 2017. Co-occurrence and hybridization between *Necturus maculosus* and a heretofore unknown *Necturus* in the Southern Appalachians. *Journal of Herpetology* 51:559–566.
- Olson, J. R., S. J. Cooper, D. L. Swanson, M. J. Braun, and J. B. Williams. 2010. The relationship of metabolic performance and distribution in black-capped and Carolina chickadees. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* 83:263–275.
- Orr, H. A. 1996. Dobzhansky, Bateson, and the genetics of speciation. *Genetics* 144:1331–1335.
- Patton, A. H., M. J. Margres, B. Epstein, J. Eastman, L. J. Harmon, and A. Storfer. 2020. Hybridizing salamanders experience accelerated diversification. *Scientific Reports* 10:6566.
- Pereira, R. J., and D. B. Wake. 2009. Genetic leakage after adaptive and nonadaptive divergence in the *Ensatina eschscholtzii* ring species. *Evolution* 63:2288–2301.
- Perkins, R. D., J. R. Gamboa, M. M. Jonika, J. Lo, A. Shum, R. H. Adams, and H. Blackmon. 2019. A database of amphibian karyotypes. *Chromosome Research* 27:313–319.
- Pough, F. H. 1980. The advantages of ectothermy for tetrapods. *The American Naturalist* 115:92–112.
- Presgraves, D. C. 2008. Sex chromosomes and speciation in *Drosophila*. *Trends in Genetics* 24:336–343.
- Prokić, M. D., S. G. Despotović, T. Z. Vučić, T. G. Petrović, J. P. Gavrić, B. R. Gavrilović, T. B. Radovanović, and Z. S. Saičić. 2018. Oxidative cost of interspecific hybridization: a case study of two *Triturus* species and their hybrids. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 221:jeb182055.
- Pyron, A. R., and J. J. Wiens. 2011. A large-scale phylogeny of Amphibia including over 2800 species, and a revised classification of extant frogs, salamanders, and caecilians. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 61:543–583.
- Qvarnström, A., M. Ålund, S. E. McFarlane, and P. M. Sirkiä. 2016. Climate adaptation and speciation: particular focus on reproductive barriers in *Ficedula* flycatchers. *Evolutionary Applications* 9:119–134.
- Reilly, S. B., and D. B. Wake. 2019. Taxonomic revision of black salamanders of the *Aneides flavipunctatus* complex (Caudata: Plethodontidae). *PeerJ* 7:e7370.
- Riley, S. P. D., H. B. Shaffer, S. R. Voss, and B. M. Fitzpatrick. 2003. Hybridization between a rare, native tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) and its introduced congener. *Ecological Applications* 13:1263–1275.
- Schartl, M., M. Schmid, and I. Nanda. 2016. Dynamics of vertebrate sex chromosome evolution: from equal size to giants and dwarfs. *Chromosoma* 125:553–571.
- Sequeira, F., J. Alexandrino, S. Rocha, J. W. Arntzen, and N. Ferrand. 2005. Genetic exchange across a hybrid zone within the Iberian endemic golden-striped salamander, *Chioglossa lusitanica*. *Molecular Ecology* 14:245–254.
- Sessions, S. K., L. Bizjak Mali, D. M. Green, V. Trifonov, and M. Ferguson-Smith. 2016. Evidence for sex chromosome turnover in proteid salamanders. *Cytogenetic and Genome Research* 148:305–313.
- Sharbel, T. F., J. Bonin, L. A. Lowcock, and D. M. Green. 1995. Partial genetic compatibility and unidirectional hybridization in syntopic populations of the salamanders *Desmognathus fuscus* and *D. ochrophaeus*. *Copeia* 1995:466–469.
- Shepard, D. B., K. J. Irwin, F. T. Burbrink, and M. Freake. 2011. Morphological differentiation in Ouachita Mountain endemic salamanders. *Herpetologica* 67:355–368.
- Sloan, D. B., J. C. Havird, and J. Sharbrough. 2017. The on-again, off-again relationship between mitochondrial genomes and species boundaries. *Molecular Ecology* 26:2212–2236.
- Soltani, G. G., D. Bénon, N. Alvarez, and C. J. Praz. 2017. When different contact zones tell different stories: putative ring species in the *Megachile concinna* species complex (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 121:815–832.
- Sweet, S. S. 1984. Secondary contact and hybridization in the Texas cave salamanders *Eurycea neotenes* and *E. tridentifera*. *Copeia* 1984:428–441.

- Swofford, D. L. 2002. PAUP*: phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (*and other methods), Version 4.0b10. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Takahashi, M. K., Y. Y. Takahashi, and M. J. Parris. 2011. Rapid change in life-cycle polyphenism across a subspecies boundary of the eastern newt, *Notophthalmus viridescens*. *Journal of Herpetology* 45:379–384.
- Tilley, S. G. 1988. Hybridization between two species of *Desmognathus* (Amphibia: Caudata: Plethodontidae) in the Great Smoky Mountains. *Herpetological Monographs* 2: 27–39.
- Tominaga, A., M. Matsui, N. Yoshikawa, K. Eto, and K. Nishikawa. 2018. Genomic displacement and shift of the hybrid zone in the Japanese fire-bellied newt. *Journal of Heredity* 109:232–242.
- Toro, J. E., R. J. Thompson, and D. J. Innes. 2002. Reproductive isolation and reproductive output in two sympatric mussel species (*Mytilus edulis*, *M. trossulus*) and their hybrids from Newfoundland. *Marine Biology* 141: 897–909.
- Twitty, V. 1963. Fertility of *Taricha* species-hybrids + viability of their offspring. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 51:156–161.
- van Riemsdijk, I., L. van Nieuwenhuize, I. Martínez-Solano, J. W. Arntzen, and B. Wielstra. 2018. Molecular data reveal the hybrid nature of an introduced population of banded newts (*Ommatotriton*) in Spain. *Conservation Genetics* 19:249–254.
- Ventura, A., C. Ciofi, C. Natali, and M. Mattoccia. 2015. Development of microsatellites for the genus *Salamandrina*: a tool to discriminate between northern and southern spectacled salamanders (*Salamandrina perspicillata* and *Salamandrina terdigitata*) and their hybrids. *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology* 63:170–173.
- Visser, M., M. de Leeuw, A. Zuiderwijk, and J. W. Arntzen. 2017. Stabilization of a salamander moving hybrid zone. *Ecology and Evolution* 7:689–696.
- Voss, S. R., H. H. Epperlein, and E. M. Tanaka. 2010. *Ambystoma mexicanum*, the axolotl: a versatile amphibian model for regeneration, development, and evolution studies. *Emerging Model Organisms*. Cold Spring Harbor Protocols 2009:pdb.emo128.
- Vučić, T., T. D. Vukov, N. T. Kolarov, M. Cvijanović, and A. Ivanović. 2018. The study of larval tail morphology reveals differentiation between two *Triturus* species and their hybrids. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 39:87–97.
- Wake, D. B., S. Y. Yang, and T. J. Papenfuss. 1980. Natural hybridization and its evolutionary implications in Guatemalan plethodontid salamanders of the genus *Bolitoglossa*. *Herpetologica* 36:335–345.
- White, C. R., N. F. Phillips, and R. S. Seymour. 2006. The scaling and temperature dependence of vertebrate metabolism. *Biology Letters* 2:125–127.
- Woodcock, M. R., J. Vaughn-Wolfe, A. Elias, D. K. Kump, K. D. Kendall, N. Timoshevskaya, V. Timoshevskiy, D. W. Perry, J. J. Smith, J. E. Spiewak, D. M. Parichy, and S. R. Voss. 2017. Identification of mutant genes and introgressed tiger salamander DNA in the laboratory axolotl, *Ambystoma mexicanum*. *Scientific Reports* 7:6.
- Yoshikawa, N., M. Matsui, and K. Nishikawa. 2012. Genetic structure and cryptic diversity of *Onychodactylus japonicus* (Amphibia, Caudata, Hynobiidae) in Northeastern Honshu, Japan, as revealed by allozymic analysis. *Zoological Science* 29:229–237.
- Yoshikawa, N., M. Matsui, K. Nishikawa, Y. Misawa, and S. Tanabe. 2010. Allozymic variation in the Japanese clawed salamander, *Onychodactylus japonicus* (Amphibia: Caudata: Hynobiidae), with special reference to the presence of two sympatric genetic types. *Zoological Science* 27:33–40.
- Zieliński, P., K. Nadachowska-Brzyska, B. Wielstra, R. Szkotak, S. D. Covaciu-Marcov, D. Cogălniceanu, and W. Babik. 2013. No evidence for nuclear introgression despite complete mtDNA replacement in the Carpathian newt (*Lissotriton montandoni*). *Molecular Ecology* 22:1884–1903.