www.cambridge.org/wsc

Research Article

Cite this article: Shen J, Wang Z, Su Y, Wang T (2021) Associations between population epigenetic differentiation and environmental factors in the exotic weed mile-a-minute (*Mikania micrantha*). Weed Sci. **69**: 307–332. doi: 10.1017/wsc.2021.13

Received: 15 September 2020 Revised: 2 February 2021 Accepted: 6 February 2021 First published online: 15 February 2021

Associate Editor:

William Vencill, University of Georgia

Keywords:

Epigenetic variation; epigenetic differentiation; environmental factors; MSAP

Authors for correspondence:

Yingjuan Su, School of Life Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China (Email: suyj@mail.sysu.edu.cn); Ting Wang, College of Life Sciences, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou 510642, China (Email: tingwang@scau.edu.cn).

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Weed Science Society of America.



Associations between population epigenetic differentiation and environmental factors in the exotic weed mile-a-minute (*Mikania micrantha*)

Jin Shen¹, Zhen Wang¹, Yingjuan Su² and Ting Wang³

¹Graduate Student, School of Life Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China; ²Professor, School of Life Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China; Research Institute of Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, China and ³Professor, College of Life Sciences, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou 510642, China

Abstract

Invasive species face new selective pressures and low genetic variation caused by genetic bottlenecks and founder effects when they are introduced into novel environments. Epigenetic variation may help them to cope with these problems. Mile-a-minute (*Mikania micrantha* Kunth) is a highly invasive exotic weed that has seriously damaged biodiversity and agricultural ecosystems. We first adopted methylation-sensitive amplified polymorphism (MSAP) markers to investigate epigenetic variation of 21 *M. micrantha* populations in southern China, and further explored the effects of environmental factors on population epigenetic differentiation by correlating epigenetic and climate and soil data. Adaptive epiloci positively correlated with climate/ soil variables were identified. Minimum temperature of the coldest month and mean temperature of the coldest quarter were considered as decisive factors for its distribution. Climate is presumed to play a relatively more important role than soil in shaping the adaptive epigenetic differentiation in *M. micrantha*. Under ongoing global warming, populations of *M. micrantha* are predicted to expand northward. In addition, the weed also presented higher epigenetic variation compared with genetic variation. Leaf shape variation was detected related to methylation-state change at the population level.

Introduction

How species can become invasive is a core issue in invasive biology. Invasive species usually face new selective pressures when they are initially introduced into novel environments. How to deal with these pressures directly determines their fate (Matesanz et al. 2010). Generally, invasive species are expected to have low genetic variation, due to genetic bottle-necks and founder effects (Dlugosch and Parker 2008), which may not be enough to support their survival (Crawford and Whitney 2010). However, they are still able to successfully colonize new habitats and defeat native species. Epigenetic variation may play a critical role in this process and may facilitate invasive species' rapid response to environmental stress (Ni et al. 2018).

Revealing populations' epigenetic variation has attracted increasing attention from invasive biologists. Independent from genetic control, epigenetic modifications can be directly induced by environmental stimuli and are reflected in phenotypic changes through modulation of gene expression without changing the underlying DNA sequences (Ni et al. 2018; Richards et al. 2017; Shi et al. 2019). As an additional, accelerated pathway to evolutionary change (Bossdorf et al. 2008), epigenetic modifications of various types, such as DNA methylation, modifications on histones and other chromosomal proteins, and the generation of extrachromosomal regulatory small RNAs and noncoding RNAs, have been widely described in eukaryotes (Ni et al. 2018; Richards et al. 2017). Among these, DNA methylation is regarded as the most common type of epigenetic variation and has been intensively studied for eukaryotes. DNA methylation is referred to as the addition of a methyl group to cytosine to form 5-methylcytosine. It has been shown to function in multiple biological processes, including hindering transcription initiation, restraining transcription elongation, silencing transposons, inactivating the X chromosome, and shaping phenotypic variation (Akimoto et al. 2007; Jones 2012; Ni et al. 2018). For plants, cytosine methylation is maintained by methyltransferase, chromomethylase, or an RNA-dependent DNA methylation pathway; it tends to position in symmetric (CG, CHG) and asymmetric (CHH) contexts (H = A, C, or T) and mainly distribute in transposons and repeat regions (Henderson and Jacobsen 2007). In non-model plants, the global DNA methylation state can be screened in natural populations using methylation-sensitive amplified polymorphism (MSAP) markers (Angers et al. 2010), a restriction enzyme-based modified amplified fragment-length

ID	Population ^a	No. of samples	Longitude	Latitude	Altitude
1	DG2	15	113.800°E	22.879°N	48
2	DG3	15	113.768°E	22.905°N	182
3	DG4	15	113.793°E	22.854°N	113
4	HK1	15	114.043°E	22.489°N	4
5	HK3	15	114.234°E	22.391°N	80
6	HK4	15	114.261°E	22.527°N	4
7	HK5	10	114.153°E	22.397°N	227
8	HK6	15	114.197°E	22.257°N	100
9	HK7	11	114.142°E	22.451°N	39
10	HK8	10	114.134°E	22.387°N	48
11	MA1	15	113.556°E	22.140°N	10
12	MA4	16	113.563°E	22.122°N	135
13	NLD2	15	113.817°E	22.409°N	48
14	NLD3	16	113.804°E	22.404°N	11
15	NLD5	15	113.800°E	22.420°N	2
16	NLD6	16	113.811°E	22.415°N	24
17	SZ1	16	114.058°E	22.554°N	47
18	SZ4	15	114.037°E	22.574°N	39
19	SZ5	15	114.170°E	22.580°N	85
20	ZH1	15	113.631°E	22.428°N	6
21	ZH2	16	113.678°E	22.414°N	13

Table 1. Sampling information of Mikania micrantha populations.

^aDG, Dongguan; HK, Hong Kong; MA, Macao; NLD, Nei Lingding Island; SZ, Shenzhen; ZH, Zhuhai.



Figure 1. Sampling map of 21 Mikania micrantha populations in southern China. See Table 1 for population codes.

polymorphism (AFLP) technique. In addition, the MSAP technique can also provide a quick glance for potential effects of environmental factors on population epigenetic differentiation.

In a heterogeneous environment, climate may exhibit high spatial variation that acts as an important abiotic factor to promote

https://doi.org/10.1017/wsc.2021.13 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adaptive evolution of plants (Abdala-Roberts and Marquis 2007; Savolainen et al. 2007). Climate not only profoundly influences seed germination, productivity, and distribution of plants, but also controls other critical variables like the length of a wet or dry season (Concilio et al. 2009; Poncet et al. 2010). Correlations between

Table 2. Information for adopted adapters and primers used in this study.

Primers	Sequences
Adapters	
EcoRI–adapter top	5'-CTCGTAGACTGCGTACC-3'
EcoRI-adapter bottom	5'-AATTGGTACGCAGTCTAC-3'
Hpall/Mspl-adapter top	5'-GATCATGAGTCCTGCT-3'
Hpall/Mspl -adapter bottom	5'-CGAGCAGGACTCATGA-3'
Pre-PCR primers	
EcoRI + CA	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCA-3'
Hpall/Mspl	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGG-3'
Selective PCR primers	
EcoRI + AG (E2)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCAAG-3'
EcoRI + CG (E3)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCACG-3'
EcoRI + CT (E4)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCACT-3'
EcoRI + CC (E5)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCACC-3'
EcoRI + GC (E7)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCAGC-3'
EcoRI + GG (E8)	5'-GACTGCGTACCAATTCAGG-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TAA (H/M1)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTAA-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TCC (H/M2)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTCC-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TTC (H/M3)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTTC-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TAG (H/M6)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTAG-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TTG (H/M7)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTTG-3'
Hpall/Mspl + TCA (H/M8)	5'-ATCATGAGTCCTGCTCGGTCA-3'

climatic factors and epi-adaptive evolution have been found in a number of plants. For instance, an adaptive epigenetic memory of the local temperature prevailing during zygotic embryogenesis and seed maturation has been observed in the progeny of Norway spruce [*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.] (Yakovlev et al. 2011). Associations between DNA methylation variation and climate variables were also detected in Arabidopsis thaliana: CHH methylation was found to increase with temperature and concentrate in transposable elements, whereas CG methylation showed a correlation with the latitude of origin and primarily occurred on genic regions (Dubin et al. 2015; Keller et al. 2016). These findings underscore the contribution of epigenetic variation to local adaptation. Currently, rapid climatic change is exerting new selection pressure on plants, which will eventually affect their adaptability (Corre and Kremer 2012; Eveno et al. 2008; Jump et al. 2006). For invasive species, investigating the contribution rate of climatic factors to epi-adaptation may provide better understanding of the mechanisms underlying response to climate change and improve the prediction for expansion speed and area.

Soil is another crucial factor associated with plant adaptive evolution (Hancock et al. 2011). It provides essential nutrients for plants, including water, mineral matter, organic matter, and metal elements. Any subtle change in soil metal content has the potential to drive local adaptation of plants (Alberto et al. 2010). Because changes in soil compositions have a strong impact on biochemical and physiological processes of plants, they are frequently posited to be an important driver of divergent selection (Lechowicz and Bell 1991; Macel et al. 2007). Soil factor-driven population-level genetic differentiation and adaptive loci associated with soil properties and metal content have been found in plants such as [Arabidopsis halleri (L.) O'Kane & Al-Shehbaz] (Meyer et al. 2009), common gum cistus (Cistus ladanifer L.) (Quintela-Sabarís et al. 2012), and [Eucalyptus tricarpa (L.A.S. Johnson) L.A.S. Johnson & K.D. Hill] (Steane et al. 2015). It is of note that changes in soil water content, temperature, and organic matter are closely related to climate change, so specific plant genotypes may be generated under the simultaneous selection by climate and soil factors (Fischer and Whitham 2014). As for epipopulation genetics, Kim et al. (2016) have reported the soil metal–associated adaptive methylation variation in red maple (*Acer rubrum* L.).

Mile-a-minute (Mikania micrantha Kunth; tribe Eupatorieae, family Asteraceae) is a highly invasive weed. It is a perennial terrestrial herbaceous vine with a slender and branched stem, having a creeping or twining growth habit. As its common name indicates, *M. micrantha* shows a strong invasiveness, which is due to its efficient sexual and vegetative reproduction coupled with wind-dispersed seed (Swamy and Ramakrishnan 1987). It also demonstrates a strong phenotypic plasticity in the introduced environmental conditions (Hong et al. 2006; Wen et al. 2000; Xu et al. 2013, 2014). This weed is highly destructive for local plants, smothering them and blocking sunlight. Mikania micrantha has caused serious damage to local biodiversity and agricultural ecosystems. Originating from Latin America, M. micrantha was introduced into Hong Kong in 1884 for horticultural purposes (Wang et al. 2003). It became naturalized in 1919 and started to expand on a large scale in southern China since 1984 (Wang et al. 2003). With recent climatic change, M. micrantha has shown the potential to invade to inland provinces such as Jiangxi in China (Hu et al. 2014).

In this study, we used MSAP, in junction with environmental conditions, to explore the (epi)genetic variation and local adaptation of introduced *M. micrantha* populations in southern China. Our specific objectives are: (1) to estimate and compare the amount and structuring of genetic and epigenetic variation in the introduced populations; (2) to identify the candidate (epi) loci for selection that are associated with local climatic/soil factors; and (3) to search for the selective effects of environmental variables on population expansion. In addition, we examined the correlation between leaf shape variation and methylation-state change.

Materials and Methods

Sample Collection

To cover as much of the substantial environmental gradient of M. *micrantha* as possible, we collected 306 individuals from 21 invasive populations in Dongguan, Nei Lingding Island, Hong Kong, Macao, Shenzhen, and Zhuhai in southern China (Figure 1; Table 1). Leaves were first stored in silica gel and then at -20 C until DNA extraction. Total genomic DNA was isolated using the modified CTAB method (Porebski et al. 1997). The quality and quantity of DNA were measured using a NanoDrop 2000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Wilmington, DE, USA). In addition, we measured the leaves of M. *micrantha* in different populations with the same growth period. Length:width ratio was used as a metric of leaf phenotypic variation.

MSAP Assay

We selected a pair of isoschizomers, *Msp*I and *Hpa*II, which recognize and cleave the same 5'-CCGG-3' sequence with different sensitivities to the methylation at the internal or external cytosine (Schulz et al. 2013). Total genomic DNA was digested at 37 C for 3 h in two parallel reactions using 10 U *Eco*RI and 5 U *Hpa*II or 10 U *Msp*I (New England Biolabs, Beverly, MA, USA) in a final volume of 20 µl, followed by 65 C for 20 min to inactivate the enzymes. *Eco*RI and *Hpa*II/*Msp*I adapters were ligated to digested products, and the reaction was carried out in a 20-µl volume containing 5 pmol adaptor and 60 U of T4 DNA ligase (New England

					Mixi	ng Scori	ng 2
Туре	Methylation status	Band pattern	Salmon Scoring	AFLP Scoring	Н	М	U
I	CCGG	11	0	1	0	0	1
	GGCC						
II	C ^m CGG	01	1	1	0	1	0
	GG ^m CC						
	C ^m CGG						
	GGCC						
111	^m CCGG	10	1	0	1	0	0
	GGCC						
IV	^m CCGG	00	0	0	0	0	0
	GGC ^m C						
	^m C ^m CGG						
	GG ^m C ^m C						
	^m C ^m CGG						
	GGCC						
	^m C ^m CGG						
	GG ^m CC						
	^m C ^m CGG						
	GGC ^m C						
	^m CCGG						
	GG ^m CC						
	mutation						

 Table 3. Methylation status, band pattern, and scoring methods.



Figure 2. Methylation-sensitive amplified polymorphism (MSAP) electrophoresis was performed on an ABI 3730 DNA analyzer with internal size standard LIZ 500 for E7/H8 primer combination. H and M represent digestion with *EcoRI/HpaII* and *EcoRI/MspI*, respectively. Blue and orange bands show the amplification products and the standard marker, respectively.

Table 4.	Genetic and	epigenetic	diversity in	regions	based	on the	e six	matrices.

Population ^b	Ν	Na	N _e	I	%P	H _e	UH _e
MS-AFLP							
DG	45	1.046	1.135	0.145	52.1%	0.088	0.089
НК	91	1.472	1.102	0.129	73.6%	0.072	0.072
MA	31	0.626	1.057	0.072	31.1%	0.041	0.041
NLD	62	1.164	1.125	0.139	58.0%	0.082	0.083
SZ	46	1.077	1.121	0.134	53.7%	0.080	0.080
ZH	31	0.728	1.104	0.110	35.9%	0.067	0.068
Average	55	1.077	1.108	0.124	53.7%	0.072	0.073
Total	306	2.000	1.116	0.141	100.0%	0.079	0.080
Salmon							
DG	45	1.072	1.131	0.146	53.6%	0.087	0.088
HK	91	1.571	1.117	0.148	78.6%	0.083	0.083
MA	31	1.011	1.103	0.126	50.5%	0.072	0.073
NLD	62	1.249	1.126	0.147	62.5%	0.086	0.086
SZ	46	1.082	1.112	0.132	54.1%	0.077	0.077
ZH	31	0.844	1.106	0.120	41.9%	0.071	0.072
Average	55	1.197	1.118	0.140	59.8%	0.081	0.082
Total	306	2.000	1.119	0.152	100.0%	0.084	0.084
Н							
DG	45	0.819	1.065	0.083	41.0%	0.046	0.047
HK	91	1.497	1.077	0.110	74.9%	0.058	0.058
MA	31	0.972	1.086	0.111	48.6%	0.062	0.063
NLD	62	1.074	1.065	0.089	53.7%	0.048	0.048
SZ	46	0.837	1.053	0.075	41.9%	0.040	0.040
ZH	31	0.663	1.059	0.076	33.1%	0.042	0.043
Average	55	1.040	1.069	0.094	52.0%	0.051	0.051
Total	306	2.000	1.068	0.102	100.0%	0.052	0.052
М							
DG	45	1.088	1.119	0.136	54.4%	0.080	0.081
HK	91	1.348	1.077	0.103	67.4%	0.056	0.056
MA	31	0.505	1.042	0.054	25.2%	0.030	0.030
NLD	62	1.185	1.111	0.132	59.2%	0.076	0.076
SZ	46	1.046	1.106	0.124	52.3%	0.072	0.073
ZH	31	0.677	1.088	0.097	33.4%	0.058	0.059
Average	55	1.034	1.091	0.110	51.7%	0.063	0.063
Total	306	2.000	1.094	0.124	100.0%	0.067	0.068
U							
DG	45	0.684	1.065	0.076	34.2%	0.044	0.044
HK	91	1.409	1.058	0.087	70.5%	0.044	0.044
MA	31	0.546	1.037	0.052	27.3%	0.028	0.028
NLD	62	0.922	1.060	0.077	46.1%	0.042	0.043
SZ	46	0.776	1.055	0.069	38.8%	0.038	0.039
ZH	31	0.533	1.054	0.063	26.6%	0.036	0.037
Average	55	0.867	1.055	0.072	43.4%	0.039	0.040
lotal	306	2.000	1.057	0.083	100.0%	0.042	0.042
HMU	45	0.000	1 001	0.007	42.20/	0.050	0.050
DG	45	0.866	1.081	0.097	43.3%	0.056	0.056
HK	91	1.431	1.072	0.102	/1.5%	0.054	0.054
MA	31	0.727	1.061	0.079	36.3%	0.044	0.044
NLD	62	1.069	1.078	0.099	53.5%	0.055	0.055
5Z	46	0.884	1.070	0.088	44.2%	0.049	0.050
ZH	31	0.635	1.066	0.079	31.6%	0.046	0.046
Average	55	0.995	1.072	0.093	49.8%	0.051	0.052
Iotal	306	2.000	1.073	0.104	100.0%	0.054	0.054

^aN, number of samples; N_a , number of different alleles; N_e , number of effective alleles = $1/(p^2 + q^2)$; I, Shannon's diversity index = $-1^*[p^*Ln(p) + q^*Ln(q)]$; %P, percentage of polymorphic loci; H_e , expected heterozygosity = 2^*p^*q ; UH_e , unbiased expected heterozygosity = $[2M/(2N - 1)]^*H_e$.

^bDG, Dongguan; HK, Hong Kong; MA, Macao; NLD, Nei Lingding Island; SZ, Shenzhen; ZH, Zhuhai.

Biolabs). After incubation at 16 C overnight, the reaction was heat deactivated at 65 C for 20 min. All adapter and primer sequences for the MSAP protocol are listed in Table 2.

A preselective polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was performed in a total volume of 20 μ l, containing 10 μ l of the ligation product, 5 pmol of each preselective primers, 1 U *Taq* DNA polymerase (Takara), and 3.75 mmol dNTP (with Mg²⁺). Thermocycling conditions were as follows: 94 C for 5 min followed by 20 cycles of 94 C

for 40 s, 56 C for 45 s, and 72 C for 1 min. After preselective amplification, the PCR products were diluted 1:50 with sterile distilled water.

We selected 31 *Eco*RI and *MspI/Hpa*II primer combinations for selective PCRs (Table 2). The amplification reaction was performed in a total volume of 20 μ l with 3.75 mmol dNTP (with Mg²⁺), 5 pmol of fluorescently labeled (6-FAM) forward primer, 5 pmol of reverse primer, 1.25 U of *Taq* DNA polymerase, and

Table 5. Percentage of three methylation states.

Population,	region/species ^a	No. of samples	Un-methylated	Hemi-methylated	Full-methylated
DG	DG2	15	18.58%	36.02%	45.40%
	DG3	15	20.24%	36.33%	43.43%
	DG4	15	20.22%	37.84%	41.94%
	Average	15	19.68%	36.73%	43.59%
	DG	45	19.86%	35.37%	44.76%
НК	HK1	15	15.70%	58.25%	26.05%
	HK3	15	16.61%	51.80%	31.59%
	HK4	15	18.23%	57.03%	24.74%
	HK5	10	14.96%	59.08%	25.96%
	HK6	15	26.11%	36.90%	36.99%
	HK7	11	23.54%	36.34%	40.12%
	HK8	10	26.51%	37.31%	36.18%
	Average	13	20.24%	48.10%	31.66%
	HK	91	20.07%	47.25%	32.68%
MA	MA1	15	12.28%	68.33%	19.40%
	MA4	16	17.43%	60.60%	21.97%
	Average	15.5	14.86%	64.47%	20.69%
	MA	31	15.04%	62.85%	22.11%
NLD	NLD2	15	18.37%	34.47%	47.16%
	NLD3	16	18.02%	39.82%	42.15%
	NLD5	15	18.75%	40.40%	40.85%
	NLD6	16	19.89%	40.62%	39.50%
	Average	15.5	18.76%	38.83%	42.42%
	NLD	62	19.16%	37.32%	43.51%
SZ	SZ1	16	21.77%	37.20%	41.02%
	SZ4	15	19.22%	33.89%	46.89%
	SZ5	15	18.32%	34.91%	46.78%
	Average	15.3	19.77%	35.33%	44.90%
	SZ	46	19.37%	34.23%	46.40%
ZH	ZH1	15	20.25%	40.06%	39.69%
	ZH2	16	19.57%	40.89%	39.54%
	Average	15.5	19.91%	40.48%	39.62%
	ZH	31	20.25%	40.00%	39.75%
Total		306	19.23%	41.69%	39.09%

^aSee Table 1 for codes.

2.5 µl of diluted preselective PCR product. The PCR profile was as follows: 94 C for 5 min, 13 touchdown cycles of 94 C for 30 s, 65 C for 30 s reduced by 0.7 C per cycle, and 72 C for 1 min; 23 cycles of 94 C for 30 s, 56 C for 30 s, and 72 C for 1 min, and a final elongation step at 72 C for 7 min. Selective PCR products were separated and visualized on an ABI 3730 DNA analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) with internal size standard LIZ 500 (Figure 2). Final profiles were analyzed using GeneMarker v. 2.2.0 software (SoftGenetics, State College, PA, USA), and translated into a presence (1)/absence (0) data matrix. To minimize the potential impact of size homoplasy (Caballero et al. 2008), we selected fragments ranging from 150 bp to 500 bp. A peak height threshold was set as 1,000 to 30,000. Furthermore, to ensure low error rates, an E4-H/M3 primer pair was used to assess the reproducibility of the MSAP assay in 306 individuals. Error rate was estimated as only 0.027%.

Methylation Scoring

As isoschizomers, *Hpa*II and *Msp*I cleave the same sequence (CCGG) with subtle differences. The former only recognizes methylated external cytosine on a single strand, while the latter recognizes methylated internal cytosine on a single or both strands. Hence, four methylation types can be obtained: Type I denotes no methylation due to cleavage by both enzymes; Type II denotes full-/hemi-methylation of internal cytosine only when *Msp*I cuts;

Type III denotes hemi-methylation of external cytosine only when *Hpa*II cuts; and Type IV is free of any enzyme cutting, possibly due to full methylation of external cytosine, full methylation of both cytosines, hemi-methylation of both cytosines, or a restriction site mutation. In this study, Type IV was considered to be uninformative, because it could be attributed to multiple and equivocal reasons.

Three scoring approaches were adopted for our data (Schulz et al. 2013): (1) *Eco*RI/*Msp*I data were treated using the methylation-sensitive (MS)-AFLP "10" matrix or genetic matrix; (2) Type II and Type III were considered to be methylated loci "1," while the other two types were marked as "0," which we called the "Salmon matrix" or "Salmon Scoring" (Salmon et al. 2008); (3) a "Mixing Scoring 2" method was used to obtain four different matrices: H, M, U, and HMU matrix. In matrix H, only Type III was considered as "1"; in matrix M, only Type II was considered as "1"; in matrix U, only Type I was regarded as "1"; and matrix HMU included H, M, and U in order (Table 3). All our analyses proceeded based on these six matrices.

Soil Chemical Analyses

Soil samples collected from 21 *M. micrantha* invasive populations were air-dried for 14 d and ground to pass through a sieve with an aperture size of 1 mm and 0.2 mm, respectively. Water contents of fresh and air-dried soil were determined by oven-drying for 6 h at



Figure 3. Leaf shape of *Mikania micrantha* varied by population and region. (A) Leaf shape parameter in 21 populations. (B) Leaf shape variation in six regions. (C) A high leaf length:width ratio is represented using individual 6 of the HK5 population. (D) A low leaf length:width ratio is represented using individual 11 of the NLD3 population. See Table 1 for population codes.

105 C. Soil pH and electrical conductivity were measured in a solution of soil mixed with water at a ratio of 200 g L^{-1} using a pH meter (DPS-307A, INESA, Shanghai, China) and a conductivity meter (DPS-307A, INESA, Shanghai, China), respectively. Soil organic matter content was measured by using the potassium dichromate volumetry method. Soil total nitrogen was quantified by the Kjeldahl method using a KjeltecTM 8400 Analyzer Unit (Foss, Hillerod, Denmark) after digestion at a ratio of 100 g L⁻¹ soil to H₂SO₄. Total carbon was determined in a total organic carbon analyzer (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) at 720 C. Soil K, Ca, Na, Mg, Al, P, S, Si, Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu, Pb, Cr, As, Se, Ni, and Cd were assayed using an inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometer (ICP-OES, PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA, USA) after digestion with HNO₃/HCl/HF at a ratio of 3:1:1 (v/v/v) using a MARS 6 Microwave Reaction System (CEM, Matthews, NC, USA). Experimental treatments without soil samples served as a control. All measurements were repeated three times.

Data Analysis

GenAlEx v. 6.41 (Peakall and Smouse, 2012) was used to assess (epi)genetic parameters, including observed number of alleles (N_a) , effective number of alleles (N_e) , Shannon's diversity index (I), number of private bands, percentage of polymorphic loci (%*P*), expected heterozygosity (H_e), and unbiased expected heterozygosity (UH_e). We also calculated pairwise geographic distance and (epi) genetic distance matrices between populations.

Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was carried out using Arlequin v. 3.5 (Excoffier and Lischer 2010) to estimate MS-AFLP genetic and epigenetic variation partitioned among groups of populations (F_{ct}), among populations within groups (F_{sc}), and among populations (F_{st}) with 10,000 permutations. A Mantel test was performed to explore linear correlation between geographic distance and (epi)genetic distance. A partial Mantel test was used to detect correlation between MS-AFLP genetic matrix and different epigenetic matrices. Significance level was evaluated using 10,000 permutations (Smouse et al. 1986).

We assessed (epi)genetic structure by using Structure v. 2.3.4 (Falush et al. 2007) to allocate individuals into clusters based on a Bayesian clustering method. The best *K* value was determined according to Ln P (D), which is an estimate of the posterior probability of the data for a given K, and ΔK . Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) based on Dice's distance matrices (Zoldoš et al. 2018) was performed to visualize the population relationship using PAST v. 3.18 (Hammer et al. 2011). Sequentially, the "10" data set was aligned in MEGA v. 6.0 and further converted to a nexus format (Tamura et al. 2013). An UPGMA tree was constructed using PAUP v. 4.0 with 1,000 permutations (Swofford 2001). Candidate adaptive loci were identified using Dfdist (Beaumont and Nichols

Variation source	df	Variation	Differentiation
	ŭ	percentage	Value
AFLP			
Among populations within groups	5	10.39%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.1005$
Among populations	15	9.08%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1939$
Among groups	285	9.00%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.1039$
Salmon			
Among populations within groups	5	6.85%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0719$
Among populations	15	6.73%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1355$
Among groups	285	6.70%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0685$
Н			
Among populations within groups	5	5.34%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0734$
Among populations	15	6.95%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1229$
Among groups	285	6.95%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0534$
М			
Among populations within groups	5	10.07%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0844$
Among populations	15	7.68%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1766$
Among groups	285	7.59%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.1007$
U			
Among populations within groups	5	6.66%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0885$
Among populations	15	8.22%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1492$
Among groups	285	8.26%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0666$
HMU			
Among populations within groups	5	7.27%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0801$
Among populations	15	7.45%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1470$
Among groups	285	7.43%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0727$

^aF_{sc}, (epi)genetic variation among populations within groups; F_{st}, (epi)genetic variation among populations; F_{ct}, (epi)genetic variation among groups.

Table 7. F_{st} value from six matrices at regional and species levels.^a

	AFLP	Salmon	Н	М	U	HMU
DG	0.0593	0.0404	0.0339	0.0502	0.0489	0.0435
НК	0.1292	0.0838	0.0856	0.1128	0.1062	0.0979
MA	0.0940	0.0748	0.0735	0.0707	0.0968	0.0769
NLD	0.0941	0.0688	0.0671	0.0774	0.0803	0.0736
SZ	0.1016	0.0891	0.0946	0.0892	0.0929	0.0921
ZH	0.0250	0.0211	0.0192	0.0317	0.0185	0.0235
Total	0.1808	0.1263	0.1156	0.1637	0.1404	0.1374

^aDG, Dongguan; HK, Hong Kong; MA, Macao; NLD, Nei Lingding Island; SZ, Shenzhen; ZH, Zhuhai.F_{st}, (epi)genetic variation among populations.

1996) and BayeScan 2.1 (Foll and Gaggiotti 2008). The former was conducted to detect outliers with 50,000 simulations with a 99.5% confidence interval (CI), while the latter was run with a sample size of 5,000, a thinning interval of 20, and 10 pilot runs of 5,000 iterations for burn-in. Only loci that were simultaneously detected by Dfdist and with a strong detection level (posterior odds, $PO \ge 100$) in BayeScan were considered as candidate adaptive loci. Samβada v. 0.4.5 (http://lasig.epfl.ch/ sambada; Joost et al. 2007; Stucki et al. 2017) was adopted to identify candidate loci that may play important roles in response to changing environments. To ensure accuracy, we also applied the spatial analysis method (SAM) to identify the correlation of candidate loci and environmental factors, including climatic and soil variables based on multiple univariate logistic regression (Joost et al. 2007). Climatic data were downloaded from WorldClim v. 2 (http://www.worldclim. org) and extracted by ArcGis software. Soil data were generated

in our lab (see above). Linkage disequilibrium (LD) among adaptive loci was detected using TASSEL software (Bradbury et al. 2007) with criteria of $R^2 > 0.3$ and P < 0.001 (Keller et al. 2012).

In addition, SAM (Joost et al. 2007) was also used to analyze the large-scale spatial (epi)genetic structure. Shannon's diversity index (I) was used for population diversity data. Distances were divided into five classes according to the maximum actual distance between two populations (85 km). SAM analyses were conducted with 9,999 permutations and 95% CI. The fine-scale spatial (epi)genetic structure was assessed by linear regression of pairwise relationship coefficients for 10 distance classes using SPAGeDi v. 1.3 (Hardy and Vekemans 2002).

We collected geographic information such as longitude and latitude of M. micrantha in southern China from the literature, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (https://www.gbif.org), the National Specimen Information Infrastructure (http://www.



Figure 4. STRUCTURE results with different *K* values for the six matrices. See Table 1 for population codes.

nsii.org.cn), and the Chinese Virtual Herbarium (http://www.cvh. ac.cn). After removal of duplicate locations, we obtained 298 distribution sites for niche model prediction. Maxent software (Phillips et al. 2006) was used to predict current and future distribution of *M. micrantha* with 10 cross-validated replicated runs, of which the latter proceeded based on the HadGEM2-ES and RCP4.5 model (Collins et al. 2011; Thomson et al. 2011). Area under the curve (AUC) was used to assess model performance. AUC values > 0.9 are usually taken as an indicator of high-accuracy models (Swets 1988) and efficient model performance (Manel et al. 2001).

Sequencing of Methylated Polymorphic Fragments

After 6% denaturing polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis and silver staining for visualization, clear and methylated bands were extracted, purified, and sequenced (Zhou and Wang 2013)



Figure 5. Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) results for the six matrices. See Table 1 for population codes.

(Guangzhou Tsingke Biotechnology, Ltd., Guangzhhou, Guangdong, China). Their sequences were BLAST searched against the NCBI and Ensembl databases.

Results and Discussion

Impacts of MSAP Scoring Approaches on (Epi)genetic Variation Estimates

This is the first report on effects of environmental factors on population epigenetic differentiation in *M. micrantha* using MSAP. So far, there exists no consensus method for scoring the information generated from the MSAP banding patterns. As for the six matrices we generated, except for the MS-AFLP genetic matrix, all other matrices were treated as epigenetic data. Of note, Mixing Score 2 included matrices H, M, and U, which were further combined into matrix HMU. Descriptive (epi)genetic parameters were then estimated for all six matrices at the population, regional, and species levels (Table 4; Supplementary Table S1). For each matrix, differences were found for such (epi)genetic parameters as the number of alleles and effective alleles, Shannon information index (*I*), percentage of polymorphic loci (%*P*), expected heterozygosity



Figure 6. UPGMA tree computed using PAUP based on the six matrices. The number on the branch indicates the bootstrap value. See Table 1 for population codes.



Figure 7. Large-scale spatial structure with five distance classes based on the six matrices. An asterisk (*) indicates significance level (P < 0.05).

 (H_e) , and unbiased expected heterozygosity (UH_e) (Friedman test, P < 0.05). At the species level, the highest (epi)genetic diversity occurred in the Salmon matrix, while the lowest was in the U matrix. Our results are consistent with Schulz et al.'s (2013) findings that scoring schemes had strong effects on the estimates of epigenetic diversity and differentiation. In this study, we adopted both Salmon Scoring and Mixing Scoring 2 to evaluate the epigenetic variation of *M. micrantha*. In comparison to Salmon Scoring, Mixing Scoring 2 incorporates scoring for both methylated and unmethylated bands, utilizing more of the underlying banding pattern information. Nevertheless, it needs to be noted that there does not seem to be one best method for scoring MSAP bands for multilocus analyses (Schulz et al. 2013).

MS-AFLP genetic matrix was used to survey genetic diversity (Foust et al. 2016; Schulz et al. 2013). We detected 1,800 polymorphic MS-AFLP genetic loci, whose percentage (%*P*) ranged from 16.17% to 40.5%. The Shannon diversity index (*I*) varied from 0.052 to 0.137, while the expected heterozygosity (H_e) ranged from 0.031 to 0.083. These results are not quite consistent with those obtained by using actual AFLP to assess *M. micrantha* (Wang et al. 2012). Similar instances have been observed in South African ragwort (*Senecio inaequidens* DC) (Lachmuth et al. 2010; Monty et al. 2013). This is not unexpected, considering that MSAP is technically a modification of AFLP.

We also evaluated epigenetic parameters. Based on the Salmon matrix, 2,523 polymorphic loci were identified with percentages of 31.11% to 41.78%; *I* and H_e values ranged from 0.110 to 0.138 and 0.066 to 0.084, respectively. Using the H matrix, 2,260 were

identified as polymorphic loci with percentages of 20.49% to 38.1%; *I* valued from 0.06 to 0.109, and H_e from 0.035 to 0.063. For the M matrix, 1,487 polymorphic loci were detected with percentages of 13.45% to 39%; I varied from 0.042 to 0.128, and H_e from 0.025 to 0.078. For the U matrix, 1,239 polymorphic loci were detected with percentages of 12.5% to 33.82%; *I* ranged from 0.035 to 0.094, and H_e from 0.02 to 0.055. The HMU matrix produced a total of 4,966 loci, with %*P* from 21.1% to 33.33%, *I* from 0.002 to 0.092, and H_e from 0.002 to 0.054.

Patterns of Population (Epi)genetic Variation and the Association of Epigenetic Variation with Leaf Plasticity

In this study, a total of 2,840 scorable polymorphic loci were obtained using 31 pairs of selective PCR primers across 306 individuals. Overall, the percentage of hemi-methylated loci ranged from 33.89% (SZ4) to 68.33% (MA1), with an average of 41.69%, followed by fully methylated loci from 19.40% (MA1) to 46.89% (SZ4), with an average of 39.09%. By contrast, the percentage of unmethylated loci ranged from 12.28% (MA1) to 26.51% (HK8), with an average of 19.23% (Table 5). Hong Kong populations exhibited the lowest level of full methylation.

Twenty-one populations were found to have three different methylation levels (*t*-test, P < 0.05), and different methylation levels were also detected at regional levels. Total methylation (full and hemi-methylation) was different between Macao and Hong Kong and the other four regions. For hemi- or full methylation, Macao, Hong Kong, and Zhuhai each were found to be different from the



Figure 8. Fine-scale spatial structure at 10 distance classes based on six matrices. An asterisk (*) indicates significance level (P < 0.05).

other regions. Regarding hemi-methylation, a significant difference was detected between Nei Lingding and Zhuhai.

Mikania micrantha had the highest epigenetic diversity at the species level based on Salmon Scoring, followed by MS-AFLP genetic variation, implying that methylation variation plays a role in its invasive evolution. The genetic variation of *M. micrantha* is lower (0.08) in comparison to other invasive plants like lantana (Lantana camara L.) (0.28), annual bluegrass (Poa annua L.) (0.17), maritime pine (Pinus pinaster Aiton) (0.15) (Blignaut et al. 2013), S. inaequidens (0.30) (Monty et al. 2013), and smooth cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora Loisel.) (0.38) (Foust et al. 2016), based on the same molecular marker. Importantly, M. micrantha also has lower epigenetic variation (0.04 to 0.08) than another invasive plant, S. alterniflora (0.37) (Foust et al. 2016). In addition, it also maintains lower population-level genetic differentiation compared with other invasive Asteraceae plants in China like Jack in the bush [Chromolaena odorata (L.) R.M. King & H. Rob.] and Santa Maria feverfew (Parthenium hysterophorus L.) (Ma et al. 2011; Tang et al. 2009; Ye et al. 2004). The low level of population-level genetic differentiation of *M. micrantha* might be related to its clonal reproduction and relatively short invasive history in China.

Compared with noninvasive species, invasive species tend to display higher phenotypic plasticity (Davidson et al. 2011). In this study, the length:width ratio was used to characterize leaf shape and evaluate leaf plasticity (Figure 3). Leaf shape was found to exhibit considerable difference among populations. In particular, leaf shape in Nei Lingding was much different from that in Dongguan, Hong Kong, and Macao. Pearson analysis showed that leaf shape was significantly related to H matrix-based Ne $(r^2 = 0.502)$, H_e $(r^2 = 0.468)$, and UH_e $(r^2 = 0.497)$ and the fullmethylation level ($r^2 = -0.433$) at the population level; and I $(r^2 = 0.865)$ and UH_e $(r^2 = 0.816)$ at the regional level (P < 0.05). These results imply that the leaf shape variation of M. micrantha may be linked to methylation-state changes. Similarly, Gao et al. (2010) described the correlation between phenotypic variation and methylation alternations in the invasive weed alligatorweed [Alternanthera philoxeroides (Mart.) Griseb.].



Figure 9. Outliers were identified by Dfdist analysis. The red dots indicate positively selective loci.

Population (Epi)genetic Differentiation among Regions

Based on regions, the 21 populations were divided into six groups, and AMOVA was performed (Table 6). Populations exhibited higher levels of epigenetic differentiation than genetic differentiation. $F_{\rm st}$ values among Hong Kong populations were found to be significantly higher than those among the Dongguan, Macao, Nei Lingding, and Zhuhai populations, but similar to those of Shenzhen populations (P < 0.05; Table 7).

Based on the genetic matrix, intrapopulation and interpopulation variation accounted for 80.61% and 19.39% of the total variation, respectively. As for the epigenetic Salmon matrix, 86.45% and 13.55% of the variation resided within and among populations separately. When using the H, M, U, and HMU matrices, 87.72%, 82.34%, 85.08%, and 85.30% of the variation were partitioned within populations, while 12.29%, 17.66%, 14.92%, and 14.70% were among populations, respectively.

Genetic differentiation ($F_{st} = 0.1939$) was higher in comparison to epigenetic differentiation (F_{st} : 0.1229 to 0.1766; Table 6). A Mantel test was performed based on Nei's genetic distance and geographic distance between populations. Except for the U matrix, most matrices were found to have a significant correlation between geographic and (epi)genetic distance (P < 0.05). Among them, the highest correlation occurred with the Salmon matrix ($r^2 = 0.235$), while the lowest occurred with the M matrix ($r^2 = 0.178$). It is of interest to note that no clear geographic genetic structure was detected among the roadside populations of *M. micrantha* in Weed Science



Figure 10. Candidate positively selective loci were detected by Bayescan analysis. Decisive selected loci were determined according to $ln (PO) \ge 2$.

southern China when using microsatellite markers (Geng et al. 2017).

The relationship between the genetic and five epigenetic matrices was further investigated. The correlation index was 0.8951, 0.4812, 0.9404, 0.7528, and 0.9192 for the Salmon, H, M, U, and HMU matrices, respectively, indicating a high correlation between genetic and epigenetic variation.

Investigation of Spatial (Epi)genetic Structure

We found that there was a clear (epi)genetic structure in genetic, Salmon, and M matrix (Figure 4). Based on the genetic matrix, the Hong Kong and Macao populations formed one cluster, while the remaining populations formed another. Comparatively, epigenetic structure was more complex (Figure 4). Different epigenetic matrices yielded distinct clustering results, indicating the potential effects of methylation states on population structure. Based on the M matrix, the Hong Kong and Macao populations also formed one cluster; three Nei Lingding populations (NLD3, NLD5, and NLD6) clustered into one group together with Dongguan populations, while one Nei Lingding population (NLD2) clustered into another group with Shenzhen and Zhuhai populations. The epigenetic structure constructed from the Salmon matrix was more subtly complicated. The structure between the four Nei Lingding populations and the other populations was similar to that from the M matrix, with the main difference seen with the Hong Kong populations; three Hong Kong populations (HK6, HK7, and HK8) clustered together, while the other four (HK1, HK3, HK4, and HK5) grouped with the Macao populations. As for the other three matrices, H, U, and HMU, no clear epigenetic structure was detected.



Figure 11. Correlation was investigated between adaptive loci and environmental factors. The correlation range was from -1 to 1. Positive and negative values indicated that loci were positively and negatively correlated with the environmental factors, respectively. The greater the absolute value, the stronger the correlation, and vice versa.

PCoA and UPGMA revealed similar results (Figures 5 and 6), with subtle differences when using the HMU matrix, in which the Hong Kong populations (HK1, HK3, HK4, and HK5) grouped with the Macao populations in the UPGMA tree (Figure 6). These results suggested that there existed a certain degree of gene flow between the populations and highlighted the importance of Hong Kong populations in the invasion of *M. micrantha* in southern China; the Hong Kong and Macao populations tend to cluster together based on either genetic or epigenetic data. This may be related to historical reasons, as Hong Kong had more trade exchange with Macao than mainland China in the 1980s, which possibly contributed to the population mixture (Wang et al. 2003; Zhang et al. 2004).

We further examined spatial (epi)genetic structure at two scales. At the large scale, for the genetic matrix, a significant negative Moran's *I* value (-0.272, P = 0.035) was observed for the 80-to 100-km distance class. Similarly, for the Salmon matrix, a significant negative *I* value (-0.743, P = 0.021) was returned for the same distance class. For the H matrix, a significant negative *I* value (-0.29, P = 0.035) was detected in the 20- to 40-km distance class. Base on the M matrix, a significant positive *I* value (0.265, P = 0.047) was detected in the 0- to 20-km distance class, while a

significant negative *I* value (-0.341, P = 0.028) was observed in the 40- to 60-km distance class. No significant value was detected for *I* for any distance classes based on the U and HMU matrices (Figure 7).

At the fine scale, the spatial structure was examined in 50-m intervals (Figure 8). For the genetic matrix, a significant positive autocorrelation was found in the first three distance classes (0 to 50 m, 50 to 100 m, and 100 to 150 m; P < 0.05). For the Salmon matrix, a similar spatial structure was detected. Using the U and HMU matrices, significant positive autocorrelation was found in the first two distance classes (0 to 50 m and 50 to 100 m; P < 0.05). For the M matrix, significant positive autocorrelation was detected in the first and third distance classes (0 to 50 m and 100 to 150 m; P < 0.05). And for the H matrix, the spatial structure was observed only in the first distance class (0 to 50 m, P < 0.05).

Identification of Candidate Selective Loci and Local Adaptive Response to Novel Environment

We detected adaptive loci and epiloci. Using Dfdist, 47 and 151 loci were identified with positive and negative selection in the genetic



Figure 12. A linkage disequilibrium (LD) test was conducted among adaptive loci. Areas above and below the diagonal indicate the R² and P-value, respectively.

matrix, respectively. By contrast, 61 and 118 loci were detected under positive and negative selection for the Salmon matrix, 34 and 63 for the H matrix, 32 and 100 for the M matrix, 21 and 37 for the U matrix, and 93 and 226 for the HMU matrix, respectively (Figure 9).

Using Bayescan, 66 and 1 loci were found to be under positive and negative selection in the genetic matrix, respectively. Comparatively, the corresponding loci were 87 and 1 for the Salmon matrix, 38 and 1 for the H matrix, 48 and 1 for the M matrix, 20 and 1 for the U matrix, and 124 and 1 for the HMU matrix, respectively (Figure 10). To ensure accuracy, only those loci that had been simultaneously identified by both Dfdist and Bayescan were finally considered as being under selection. As a result, we found 39 candidate selective loci in the genetic matrix, 56 for the Salmon matrix, 22 for the H matrix, 27 for the M matrix,15 for the U matrix, and 81 for the HMU matrix, respectively.

We used Sam β ada software to detect locus–environmental variable associations. It identified 182, 122, 13, 136, 37, and 199 candidate loci for the genetic, Salmon, H, M, U, and HMU matrices,

respectively. The majority of these candidate loci were associated with multiple environmental variables. The majority of these candidate loci were further subjected to univariate linear regression model analysis. Only loci with $R^2 \ge 0.5$ were considered as adaptive (Figure 11), which was 11, 4, 2, 11, 1, and 17 for the genetic, Salmon, H, M, U, and HMU matrices, respectively. Among them, five loci were simultaneously detected in three matrices, and four were detected in four matrices. In total, for the six matrices, 21 adaptive loci were detected that were positively correlated with such environmental factors as soil Mn, Zn, Ni, P, and S; latitude; mean diurnal range; temperature seasonality; temperature annual range; precipitation of driest month; precipitation of driest quarter; and precipitation of coldest quarter. Of note, there were more adaptive epiloci (20) than adaptive loci (11) related to environmental factors. Moreover, LD was found in the adaptive (epi)loci (Figure 12). Our results underscore the relative importance of methylation-based epigenetic variation in the adaptive response to environmental conditions (Herrera and Bazaga 2010). Also of note, no adaptive (epi)loci were found to be solely linked to temperature, but some were simultaneously associated with both



Figure 13. Current (A) and potential future distribution (B) of Mikania micrantha predicted based on Maxent.

temperature and precipitation. Similar results have been obtained in other plants like black spruce [*Picea mariana* (Mill.) Britton, Sterns & Poggenb.] (Prunier et al. 2012) and European larch (*Larix decidua* Mill.) (Mosca et al. 2012). These findings suggest that the interaction between temperature and precipitation might be more important than their separate action in causing differentiation at the adaptive (epi)loci. It has been shown that transcriptional networks responsive to dehydration and cold stresses are interconnected in *Arabidopsis* (Yamaguchi-Shinozaki and Shinozaki 2006).

Mikania micrantha was predicted to expand northward in the future (Figure 13), which is in line with previous suggestion by Hu et al. (2014). Environmental factors, including minimum temperature of coldest month, mean temperature of coldest quarter, mean temperature of driest quarter, temperature annual range, annual precipitation, and precipitation of warmest quarter, made



Figure 14. Response curves of *Mikania micrantha* to environmental gradients. The edges of the red and blue curves represent the average response and the standard deviation range, respectively.

the greatest contribution during the expansion (Figure 14). Of them, minimum temperature of the coldest month and mean temperature of the coldest quarter were the decisive factors (contribution rate of 62.3%). More importantly, the optimum growth conditions were revealed as follows (Figure 15): minimum temperature of coldest month, 10 to 24 C; mean temperature of coldest quarter, 14 to 27 C; mean temperature of driest quarter, 16 to 23 C; temperature annual range, 8 to 20 C; annual precipitation, 1,800 to 4,900 mm; and precipitation of warmest quarter, 800 to 3,100 mm.

Soil factors have strong effects on the invasion of *M. micrantha* (Chen et al. 2018). Here, five soil factors (Mn, Zn, Ni, P, and S) were found to be positively related to adaptive (epi)loci. Our results not

only highlight the specific selective soil components but also the candidate loci involved in the response to edaphic selection for *M. micrantha*.

Our findings are not unexpected considering the important functions of Mn, Zn, Ni, P, and S. Mn plays a crucial role in many redox reactions as a cofactor for enzymes (Doncheva et al. 2005). Mn deficiency may cause oxidative damage (Shenker et al. 2004), while excess Mn imposes toxic effects by interfering with a plant's use of other mineral elements (Arya and Roy 2011; Doncheva et al. 2005). Zn fulfills functions in auxin synthesis, signal transduction, transcriptional regulation, the defense against reactive oxygen species, and as component of zinc finger protein and enzymes (Bharti et al. 2013; Cakmak 2000; Cherif et al. 2011; Epple et al. 2003;



Figure 15. Evaluation of climate variable contribution using the jackknife test. Blue bars represent contribution of each variable; green bars, without variable; red bar, with all variables.

Riechmann et al. 2000). Zn concentration influences germination, branch growth, and light system II (Bonnet et al. 2000). P is a major element in soil organic matter (Herrera-Estrella and López-Arredondo 2016). It participates in many metabolic processes and plays an important role in stress resistance to hostile environments. P excess will affect the absorbance of Fe, Mn, and Zn (Huang 2004). Ni is an important micronutrient for plant growth and metabolism (Lin and Gao 2005). Ni²⁺ generally leads to phytotoxicity in soils (Mishra and Kar1974; Sheoran et al. 1990). Ni may reduce the photosynthetic rate and the activities of key enzymes of the photosynthetic carbon reduction cycle (Sheoran et al. 1990). S represents an essential nonmetallic element for plants (Piotrowska-Dlugosz et al. 2017). Soil S excess and deficiency have serious effects on plant growth (Behera et al. 2020). Of note, S enables increased Ni^{2+} uptake (Hashem et al. 2020). This offers a clue for understanding the preference of *M. micrantha* for heavy metal-contaminated soils (Ho et al. 2019; Leung et al. 2019). This study also provided evidence that selective pressures resulting from soil factors were important in structuring the M. micrantha populations (Nosil et al. 2007).

Comparison of Neutral and Adaptive (Epi)Loci Data Sets

Our results showed that adaptive (epi)loci exhibited higher (epi) genetic diversity and differentiation than neutral (epi)loci. Importantly, epigenetic diversity was higher than genetic diversity (Table 8). Compared with neutral loci, adaptive loci data set yielded significantly higher $F_{\rm st}$ values (Table 9). For neutral (epi) loci, the $F_{\rm st}$ value based on the genetic matrix was greater than values based on the epigenetic matrices (Table 9); while the correlation between genetic and geographic distance was weaker than those between epigenetic and geographic distance (Table 10).

By controlling genetic distance, an isolation by geographic distance pattern still can be detected based on the Salmon matrix. After removing adaptive (epi)loci, the Hong Kong and Macao populations were more clearly clustered together based on the genetic and epigenetic matrices (Figure 16), indicating the roles of adaptive (epi)loci in *M. micrantha* invasion. The fine-scale spatial (epi) genetic structure was examined based on neutral and adaptive loci, respectively (Figure 17).

In conclusion, effects of environmental factors on population epigenetic differentiation of *M. micrantha* were first revealed by using MSAP to correlate epigenetic loci and climate/soil data. We found 20 candidate adaptive epiloci correlated with climate (precipitation and temperature) and/or soil variables (Mn, Zn, Ni, P, and S). Minimum temperature of the coldest month and mean temperature of the coldest quarter were identified as decisive factors for *M. micrantha* distribution. Climate is presumed to play a relatively more important role than soil in shaping the adaptive (epi)genetic differentiation. Under ongoing global warming, populations of *M. micrantha* are predicted to expand northward. Compared with genetic diversity, their epigenetic diversity was higher. Population-level (epi)genetic variation showed the pattern

Table 8. Genetic and epigenetic diversity of neutral and adaptive loci.^a

			I	Na		N _e		1	ç	%P		H _e	l	JH _e
pAP -	Population	Ν	Neutral	Adaptive	Neutral	Adaptive	Neutral	Adaptive	Neutral	Adaptive	Neutral	Adaptive	Neutral	Adaptive
DE 44 1.000 1.000 0.005 0.427 0.005 0.005 0.427 0.017 MA 1 0.100 0.110 0.112 <th0.112< th=""> 0.112 <th0.112< th=""></th0.112<></th0.112<>	AFLP													
HK9.11.4682.001.1201.1140.1210.2147.34%5.00,0%0.0710.1170.1070.1070.107MA0.00.1190.001.1390.001.1390.000.0140.0390.0240.029M100.01.1390.001.1390.001.1390.0100.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.0310.0390.031 <th< td=""><td>DG</td><td>45</td><td>1.040</td><td>2.000</td><td>1.130</td><td>1.818</td><td>0.142</td><td>0.632</td><td>51.8%</td><td>100.0%</td><td>0.085</td><td>0.442</td><td>0.086</td><td>0.447</td></th<>	DG	45	1.040	2.000	1.130	1.818	0.142	0.632	51.8%	100.0%	0.085	0.442	0.086	0.447
MA 31 0.644 1.089 1.081 1.017 0.064 3.089 4.089 0.041 0.029 0.041 0.029 0.041 0.029 0.041 0.029 0.041 0.029 0.021	нк	91	1.468	2.000	1.102	1.154	0.128	0.214	73.4%	100.0%	0.071	0.117	0.072	0.117
NLD G2 119 2.00 1.12 1.02 0.13' 0.57 57% 10.0% 0.01' 0.47' 0.01 0.01'' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01''' 0.01'''' 0.01''''' 0.01'''' 0.01''''' <t< td=""><td>MA</td><td>31</td><td>0.624</td><td>0.909</td><td>1.058</td><td>1.031</td><td>0.072</td><td>0.064</td><td>31.0%</td><td>45.5%</td><td>0.041</td><td>0.029</td><td>0.041</td><td>0.029</td></t<>	MA	31	0.624	0.909	1.058	1.031	0.072	0.064	31.0%	45.5%	0.041	0.029	0.041	0.029
Sz. 46 1073 1078 1192 1422 0.33 0.395 5.35% 1.846 0.078 0.279 0.279 0.279 Awerga 53 1.044 1.77 1.105 1.035 0.129 0.373 0.395 8.044 0.078 0.246 0.077 0.316 0.078 0.315 0.77 0.335 Total	NID	62	1 159	2 000	1 122	1 620	0 137	0 507	57.7%	100.0%	0.081	0 347	0.081	0.350
7H 3I 0.721 1.818 1.102 1.066 0.046 0.476 0.076 0.076 0.046 0.076 0.047 0.231 Talal 366 2.000 1.114 1.466 0.120 0.033 0.076 0.076 0.231 0.076 0.076 0.231 0.076 0.076 0.231 0.076 0.076 0.248 0.077 0.248 0.077 0.248 0.077 0.468 0.078 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.068 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.077 0.448 0.077 0.448 0.077 0.448 0.077 0.448 0.077 0.448 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078 0.078	\$7	46	1.073	1.636	1 119	1 482	0.133	0.395	53.5%	81.8%	0.078	0.267	0.079	0.270
merrage 55 1.014 1.127 1.136 1.485 0.139 0.435 0.05% 8.48% 0.070 0.248 0.078 0.318 0.235 Salmon 0.078 0.318 0.037 0.018 0.038 0.118 0.038 0.118 0.038 0.118 0.038 0.118 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038 0.018 0.038	32 7H	31	0.721	1.000	1 102	1.506	0.108	0.426	35.6%	90.9%	0.066	0.286	0.067	0.290
Job Job <td>Avorago</td> <td>55</td> <td>1.014</td> <td>1.010</td> <td>1.102</td> <td>1.300</td> <td>0.108</td> <td>0.420</td> <td>50.5%</td> <td>96.4%</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.280</td> <td>0.007</td> <td>0.250</td>	Avorago	55	1.014	1.010	1.102	1.300	0.108	0.420	50.5%	96.4%	0.000	0.280	0.007	0.250
Name So Lood Lood Lood Lood Outs O	Total	200	2.000	2.000	1.105	1.455	0.120	0.313	100.00/	100.00/	0.070	0.240	0.071	0.231
Subset IDP 2000 III IDP IDP SIM	Total Calman	306	2.000	2.000	1.114	1.496	0.139	0.488	100.0%	100.0%	0.078	0.315	0.078	0.316
Db ns 1.0.0 2.0.0 1.1.10 1.1.12 1.1.12 0.1.12 0.0.0%	Salmon							0.507	50 50/				0.007	
HK 91 1.370 2.000 1.117 1.137 0.148 0.212 75.9% 100.0% 0.033 0.116 0.033 0.116 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.018 0.033 0.014 0.077 0.449 0.077 0.449 Average 55 1.337 1.83 1.15 1.570 0.16 0.051 0.077 0.586 91.7% 0.079 0.322 0.080 0.326 Total 306 2.000 1.077 1.138 0.110 0.211 100.0% 0.066 0.028 0.046 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.232 0.028 0.238 0.236 0.236 0.237 0.044	DG	45	1.070	2.000	1.130	1.710	0.145	0.587	53.5%	100.0%	0.086	0.401	0.087	0.406
MA 31 1011 1000 1.03 1.071 0.26 0.26 0.072 0.062 0.073 0.0657 SZ 46 1.081 2.000 1.111 1.865 0.131 0.650 44,0% 100.0% 0.075 0.443 0.043 0.444 Change 306 2.000 1.035 1.030 0.131 0.027 4.1%% 100.0% 0.064 0.0420 0.064 0.0420 0.044 Total 306 2.000 1.065 1.448 0.081 0.177 4.1%% 100.0% 0.064 0.238 0.046 0.218 MA 31 0.971 2.000 1.065 1.448 0.081 0.210 0.066 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.046 0.238 0.048 0.358 0.138	нк	91	1.570	2.000	1.117	1.137	0.148	0.223	78.5%	100.0%	0.083	0.116	0.083	0.116
NLD 62 1.248 2.000 1.125 1.386 0.146 0.645 6.24% 100.0% 0.075 0.645 0.076 0.443 2H 31 0.342 2.000 1.105 1.300 0.113 0.472 4.8% 100.0% 0.075 0.441 0.072 0.444 Array 386 2.000 1.105 1.300 0.113 0.432 4.8% 100.0% 0.075 0.441 0.072 0.444 Array 386 2.000 1.105 1.490 0.471 100.0% 0.0464 0.425 0.046 0.221 H 386 2.077 1.338 0.110 0.321 74.8% 100.0% 0.046 0.255 0.046 0.321 ND 62 1.074 2.000 1.065 1.544 0.099 0.330 53.7% 100.0% 0.044 0.172 0.048 0.032 X1 1.52 0.015 0.577 43.00 0.044 0.044 0.460 0.460 0.461 0.044 0.460 0.464 0.355	MA	31	1.011	1.000	1.103	1.071	0.126	0.123	50.5%	50.0%	0.072	0.062	0.073	0.063
SZ 46 1.081 2.000 1.111 1.866 0.131 0.630 54.0% 1.00.0% 0.071 0.449 0.072 0.448 Average 53 1.137 1.833 1.115 1.570 0.136 0.417 56.8% 91.7% 0.071 0.322 0.080 0.328 Column 0.318 1.137 0.135 0.417 56.8% 91.7% 0.034 0.322 0.080 0.328 H - - 0.015 1.488 0.033 0.417 7.8% 100.07% 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.052 0.062 <th< td=""><td>NLD</td><td>62</td><td>1.248</td><td>2.000</td><td>1.125</td><td>1.836</td><td>0.146</td><td>0.645</td><td>62.4%</td><td>100.0%</td><td>0.085</td><td>0.453</td><td>0.086</td><td>0.457</td></th<>	NLD	62	1.248	2.000	1.125	1.836	0.146	0.645	62.4%	100.0%	0.085	0.453	0.086	0.457
ZH 31 0.842 2.000 1.05 1.800 0.119 0.622 4.18% 10.0% 0.071 0.411 0.072 0.432 Total 36 2.000 2.000 1.118 1.731 0.151 0.611 10.0% 10.0% 0.079 0.322 0.080 0.326 Total 31 0.477 1.138 0.110 0.214 47.4% 100.0% 0.064 0.258 0.466 0.258 MA 31 0.477 2.000 1.055 1.101 0.212 7.4% 100.0% 0.061 0.118 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.228 0.066 0.028 0.028 0.028 0.028 0.028 0.028 0.026 0.028 0.026 0.028 0.026 0.	SZ	46	1.081	2.000	1.111	1.866	0.131	0.650	54.0%	100.0%	0.076	0.459	0.077	0.464
Average 55 1.137 1.83 1.115 1.570 0.136 0.477 56.8% 9.1% 0.09 0.322 0.80 0.322 H U U U U 0.00% 0.084 0.420 0.844 0.421 HK 91 1.497 2.000 1.077 1.138 0.110 0.321 74.8% 100.0% 0.664 0.218 0.662 0.221 NLD 6.2 1.074 2.000 1.655 1.648 0.009 0.530 53.7% 100.0% 0.048 0.336 0.049 0.321 2.017 2.222 0.221 0.049 0.331 2.10 0.049 0.031 2.13% 100.0% 0.040 0.012 0.049 0.031 2.13% 100.0% 0.042 0.040 0.041 0.043 0.047 Z44 31 0.662 2.000 1.67 1.42 0.001 0.004 0.004 0.021 0.040 0.007 0.017 0.017 <td>ZH</td> <td>31</td> <td>0.842</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>1.105</td> <td>1.800</td> <td>0.119</td> <td>0.632</td> <td>41.8%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.071</td> <td>0.441</td> <td>0.072</td> <td>0.448</td>	ZH	31	0.842	2.000	1.105	1.800	0.119	0.632	41.8%	100.0%	0.071	0.441	0.072	0.448
Total H3002.0001.1181.710.1510.611100.0%0.0840.4200.0840.082DG450.8182.0001.0651.4980.0830.3744.09%100.0%0.0460.2580.0460.261MA310.9712.0001.0651.5840.0890.53048.5%100.0%0.0610.2180.0620.222MA0.21742.0001.0651.5440.0890.53053.7%100.0%0.0400.1720.0400.671SZ460.8362.0001.0531.2210.0740.30541.8%100.0%0.0400.2660.0500.272Average550.9762.0001.0671.4620.0900.40748.8%100.0%0.0490.2660.0500.0270Total3062.0001.0671.4620.0900.40748.8%100.0%0.0550.6660.4500.272M310.530.771.0420.1020.4421.000%0.0550.0660.0560.056MA310.530.771.0740.1330.13767.2%9.9%0.0740.3510.0740.351MA310.530.771.0740.1310.1310.1320.5059.9%0.0740.3510.0770.221MA310.6681.8181.4030.1660.3454.84.%8.3%	Average	55	1.137	1.833	1.115	1.570	0.136	0.477	56.8%	91.7%	0.079	0.322	0.080	0.326
H U	Total	306	2.000	2.000	1.118	1.731	0.151	0.611	100.0%	100.0%	0.084	0.420	0.084	0.421
DG 45 0.818 2.000 1.065 1.488 0.031 0.374 40.9% 100.0% 0.046 0.258 0.046 0.261 MA 11 0.971 2.000 1.066 1.356 0.110 0.339 48.6% 100.0% 0.061 0.218 0.062 0.229 SZ 46 0.862 2.000 1.055 1.634 0.089 0.330 43.6% 100.0% 0.040 0.172 0.040 0.047 Average 55 0.376 2.000 1.059 1.924 0.075 0.677 4.88% 100.0% 0.040 0.426 0.050 0.052 0.226 0.050 0.277 Total 3.06 2.020 1.067 1.442 0.90 0.467 4.88% 100.0% 0.049 0.266 0.050 0.276 0.328 0.276 0.358 0.276 0.358 0.376 0.378 0.376 0.378 0.376 0.443 0.376 0.376 0.378 0.376 0.466 0.356 0.066 0.056 0.056 0.056 0.	н													
PH 91 1.497 2.000 1.077 1.138 0.110 0.221 74.8% 100.0% 0.053 0.115 0.059 0.116 NA 31 0.071 2.000 1.065 1.536 0.110 0.33 45.% 100.0% 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.357 ZH 31 0.652 2.000 1.057 1.921 0.074 0.057 33.6% 100.0% 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.049 0.050 0.777 0.443 0.677 0.437 0.724 1.017 0.045 0.052 0.282 0.052 0.282 0.052 0.282 0.052 0.282 0.053 0.248 0.777 0.443 0.77 0.443 0.77 0.443 0.77 0.443 0.77 0.473 0.723 0.77 0.723 0.77 </td <td>DG</td> <td>45</td> <td>0.818</td> <td>2 000</td> <td>1 065</td> <td>1 498</td> <td>0.083</td> <td>0 374</td> <td>40.9%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.046</td> <td>0 258</td> <td>0.046</td> <td>0 261</td>	DG	45	0.818	2 000	1 065	1 498	0.083	0 374	40.9%	100.0%	0.046	0 258	0.046	0 261
MA 1 1.07 2.00 1.06 0.13 0.45 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.12 0.02 0.22 NLD 62 1.074 2.000 1.065 1.644 0.099 0.530 53.7% 1.00.0% 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.356 0.048 0.366 0.044 0.440 0.042 0.400 0.433 0.447 ZH 3.1 0.622 2.000 1.067 1.442 0.102 0.445 1.00.0% 0.045 0.262 0.222 <td>нк</td> <td>91</td> <td>1 497</td> <td>2,000</td> <td>1.077</td> <td>1 138</td> <td>0 1 1 0</td> <td>0.221</td> <td>74.8%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.058</td> <td>0.115</td> <td>0.058</td> <td>0.116</td>	нк	91	1 497	2,000	1.077	1 138	0 1 1 0	0.221	74.8%	100.0%	0.058	0.115	0.058	0.116
mlb field f	ΜΔ	31	0.971	2.000	1.077	1 356	0.110	0.221	48.5%	100.0%	0.050	0.218	0.050	0.222
ND Az L0.74 L0.05 L0.94 L0.94 L0.94 L0.95 L0.95 <thl2.95< th=""> <thl2.95< <="" td=""><td></td><td>62</td><td>1.074</td><td>2.000</td><td>1.065</td><td>1.550</td><td>0.110</td><td>0.535</td><td>-0.J /0 52 70%</td><td>100.0%</td><td>0.001</td><td>0.210</td><td>0.002</td><td>0.222</td></thl2.95<></thl2.95<>		62	1.074	2.000	1.065	1.550	0.110	0.535	-0.J /0 52 70%	100.0%	0.001	0.210	0.002	0.222
SL 40 0.33 2.000 1.033 1.21 0.014 0.335 4.835 100.0% 0.040 0.112 0.040 0.114 Average 55 0.376 2.000 1.667 1.442 0.090 0.407 4.848% 100.0% 0.049 0.266 0.050 0.270 Total 306 2.000 1.067 1.442 0.090 0.407 4.848% 100.0% 0.049 0.266 0.050 0.272 0.222 M 7 0.443 0.078 0.448 HK 91 1.344 1.818 1.077 1.074 0.103 0.137 67.2% 90.9% 0.056 0.066 0.056 0.066 ND 6.2 1.180 1.818 1.071 1.631 0.129 0.508 50.0% 90.9% 0.074 0.351 0.074 0.332 SZ 46 1.043 1.455 1.104 1.391 0.123 0.330 52.1% 0.074 0.351 0.074 0.353 SZ 46 1.043 1.455 <td>NLD</td> <td>02</td> <td>1.074</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>1.005</td> <td>1.034</td> <td>0.035</td> <td>0.330</td> <td>41.00/</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.040</td> <td>0.330</td> <td>0.040</td> <td>0.335</td>	NLD	02	1.074	2.000	1.005	1.034	0.035	0.330	41.00/	100.0%	0.040	0.330	0.040	0.335
2H 3.1 0.662 2.000 1.063 1.924 0.095 0.612 3.3.0% 1.00.0% 0.042 0.480 0.043 0.481 Average 55 0.076 2.000 1.067 1.424 0.102 0.445 1.00.0% 0.052 0.282 0.052 0.282 M DG 4.5 1.081 2.000 1.113 1.821 0.133 0.633 54.1% 100.0% 0.077 0.443 0.078 0.446 MA 31 0.503 0.777 1.042 1.025 0.054 0.051 25.1% 36.4% 0.030 0.022 0.030 0.023 SZ 46 1.043 1.455 1.104 1.391 0.122 0.330 52.1% 72.7% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.223 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.065 1.474 0.095 0.414 3.30% 90.9% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.232 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.065 1.474 0.095 0.414 3.	52	46	0.836	2.000	1.053	1.221	0.074	0.305	41.8%	100.0%	0.040	0.172	0.040	0.174
Average 55 0.9% 2.000 1.0% 1.4%2 0.990 0.407 48.8% 100.0% 0.049 0.26% 0.050 0.210 M 7 1.081 2.000 1.057 1.434 0.102 0.447 100.0% 100.0% 0.077 0.443 0.052 0.222 0.222 M 1 1.444 1.18 1.071 1.074 0.103 0.137 67.2% 90.9% 0.056 0.066 0.056 0.066 0.030 0.023 NLD 6.2 1.180 1.818 1.107 1.631 0.129 0.508 59.0% 90.9% 0.074 0.351 0.072 0.232 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.065 1.474 0.095 0.414 33.0% 0.061 0.232 0.077 0.275 0.057 0.275 0.057 0.223 0.066 0.284 0.066 0.284 0.066 0.284 0.066 0.284 0.066 0.284	ZH	31	0.662	2.000	1.059	1.924	0.075	0.672	33.0%	100.0%	0.042	0.480	0.043	0.487
Total 36 2.00 2.00 1.434 0.02 0.445 100.0% 100.0% 0.052 0.282 0.852 0.282 DG 45 1.081 2.000 1.113 1.821 0.133 0.633 54.1% 100.0% 0.077 0.443 0.078 0.448 MK 91 1.344 1.818 1.077 1.74 0.103 0.137 67.2% 90.9% 0.056 0.066 0.066 0.066 0.065 0.066 0.035 0.023 0.030 0.023 NLD 66 1.818 1.04 1.391 0.123 0.303 52.1% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.223 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.088 1.403 0.106 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.230 0.061 0.232 0.072 0.237 Average 55 0.970 1.666 1.883 1.074 0.026 0.473 70.4% 100.0% 0	Average	55	0.976	2.000	1.067	1.462	0.090	0.407	48.8%	100.0%	0.049	0.266	0.050	0.270
M DG 45 1.081 2.000 1.113 1.821 0.133 0.633 54.1% 100.0% 0.076 0.443 0.0768 0.066 MA 31 0.503 0.727 1.042 0.103 0.137 67.2% 90.9% 0.056 0.066 0.066 0.066 NLD 62 1.180 1.818 1.107 1.631 0.129 0.508 59.0% 90.9% 0.074 0.351 0.074 0.353 SZ 46 1.043 1.455 1.144 0.959 0.414 3.0% 90.9% 0.057 0.275 0.057 0.279 Average 55 0.970 1.666 1.088 1.403 0.126 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.661 0.234 0.066 0.2324 Otal 3.06 2.000 1.058 1.422 0.474 100.0% 0.044 0.297 0.044 0.298 MA 31 0.544 2.000	Total	306	2.000	2.000	1.067	1.434	0.102	0.445	100.0%	100.0%	0.052	0.282	0.052	0.282
DG 45 1.081 2.000 1.113 1.821 0.133 0.633 54.1% 100.0% 0.077 0.443 0.078 0.448 MK 91 1.344 1.818 1.077 1.074 0.133 0.137 67.2% 90.9% 0.036 0.066 0.066 0.066 0.056 0.066 0.051 0.231 0.074 0.032 0.033 0.033 0.033 0.032 0.030 0.023 0.033 0.033 0.032 0.033 0.033 0.032 0.035 0.037 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.037 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.027 0.026 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 <t< td=""><td>М</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	М													
HK 91 1.344 1.818 1.077 1.074 0.103 0.137 77.2% 90.9% 0.056 0.066 0.056 0.050 0.023 0.030 0.023 NLD 62 1.180 1.818 1.107 1.631 0.122 0.508 59.0% 90.9% 0.074 0.351 0.074 0.323 ZH 31 0.666 1.818 1.065 1.474 0.095 0.414 33.0% 90.9% 0.057 0.275 0.072 0.223 Average 55 0.970 1.606 1.088 1.403 0.166 0.345 44.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.230 0.061 0.232 Jotal 306 2.000 1.066 1.088 0.162 0.447 100.0% 0.064 0.230 0.061 0.232 U U U U U U 0.064 0.333 0.062 0.033 0.064 0.022 0.066 0.473 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.460 0.056 0.043 0.005 0.043 <td>DG</td> <td>45</td> <td>1.081</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>1.113</td> <td>1.821</td> <td>0.133</td> <td>0.633</td> <td>54.1%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.077</td> <td>0.443</td> <td>0.078</td> <td>0.448</td>	DG	45	1.081	2.000	1.113	1.821	0.133	0.633	54.1%	100.0%	0.077	0.443	0.078	0.448
MA 31 0.503 0.727 1.042 1.025 0.054 0.051 25.1% 36.4% 0.030 0.023 0.030 0.023 SLD 62 1.180 1.413 1.061 0.123 0.508 59.0% 0.074 0.351 0.074 0.351 SZ 46 1.043 1.445 1.104 1.391 0.123 0.303 52.1% 72.7% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.223 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.045 1.444 0.095 0.414 33.0% 90.3% 0.061 0.230 0.061 0.232 Total 36 2.000 1.092 1.438 0.122 0.447 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.423 U U U U U U 0.010% 0.044 0.455 0.44 0.466 LK 91 1.409 2.000 1.054 1.422 0.086 0.473 7.0.4% 100.0% 0.044 0.453 0.404 0.466 0.333 0.022 0	HK	91	1.344	1.818	1.077	1.074	0.103	0.137	67.2%	90.9%	0.056	0.066	0.056	0.066
NLD 62 1.180 1.818 1.07 1.63 0.129 0.508 59.0% 90.9% 0.074 0.351 0.072 0.232 ZZ 46 1.043 1.455 1.104 1.391 0.123 0.330 52.1% 72.7% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.223 Average 55 0.970 1.666 1.088 1.403 0.106 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.234 0.066 0.284 Otal 306 2.000 1.064 1.835 0.076 0.648 34.2% 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.284 U 0.054 1.055 1.022 0.086 0.473 7.4%6 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.284 0.032 0.028 0.032 0.028 0.032 0.028 0.032 0.032 0.033 0.33 MA 31 0.544 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.043 0.016 0.33 0.022 0.033	MA	31	0.503	0.727	1.042	1.025	0.054	0.051	25.1%	36.4%	0.030	0.023	0.030	0.023
SZ 46 1.043 1.455 1.104 1.391 0.123 0.330 S2.1% 72.7% 0.071 0.221 0.072 0.023 ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.085 1.474 0.095 0.414 33.0% 90.9% 0.057 0.275 0.057 0.273 Average 55 0.970 1.606 1.088 1.403 0.106 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.232 0.661 0.232 Total 306 2.000 1.064 1.835 0.126 0.447 100.0% 100.0% 0.066 0.284 0.062 0.281 U	NLD	62	1.180	1.818	1.107	1.631	0.129	0.508	59.0%	90.9%	0.074	0.351	0.074	0.353
ZH 31 0.668 1.818 1.085 1.474 0.095 0.414 33.0% 90.9% 0.057 0.275 0.057 0.279 Average 55 0.970 1.666 1.088 1.433 0.106 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.230 0.061 0.232 U	SZ	46	1.043	1.455	1.104	1.391	0.123	0.330	52.1%	72.7%	0.071	0.221	0.072	0.223
Average 55 0.970 1.606 1.088 1.403 0.106 0.345 48.4% 80.3% 0.061 0.230 0.061 0.232 Total 0.6 2.000 2.000 1.092 1.488 0.122 0.447 100.0% 100.0% 0.061 0.230 0.266 0.285 U DG 45 0.683 2.000 1.064 1.835 0.076 0.648 34.2% 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.4928 MA 31 0.54 2.000 1.058 1.422 0.086 0.473 70.4% 100.0% 0.044 0.497 0.044 0.298 0.033 NLD 62 0.921 2.000 1.065 1.016 0.077 0.047 46.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.043 0.016 SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.221 0.069 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.032 0.032 0.033 <	ZH	31	0.668	1.818	1.085	1.474	0.095	0.414	33.0%	90.9%	0.057	0.275	0.057	0.279
Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.092 1.438 0.122 0.447 100.0% 100.0% 0.666 0.284 0.066 0.285 U DG 45 0.683 2.000 1.064 1.835 0.076 0.648 34.2% 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.499 MA 31 0.544 2.000 1.037 1.033 0.052 0.083 2.72% 100.0% 0.044 0.297 0.044 0.298 NLD 62 0.921 2.000 1.065 1.022 0.069 0.060 3.8% 100.0% 0.028 0.032 0.028 0.033 0.022 ZH 31 0.534 0.000 1.055 1.022 0.069 0.600 3.8% 100.0% 0.036 0.000 0.037 0.003 0.037 0.000 1.037 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.137 0.036	Average	55	0.970	1.606	1.088	1.403	0.106	0.345	48.4%	80.3%	0.061	0.230	0.061	0.232
u nm nm </td <td>Total</td> <td>306</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>1.092</td> <td>1.438</td> <td>0.122</td> <td>0.447</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.066</td> <td>0.284</td> <td>0.066</td> <td>0.285</td>	Total	306	2.000	2.000	1.092	1.438	0.122	0.447	100.0%	100.0%	0.066	0.284	0.066	0.285
DG 45 0.683 2.000 1.064 1.835 0.076 0.648 34.2% 100.0% 0.044 0.455 0.044 0.420 HK 91 1.409 2.000 1.058 1.422 0.086 0.473 70.4% 100.0% 0.044 0.297 0.044 0.298 MA 31 0.544 2.000 1.037 1.033 0.052 0.083 27.2% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.043 0.016 SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.669 0.660 38.8% 100.0% 0.038 0.022 0.039 0.022 ZH 31 0.534 0.000 1.054 1.000 0.663 0.000 2.67% 0.0% 0.038 0.022 0.039 0.138 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total	U													
DG DG DG Lood Lood Lood Lood DG	DG	45	0.683	2 000	1 064	1 835	0.076	0.648	34.2%	100.0%	0 044	0.455	0 044	0.460
Int 31 1.403 2.000 1.037 1.033 0.052 0.036 0.473 10.470 100.0% 0.044 0.123 0.044 0.123 NLD 62 0.921 2.000 1.060 1.016 0.077 0.047 46.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.043 0.016 SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.069 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.038 0.022 0.039 0.022 ZH 31 0.534 0.000 1.055 1.021 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.432 0.432 HMU 0.433	HK	91	1 409	2.000	1.058	1.000	0.086	0.473	70.4%	100.0%	0.044	0.155	0.044	0.100
NAX 31 0.34 2.000 1.033 0.032 0.003 1.123 1.0000 0.025 0.032 0.032 0.034 0.015 NLD 62 0.921 2.000 1.060 1.016 0.077 0.047 46.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.033 0.016 SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.069 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.042 0.016 0.043 0.000 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.182 MMU 0.000 2.000 1.079 1.807 0.095 0.611 43.1% 100.0% 0.054 0.430 0.055 0.434 HK 91 1.429 1.882 1.072 1.169 0.102 0.220 71.5% 94.1%	MA	21	0.544	2.000	1.030	1.022	0.000	0.092	27.20%	100.0%	0.079	0.020	0.079	0.230
NLD 62 0.321 2.000 1.050 1.016 0.017 0.047 46.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.018 0.043 0.015 SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.069 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.038 0.002 0.037 0.000 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.183 HMU		51	0.021	2.000	1.057	1.055	0.032	0.083	21.270	100.0%	0.028	0.032	0.023	0.033
SZ 46 0.775 2.000 1.055 1.022 0.069 0.060 38.8% 100.0% 0.038 0.022 0.039 0.022 ZH 31 0.534 0.000 1.055 1.201 0.011 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.036 0.000 0.037 0.000 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.036 0.000 0.037 0.001 Average 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.183 HMU		02	0.921	2.000	1.060	1.010	0.077	0.047	40.0%	100.0%	0.042	0.010	0.043	0.010
ZH 31 0.034 0.000 1.054 1.000 0.063 0.000 26.7% 0.0% 0.036 0.000 0.037 0.000 Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.071 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total 306 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.183 HMU 0.05 0.862 2.000 1.079 1.807 0.095 0.611 43.1% 100.0% 0.054 0.430 0.055 0.434 HK 91 1.429 1.882 1.072 1.169 0.102 0.220 71.5% 94.1% 0.044 0.057 0.044 0.058 NLD 62 1.066 2.000 1.077 0.079 0.107 36.2% 52.9% 0.044 0.054 0.334 0.054 0.337 0.337 52 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358	52	46	0.775	2.000	1.055	1.022	0.069	0.060	38.8%	100.0%	0.038	0.022	0.039	0.022
Average 55 0.811 1.667 1.055 1.221 0.01 0.219 40.5% 83.3% 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.137 0.039 0.138 Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.183 MMU DG 45 0.862 2.000 1.079 1.807 0.095 0.611 43.1% 100.0% 0.054 0.430 0.055 0.434 HK 91 1.429 1.882 1.072 1.169 0.102 0.220 71.5% 94.1% 0.053 0.122 0.054 0.122 MA 31 0.725 1.059 1.060 1.077 0.079 0.493 53.3% 100.0% 0.054 0.334 0.054 0.337 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1	ZH	31	0.534	0.000	1.054	1.000	0.063	0.000	26.7%	0.0%	0.036	0.000	0.037	0.000
Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.057 1.223 0.083 0.329 100.0% 100.0% 0.042 0.182 0.042 0.183 HMU HM	Average	55	0.811	1.667	1.055	1.221	0.071	0.219	40.5%	83.3%	0.039	0.137	0.039	0.138
HMU DG 45 0.862 2.000 1.079 1.807 0.095 0.611 43.1% 100.0% 0.054 0.430 0.055 0.434 HK 91 1.429 1.882 1.072 1.169 0.102 0.220 71.5% 94.1% 0.053 0.122 0.054 0.122 MA 31 0.725 1.059 1.060 1.077 0.079 0.107 36.2% 52.9% 0.044 0.057 0.044 0.058 NLD 62 1.066 2.000 1.076 1.595 0.097 0.493 53.3% 100.0% 0.054 0.334 0.054 0.337 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.297 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 </td <td>Total</td> <td>306</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>2.000</td> <td>1.057</td> <td>1.223</td> <td>0.083</td> <td>0.329</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>100.0%</td> <td>0.042</td> <td>0.182</td> <td>0.042</td> <td>0.183</td>	Total	306	2.000	2.000	1.057	1.223	0.083	0.329	100.0%	100.0%	0.042	0.182	0.042	0.183
DG 45 0.862 2.000 1.079 1.807 0.095 0.611 43.1% 100.0% 0.054 0.430 0.055 0.434 HK 91 1.429 1.882 1.072 1.169 0.102 0.220 71.5% 94.1% 0.053 0.122 0.054 0.125 0.054 0.125 MA 31 0.725 1.059 1.060 1.077 0.079 0.107 36.2% 52.9% 0.044 0.054 0.054 0.054 0.334 NLD 62 1.066 2.000 1.076 1.595 0.097 0.493 53.3% 10.0% 0.048 0.334 0.054 0.337 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 </td <td>HMU</td> <td></td>	HMU													
HK911.4291.8821.0721.1690.1020.22071.5%94.1%0.0530.1220.0540.122MA310.7251.0591.0601.0770.0790.10736.2%52.9%0.0440.0570.0440.058NLD621.0662.0001.0761.5950.0970.49353.3%100.0%0.0540.3340.0540.337SZ460.8821.6471.0681.3990.0870.35844.1%82.4%0.0480.2340.0490.237ZH310.6311.8821.0651.5180.0780.43631.4%94.1%0.0450.2930.0450.294Average550.9331.7451.0701.4270.0900.37146.6%87.3%0.0500.2450.0500.248Total3062.0001.0721.4670.1030.462100.0%0.0530.2960.0530.296	DG	45	0.862	2.000	1.079	1.807	0.095	0.611	43.1%	100.0%	0.054	0.430	0.055	0.434
MA 31 0.725 1.059 1.060 1.077 0.079 0.107 36.2% 52.9% 0.044 0.057 0.044 0.058 NLD 62 1.066 2.000 1.076 1.595 0.097 0.493 53.3% 100.0% 0.054 0.334 0.054 0.337 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.297 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.245 0.050 0.295 0.053 0.296 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.245 0.050 <	HK	91	1.429	1.882	1.072	1.169	0.102	0.220	71.5%	94.1%	0.053	0.122	0.054	0.122
NLD 62 1.066 2.000 1.076 1.595 0.097 0.493 53.3% 100.0% 0.054 0.334 0.054 0.337 SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.297 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.295 0.050 0.296 Total 306 2.000 1.072 1.467 0.103 0.462 100.0% 100.0% 0.053 0.296 0.053 0.296 0.053 0.296	MA	31	0.725	1.059	1.060	1.077	0.079	0.107	36.2%	52.9%	0.044	0.057	0.044	0.058
SZ 46 0.882 1.647 1.068 1.399 0.087 0.358 44.1% 82.4% 0.048 0.234 0.049 0.237 ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.297 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.245 0.050 0.245 Total 306 2.000 1.072 1.467 0.103 0.462 100.0% 100.0% 0.053 0.296 0.653 0.296	NLD	62	1.066	2.000	1.076	1.595	0.097	0.493	53.3%	100.0%	0.054	0.334	0.054	0.337
ZH 31 0.631 1.882 1.065 1.518 0.078 0.436 31.4% 94.1% 0.045 0.293 0.045 0.297 Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.245 0.050 0.248 Total 306 2.000 1.072 1.467 0.103 0.462 100.0% 100.0% 0.053 0.296 0.053 0.296	SZ	46	0.882	1.647	1.068	1.399	0.087	0.358	44.1%	82.4%	0.048	0.234	0.049	0.237
Average 55 0.933 1.745 1.070 1.427 0.090 0.371 46.6% 87.3% 0.050 0.245 0.050 0.248 Total 306 2.000 1.072 1.467 0.103 0.462 100.0% 0.053 0.296 0.053 0.296 0.296	ZH	31	0.631	1.882	1.065	1.518	0.078	0.436	31.4%	94.1%	0.045	0.293	0.045	0.297
Total 306 2.000 2.000 1.072 1.467 0.103 0.462 100.0% 100.0% 0.053 0.296 0.053 0.296	Average	55	0,933	1.745	1.070	1.427	0,090	0.371	46.6%	87.3%	0.050	0.245	0.050	0.248
	Total	306	2 000	2 000	1 072	1 467	0 103	0.462	100.0%	100.0%	0.053	0.296	0.053	0.296

^aN, number of samples; N_a, number of different alleles; N_e, number of effective alleles = $1/(p^2 + q^2)$; I, Shannon's diversity index = $-1^*[p^*Ln(p) + q^*Ln(q)]$; %P, percentage of polymorphic loci; He, expected heterozygosity = 2^*p^*q ; UHe, unbiased expected heterozygosity = $[2N/(2N - 1)]^*H_e$; DG, Dongguan; HK, Hong Kong; MA, Macao; NLD, Nei Lingding Island; SZ, Shenzhen; ZH, Zhuhai.

Table 9.	Analysis of	molecular	variance	(AMOVA)	based of	on neutral	and	adaptive	loci.
----------	-------------	-----------	----------	---------	----------	------------	-----	----------	-------

	Neutra	al loci	Adaptive loci		
Variation sources	Variation percentage	Differentiation value	Variation percentage	Differentiation value	
AFLP					
Among populations within groups	9.41%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.1003$	47.90%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0720$	
Among populations	9.08%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1850$	5.89%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.5378$	
Among groups	81.50%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0941$	46.22%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.4790$	
Salmon					
Among populations within groups	6.53%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0720$	53.56%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0530$	
Among populations	6.73%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1326$	2.46%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.5602$	
Among groups	86.74	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0653$	43.98%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.5356$	
Н					
Among populations within groups	5.22%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0733$	32.81%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.1040$	
Among populations	6.95%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1217$	6.99%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.3980$	
Among groups	87.83%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0522$	60.20%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.3281$	
M					
Among populations within groups	8.81%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0842$	48.88%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.09377$	
Among populations	7.68%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1649$	4.79%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.53670$	
Among groups	83.51%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0881$	46.33%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.48877$	
U					
Among populations within groups	6.58%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0883$	26.60%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.2459$	
Among populations	8.22%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1480$	18.05%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.4465$	
Among groups	85.20%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0658$	55.35%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.2660$	
HMU					
Among populations within groups	6.66%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.0799$	42.29%	$F_{\rm sc} = 0.1054$	
Among populations	7.45%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.1411$	6.08%	$F_{\rm st} = 0.4837$	
Among groups	85.89%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.0666$	51.63%	$F_{\rm ct} = 0.4229$	

Table 10. Mantel test based on neutral and adaptive locus matrices.

	Neutr	al loci	Adapti	ve loci
Matrix	r ²	Р	r ²	Р
AFLP	0.1690	0.0255	0.2408	0.0094
Salmon	0.2327	0.0044	0.2676	0.0056
Н	0.1973	0.0202	0.2460	0.0159
М	0.1443	0.0469	0.2382	0.0100
U	0.1178	0.0962	0.0003	0.4452
HMU	0.1958	0.0124	0.2563	0.0073



Figure 16. Structure results of neutral or adaptive loci based on the six matrices. See Table 1 for population codes.



Figure 17. Fine-scale spatial structure of neutral and adaptive loci based on the six matrices. An asterisk (*) indicates significance level (P < 0.05).

of isolation by distance and spatial structure at a small scale. Moreover, leaf shape variation was found to be related to population methylation percentage and epigenetic diversity. These results may be helpful for formulating a control strategy for *M. micrantha*.

Supplementary material

To view supplementary material for this article, please visit https:// doi.org/10.1017/wsc.2021.13

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31670200, 31770587, 31872670, and 32071781), the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province, China (2016A030313320 and 2017A030313122), the Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangdong Province, China (2017A030303007), the Project of the Department of Science and Technology of Shenzhen City, Guangdong, China (JCYJ20160425165447211, JCYJ20170413155402977, JCYJ20170818155249053, and JCYJ20190813172001780), and the Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangzhou City, China (201804010389). The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Abdala-Roberts L, Marquis RJ (2007) Test of local adaptation to biotic interactions and soil abiotic conditions in the ant-tended *Chamaecrista fasciculata* (Fabaceae). Oecologia 154:315–326
- Akimoto K, Katakami H, Kim HJ, Ogawa E, Sano CM, Wada Y, Sano H (2007) Epigenetic inheritance in rice plants. Ann Bot 100:205–217
- Alberto F, Niort J, Derory J, Lepais O, Vitalis R, Galop D, Kremer A (2010) Population differentiation of sessile oak at the altitudinal front of migration in the French Pyrenees. Mol Ecol 19:2626–2639
- Angers B, Castonguay E, Massicotte R (2010) Environmentally induced phenotypes and DNA methylation: how to deal with unpredictable conditions until the next generation and after. Mol Ecol 19:1283–1295
- Arya SK, Roy BK (2011) Manganese induced changes in growth, chlorophyll content and antioxidants activity in seedlings of broad bean (*Vicia faba* L.). J Environ Biol 32:707–711
- Beaumont MA, Nichols RA (1996) Evaluating loci for use in the genetic analysis of population structure. Proc R Soc Lond Ser B: Biol Sci 263:1619–1626
- Behera SK, Shukla AK, Prakash C, Tripathi A, Kumar A, Trivedi V (2020) Establishing management zones of soil sulfur and micronutrients for sustainable crop production. Land Degrad Dev 2020:1–12
- Bharti K, Pandey N, Shankhdhar D, Srivastava PC, Shankhdhar SC (2013) Evaluation of some promising wheat genotypes (*Triticum aestivum* L.) at different zinc regimes for crop production. Cereal Res Commun 41:539–549
- Blignaut M, Ellis AG, Le Roux JJ (2013) Towards a transferable and cost-effective plant AFLP protocol. PLoS ONE 8:e61704
- Bonnet M, Camares O, Veisseire P (2000) Effects of zinc and influence of *Acremonium lolii* on growth parameters, chlorophyll a fluorescence and antioxidant enzyme activities of ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L. cv Apollo). J Exp Bot 51:945–953
- Bossdorf O, Richards CL, Pigliucci M (2008) Epigenetics for ecologists. Ecol Lett 11:106–115
- Bradbury PJ, Zhang Z, Kroon DE, Casstevens TM, Ramdoss Y, Buckler ES (2007) TASSEL: software for association mapping of complex traits in diverse samples. Bioinformatics 23:2633–2635
- Caballero A, Quesada H, Rolan-Alvarez E (2008) Impact of amplified fragment length polymorphism size homoplasy on the estimation of population genetic diversity and the detection of selective loci. Genet 179:539–554
- Cakmak I (2000) Role of zinc in protecting plant cells from reactive oxygen species. New Phytol 146:185–205
- Chen BM, Su JQ, Liao HX, Peng SL (2018) A greater foraging scale, not a higher foraging precision, may facilitate invasion by exotic plants in nutrient-heterogeneous conditions. Ann Bot 121:561–569
- Cherif J, Mediouni C, Ammar WB, Jemal F (2011) Interactions of zinc and cadmium toxicity in their effects on growth and in antioxidative systems in tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum*). J Environ Sci 23:837–844

- Collins WJ, Bellouin N, Doutriaux-Boucher M, Gedney N, Halloran P, Hinton T, Hughes J, Jones CD, Joshi M, Liddicoat S, Martin G, O'Connor F, Rae J, Senior C, Sitch S, *et al.* (2011) Development and evaluation of an earth-system model–HadGEM2. Geosci Model Dev 4:997–1062
- Concilio A, Chen JQ, Ma S, North M (2009) Precipitation drives interannual variation in summer soil respiration in a Mediterranean-climate, mixedconifer forest. Clim Change 92:109–122
- Corre VL, Kremer A (2012) The genetic differentiation at quantitative trait loci under local adaptation. Mol Ecol 21:1548–1566
- Crawford KM, Whitney KD (2010) Population genetic diversity influences colonization success. Mol Ecol 19:1253–1263
- Davidson AM, Jennions M, Nicotra AB (2011) Do invasive species show higher phenotypic plasticity than native species and, if so, is it adaptive? A metaanalysis. Ecol Lett 14:419–31
- Dlugosch KM, Parker IM (2008) Founding events in species invasions: genetic variation, adaptive evolution, and the role of multiple introductions. Mol Ecol 17:431–449
- Doncheva S, Georgieva K, Vassileva V, Stoyanova Z, Popov N, Ignatov G (2005) Effects of succinate on manganese toxicity in pea plants. J Plant Nutr 28:47–62
- Dubin JM, Zhang P, Meng DZ, Remigereau MS, Osborne EJ, Paolo CF, Drewe P, Kahles A, Jean G, Vilhjálmsson B, Jagoda J, Irez S, Voronin V, Song Q, Long Q, *et al.* (2015) DNA methylation in *Arabidopsis* has a genetic basis and shows evidence of local adaptation. eLife 4:e05255
- Epple P, Mack AA, Morris VRF, Dangl JL (2003) Antagonistic control of oxidative stress-induced cell death in *Arabidopsis* by two related, plant-specific zinc finger proteins. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 100:6831–6836
- Eveno E, Collada C, Guevara MA, Léger V, Soto A, Díaz L, Léger P, González-Martínez SC, Cervera MT, Plomion C, Garnier-Géré PH (2008) Contrasting patterns of selection at *Pinus pinaster* Ait. drought stress candidate genes as revealed by genetic differentiation analyses. Mol Biol Evol 25:417–437
- Excoffier L, Lischer HEL (2010) Arlequin suite ver 3.5: a new series of programs to perform population genetics analyses under Linux and Windows. Mol Ecol Resour 10:564
- Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK (2007) Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data: dominant markers and null alleles. Mol Ecol Notes 7:574–578
- Fischer DG, Whitham TG (2014) Plant genetic effects on soils under climate change. Plant Soil 379:1–19
- Foll M, Gaggiotti OA (2008) Genome-scan method to identify selected loci appropriate for both dominant and codominant markers: a bayesian perspective. Genetics 180:977–993
- Foust CM, Preite V, Schrey AW, Alvarez M, Robertson MH, Verhoeven KJF, Richards CL (2016) Genetic and epigenetic differences associated with environmental gradients in replicate populations of two salt marsh perennials. Mol Ecol 25:1639–1652
- Gao LX, Geng YP, Li B, Chen JK, Yang J (2010) Genome-wide DNA methylation alterations of Alternanthera philoxeroides in natural and manipulated habitats: implications for epigenetic regulation of rapid responses to environmental fluctuation and phenotypic variation. Plant Cell Environ 33:1820– 1827
- Geng S, Chen Q, Cai W, Cao A, Ouyang C (2017) Genetic variation in the invasive weed *Mikania micrantha* (Asteraceae) suggests highways as corridors for its dispersal in Southern China. Ann Bot 119:457–464
- Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD (2011) PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. Palaeontol Electronica 4:4-9
- Hancock AM, Brachi B, Faure N, Horton MW, Jarymowycz LB, Sperone FG, Toomajian C, Roux F, Bergelson J (2011). Adaptation to climate across the *Arabidopsis thaliana* genome. Science 334:83–86
- Hardy OJ, Vekemans X (2002) SPAGeDi: a versatile computer program to analyse spatial genetic structure at the individual or population levels. Mol Ecol Notes 2:618–620
- Hashem IA, Abbas AY, El-Hamed AEHA, Salem HMS, El-Hosseiny OEM, Abdel-Salam MA, Saleem MH, Zhou WB, Hu RG (2020) Potential of rice straw biochar, sulfur and ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.) in remediating soil contaminated with nickel through irrigation with untreated wastewater. PeerJ 8:e9267

- Henderson IR, Jacobsen SE (2007) Epigenetic inheritance in plants. Nature 447:418-424
- Herrera CM, Bazaga P (2010) Epigenetic differentiation and relationship to adaptive genetic divergence in discrete populations of the violet *Viola cazorlensis*. New Phytol 187:867–876
- Herrera-Estrella L, López-Arredondo D (2016) Phosphorus: the underrated element for feeding the world. Trends Plant Sci 21:461–463
- Ho ML, Patrick YKY, Stephen CWS, Chi KA, Kwai CC, Ka LC, Kin LKY, Wai CL (2019) The potential of *Mikania micrantha* (Chinese creeper) to hyperaccumulate heavy metals in soil contaminated by electronic waste. Environ Sci Pollut Res 26:35275–35280
- Hong L, Pan X, Hu X, Shen H, Xu X (2006) Comparative study on the morphological structure of the root of *Mikania micrantha*, an invasive weed. J Chin Electron Microsc Soc 25:259–260
- Hu L, Li MG, Wei PP (2014) Salt tolerance of the invasive vine *Mikania micrantha* Kunth. Ecol Environ Sci 23:7–15
- Huang Z (2004) Interactions between cadmium and phosphorus, zinc, iron, calcium and their ecological effects. Chin J Ecol 1:92–97
- Jones PA (2012) Functions of DNA methylation: islands, start sites, gene bodies and beyond. Nat Rev Genet 13:484–492
- Joost S, Bonin A, Bruford MW, Després L, Conord C, Erhardt G, Taberlet P (2007) A spatial analysis method (SAM) to detect candidate loci for selection: towards a landscape genomics approach to adaptation. Mol Ecol 16:3955–3969
- Jump AS, Hunt JM, Martinez-Izquierdo JA, Peñuelas J (2006) Natural selection and climate change: temperature-linked spatial and temporal trends in gene frequency in *Fagus sylvatica*. Mol Ecol 15:3469–3480
- Keller ET, Lasky RJ, Yi VS (2016) The multivariate association between genomewide DNA methylation and climate across the range of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Mol Ecol 25:1823–1837
- Keller SR, Levsen N, Olson MS, Tiffin P (2012) Local adaptation in the flowering-time gene network of balsam poplar, *Populus balsamifera* L. Mol Biol Evol 29:3143–3152
- Kim NS, Im MJ, Nkongolo K (2016) Determination of DNA methylation associated with Acer rubrum (red maple) adaptation to metals: analysis of global DNA modifications and methylation-sensitive amplified polymorphism. Ecol Evol 6:5749–5760
- Lachmuth S, Durka W, Schurr FM (2010) The making of a rapid plant invader: genetic diversity and differentiation in the native and invaded range of *Senecio inaequidens*. Mol Ecol 19:3952–3967
- Lechowicz, MJ, Bell G (1991) The ecology and genetics of fitness in forest plants. II. Microspatial heterogeneity of the edaphic environment. Jour Ecol 79: 687–696
- Leung HM, Yue PYK, Sze SCW, Au CK, Cheung KC, Chan4 KL, Yung KLK, Li WC (2019) The potential of *Mikania micrantha* (Chinese creeper) to hyperaccumulate heavy metals in soil contaminated by electronic waste. Environ Sci Pollut Res 26:35275–35280
- Lin Y, Gao J (2005) Nickel toxicity of rice seedlings: cell wall peroxidase, lignin, and NiSO4-inhibited root growth. Crop Environ Biol Inf 2:131– 136
- Ma JW, Geng SL, Wang SB, Zhang GL, Fu WD, Shu B (2011) Genetic diversity of the newly invasive weed *Flaveria bidentis* (Asteraceae) reveals consequences of its rapid range expansion in northern China. Weed Res 51: 363–372
- Macel M, Lawson CS, Mortimer SR, Šmilauerova M, Bischoff A, Crémieux L, Doležal J, Andrew R (2007) Climate vs. soil factors in local adaptation of two common plant species. Ecol 88:424–433
- Manel S, Williams H C, Ormerod SJ (2001) Evaluating presence-absence models in ecology: the need to account for prevalence. J Appl Ecol, 38:921–931
- Matesanz S, Gianoli E, Valladares F (2010) Global change and the evolution of phenotypic plasticity in plants: global change and plasticity. Ann NY Acad Sci 1206:35–55
- Meyer CL, Vitalis R, Saumitou-Laprade P, Castric V (2009) Genomic pattern of adaptive divergence in *Arabidopsis halleri*, a model species for tolerance to heavy metal. Mol Ecol 18:2050–2062
- Mishra D, Kar M (1974) Nickel in plant growth and metabolism. Bot Rev 40:395-452

- Monty A, Bizoux JP, Escarré J, Mahy G (2013) Rapid plant invasion in distinct climates involves different sources of phenotypic variation. PLoS ONE 8: e55627
- Mosca E, Eckert AJ, Pierro EAD, Rocchini D, Porta NL, Belletti P, Neale DB (2012) The geographical and environmental determinants of genetic diversity for four alpine conifers of the European Alps. Mol Ecol 21:5530–5545
- Ni P, Li SG, Lin YP, Xiong W, Huang XN, Zhan AB (2018) Methylation divergence of invasive *Ciona* ascidians: Significant population structure and local environmental influence. Ecol Evol 8:10272–10287
- Nosil P, Egan SP, Funk DJ (2007) Heterogeneous genomic differentiation between walking-stick ecotypes: "isolation by adaptation" and multiple roles for divergent selection. Evolution 62:316–336
- Peakall R, Smouse PE (2012) GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. Bioinformatics 28: 2537–2539
- Phillips SJ, Anderson RP, Schapire RE (2006) Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. Ecol Model 190:231–259
- Piotrowska-Dlugosz A, Siwik-Ziomek A, Dlugosz J, Gozdowski D (2017) Spatio-temporal variability of soil sulfur content and arylsulfatase activity at a conventionally managed arable field. Geoderma 295:108–118
- Poncet BN, Herrmann D, Gugerli F, Taberlet P, Holderegger R, Gielly L, Rioux D, Thuiller W, Aubert S, Manel S (2010) Tracking genes of ecological relevance using a genome scan in two independent regional population samples of *Arabis alpina*. Mol Ecol 19:2896–2907
- Porebski S, Bailey LG, Baum BR (1997) Modification of a CTAB DNA extraction protocol for plants containing high polysaccharide and polyphenol components. Plant Mol Biol Rep 15:8–15
- Prunier J, Gerardi S, Laroche J, Beaulieu J, Bousquet J (2012) Parallel and lineage-specific molecular adaptation to climate in boreal black spruce. Mol Ecol 21:4270–4286
- Quintela-Sabarís C, Ribeiro MM, Poncet B, Costa R, CastroFernández D, Fraga MI (2012) AFLP analysis of the pseudometallophyte *Cistus ladanifer*: comparison with cpSSRs and exploratory genome scan to investigate loci associated to soil variables., Plant Soil 359:397–413
- Richards CL, Alonso C, Becker C, r O, Bucher E, Colomé-Tatché M (2017) Ecological plant epigenetics: evidence from model and non-model species, and the way forward. Ecol Lett 20:1576–1590
- Riechmann JL, Heard J, Martin G, Reuber L, Jiang C, Keddie J, Adam L, Pineda O, Ratcliffe OJ, Samaha RR, Creelman R, Pilgrim M, Broun P, Zhang JZ, Ghandehari D, *et al.* (2000) *Arabidopsis* transcription factors: genome-wide comparative analysis among eukaryotes. Science 290:2105–2110
- Salmon A, Clotault J, Jenczewski E, Chable V, Manzanares-Dauleux MJ (2008) Brassica oleracea displays a high level of DNA methylation polymorphism. Plant Sci 174:61–70
- Savolainen O, Pyhäjärvi T, Knürr T (2007) Gene flow and local adaptation in trees. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst 38:595–619
- Schulz B, Eckstein RL, Durka W (2013) Scoring and analysis of methylationsensitive amplification polymorphisms for epigenetic population studies. Mol Ecol Resour 13:642–653
- Shenker M, Plessner OE, Tel-Or E (2004) Manganese nutrition effects on tomato growth, chlorophyll concentration, and superoxide dismutase activity. J Plant Physiol 161:197–202
- Sheoran IS, Singal HR, Singh R (1990) Effect of cadmium and nickel on photosynthesis and the enzymes of the photosynthetic carbon reduction cycle in pigeonpea (*Cajanus cajan* L.). Photosynth Res 23:345–351
- Shi W, Chen X, Gao L, Xu CY, Ou X, Bossdorf O, Yang J, Geng Y (2019) Transient stability of epigenetic population differentiation in a clonal invader. Front Plant Sci 9:1851
- Smouse PE, Long JC, Sokal RR (1986) Multiple regression and correlation extensions of the Mantel test of matrix correspondence. Syst Zool 35:627
- Steane DA, Potts BM, Mclean E, Collins L, Prober SM, Stock WD, Vaillancourt RE, Byrne M (2015) Genome-wide scans reveal cryptic population structure in a dry-adapted eucalypt. Tree Genet Genomes 11:33
- Stucki S, Orozco-Terwengel P, Forester BR, Duruz S, Colli L, Masembe C, Negrini R, Landguth E, Jones MR, The Nextgen Consortium, Bruford MW, Taberlet P, Joost S (2017) High performance computation of landscape genomic models including local indicators of spatial association. Mol Ecol Resour 17:1072–1089

- Swamy PS, Ramakrishnan PS (1987) Weed potential of *Mikania micrantha* HBK, and its control in fallows after shifting agriculture (Jhum) in North-East India. Agric Ecosyst Environ 18:195–204
- Swets JA (1988) Measuring the accuracy of diagnostic systems. Science 240:1285–1293
- Swofford DL (2001) PAUP*: phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (and other methods). Version 4. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer
- Tamura K, Steche G, Peterson D, Filipski A, Kumar S (2013) MEGA6: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis version 6.0. Mol Biol Evol 30: 2725–2729
- Tang SQ, Wei F, Zeng LY, Li XK, Tang SC, Zhong Y, Geng YP (2009) Multiple introductions are responsible for the disjunct distributions of invasive *Parthenium hysterophorus* in China: evidence from nuclear and chloroplast DNA. Weed Res 49:373–380
- Thomson AM, Calvin KV, Smith SJ, G. Kyle GP, Volke A, Patel P, Delgado-Arias S, Bond-Lamberty B, Wise MA, Clarke LE, Edmonds JA (2011) RCP4.5: a pathway for stabilization of radiative forcing by 2100. Clim Change 109:77–94
- Wang BS, Liao WB, Zan QJ, Li MG, Zhou XY, Gao SH (2003) The spread of *Micania micrantha* in China. Acta Sci Nat Univ Sunyatseni 42: 47–50
- Wang T, Chen GP, Zan QJ, Wang CB, Su YJ (2012) AFLP genome scan to detect genetic structure and candidate loci under selection for local adaptation of the invasive weed *Mikania micrantha*. PLoS ONE 7:e41310

- Wen DZ, Ye WH, Feng HL, Cai CX (2000) Comparison of basic photosynthetic characteristics between exotic invader weed *Mikania micrantha* and its companion species. J Trop Subtrop Bot 8:139–146
- Xu G, Shen S, Zhang F (2014) Adaptability and reproductive characteristics of *Mikania micrantha* H.B.K. under different habitats. Ecol Environ Sci 23:1258–1264
- Xu G, Shen S, Zhang F, Li T, Zhang Y (2013) Effect of soil-water conditions on survival rate and morphological plasticity of clonal plant *Mikania micrantha* H.B.Kunth. Sci Agric Sin 46:3134–3141
- Yakovlev AI, Asante KAD, Carl FG, Junttila O, Johnsen Ø (2011) Differential gene expression related to an epigenetic memory affecting climatic adaptation in Norway spruce. Plant Sci 180:132–139
- Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Shinozaki K (2006) Transcriptional regulatory networks in cellular responses and tolerance to dehydration and cold stresses. Annu Rev Plant Biol 57:781–803
- Ye WH, Mu HP, Cao HL, Ge XJ (2004) Genetic structure of the invasive *Chromolaena odorata* in China. Weed Res 44:129–135
- Zhang LY, Ye WH, Cao HL, Feng HL (2004) *Mikania micrantha* H. B. K. in China—an overview. Weed Res 44:42–49
- Zhou Y, Wang Y (2013) Rapid and efficient recycling DNA fragments from non-denaturing polyacrylamide gel. Biotechnol Bull 1:194–198
- Zoldoš V, Biruš I, Muratović E, Šatović Z, Vojta A, Robin O, Pustahija F, Bogunic F, Vicic BV, Siljak-Yakovlev S (2018) Epigenetic differentiation of natural populations of *Lilium bosniacum* associated with contrasting habitat conditions. Genome Biol Evol 10:291–303