AVIAN BIOLOGY

Acoustic, genetic, and morphological analysis of the Canarian common chaffinch complex (Fringilla coelebs ssp.) reveals a cryptic diversification process

Journal:	Journal of Avian Biology
Manuscript ID	JAV-01885.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Article
Keywords:	Avian radiation, Incipient speciation, Integrative taxonomy
Abstract:	The common chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs) is the extant avian species with the highest level of differentiation across North Atlantic archipelagos. Such a degree of diversification has been traditionally recognised within the subspecies category, with one endemic subspecies occurring in Azores (F. c. moreletti), one in Madeira (F. c. maderensis), and three in the Canary Islands (F. c. canariensis, F. c. palmae and F. c. ombriosa). Recent genetic, acoustic, and sperm morphology studies informed us about the significant differentiation of the Gran Canaria population, which is traditionally included within F. c. canariensis subspecies. The goal of this study is to examine the similarity of the Canarian chaffinches, with the objective of determining if the Gran Canaria chaffinches represent an isolated and distinct population. In order to achieve this aim, we used a double approach: (1) we analysed new morphological and genetic data from the Canary Islands, and (2) we reviewed and synthesised the vast acoustic, morphological and genetic information available for these taxa in Macaronesia, with special emphasis on the Canary Islands. Genetic, acoustic, and sperm morphological data, and to a lesser extent phenotypic data, strongly support the existence of a cryptic taxon in Gran Canaria. Moreover, our findings also reveal an incipient speciation process on going in the Canary Islands, mostly driven by genetic differentiation. Overall, our synthesis suggests that individuals occurring in Gran Canaria should be considered as a novel taxon that we formally described as Fringilla canariensis bakeri ssp. nov.

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

5 Abstract

The common chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs) is the extant avian species with the highest 6 7 level of differentiation across North Atlantic archipelagos. Such a degree of 8 diversification has been traditionally recognised within the subspecies category, with 9 one endemic subspecies occurring in Azores (F. c. moreletti), one in Madeira (F. c. 10 maderensis), and three in the Canary Islands (F. c. canariensis, F. c. palmae and F. c. 11 ombriosa). Recent genetic, acoustic, and sperm morphology studies informed us about 12 the significant differentiation of the Gran Canaria population, which is traditionally 13 included within F. c. canariensis subspecies. The goal of this study is to examine the similarity of the Canarian chaffinches, with the objective of determining if the Gran 14 15 Canaria chaffinches represent an isolated and distinct population. In order to achieve this aim, we used a double approach: (1) we analysed new morphological and genetic 16 data from the Canary Islands, and (2) we reviewed and synthesised the vast acoustic. 17 morphological and genetic information available for these taxa in Macaronesia, with 18 special emphasis on the Canary Islands. Genetic, acoustic, and sperm morphological 19 20 data, and to a lesser extent phenotypic data, strongly support the existence of a cryptic taxon in Gran Canaria. Moreover, our findings also reveal an incipient speciation 21 22 process on going in the Canary Islands, mostly driven by genetic differentiation. 23 Overall, our synthesis suggests that individuals occurring in Gran Canaria should be 24 considered as a novel taxon that we formally described as Fringilla canariensis bakeri 25 ssp. nov.

Key words: Avian radiation, Gran Canaria, *Fringilla coelebs bakeri*, incipient
speciation, integrative taxonomy, island biogeography, Macaronesia.

28

29 Introduction

Oceanic islands support high levels of speciation events due to the role of founder 30 events, drift, mutation, limited gene flow, and selection acting on a small contingent of 31 32 colonisers over time (Emerson 2002, Grant and Grant 2008). Such divergence events have produced a plethora of forms and colours that taxonomists have frequently 33 34 described and classified as distinct taxa. Different types of information have been used 35 to understand the origin and variation of biodiversity, for instance, biometry (e.g. Grant 36 1979a, 1979b, Dennison and Baker 1991), acoustic (e.g. Lynch and Baker 1990, Päckert et al. 2006, Tietze et al. 2015), genetic (e.g. Avise 2000, Alström et al. 2015, Stervander 37 et al. 2015), or a combination of methods (Illera et al. 2014). However, cryptic 38 39 differentiation, that is, species evolving similar morphologies, makes the correct identification of unique taxa difficult, which increases the risk of underestimating 40 biodiversity (Padial et al. 2010; Fišer et al. 2018). 41

42 The Canary Islands are an oceanic archipelago situated about 100 and 460 km from the African mainland. The archipelago consists of seven principal volcanic islands 43 44 with a well studied variation of geological ages increasing towards the African continent. El Hierro appears as the youngest island (1 Mya) and Fuerteventura as the 45 46 oldest (~ 20 Mya). The Canary Islands harbour a high number of terrestrial endemic 47 species, making this archipelago one of the most important centres for biodiversity in 48 the temperate region (Juan et al. 2000, Illera et al. 2012). As an example, the more than 49 150 native land vertebrate taxa inhabiting the archipelago, 21 (13%) are endemic (Arechavaleta et al. 2010). This value is even higher considering the plants where the 50 51 endemic taxa (> 550 species) represent around 40% of the native flora (Francisco-Ortega et al. 2000). In relation to extant breeding birds, six species and more than 30 52 subspecies are endemics (Illera et al. 2012, 2016), while considering the extant and 53

extinct species the number is much higher (Illera et al. 2012, 2016). Interestingly, the 54 Canarian birds have recently provided several examples of cryptic differentiation. For 55 instance, four subspecies of the Canarian blue tit (*Cyanistes teneriffae*) had traditionally 56 been recognised in the Canary Islands based on morphology, plumage and song (Martín 57 and Lorenzo 2001). However, Kvist et al. (2005) provided significant genetic 58 59 divergences not only among the classical subspecies but also between Gran Canaria and the remaining populations. Such differences were used three years later to support the 60 61 description of a new subspecies in Gran Canaria (Dietzen et al. 2008). Indeed, with such a level of differentiation in all Canarian blue tit subspecies have been suggested that 62 63 each is treated as a full species (Sangster 2006, Illera et al. 2016). The goldcrest (*Regulus regulus*) provides another interesting case of cryptic differentiation. Päckert 64 and colleagues (2006) studied the acoustic, morphology and genetics of the goldcrests 65 in Macaronesia. They found an unforeseen colonisation pattern with two distinct 66 lineages within the Canary Islands, suggesting two independent waves of colonisation 67 from the Iberian Peninsula. Such findings supported the description of a new subspecies 68 (R. r. ellenthalerae), occurring in the western islands of La Palma and El Hierro, 69 70 meanwhile the former subspecies (R. regulus teneriffae) inhabits the islands of Tenerife and La Gomera. In addition, similar scenarios have been documented to occur with the 71 72 robin (Erithacus rubecula), and the blue chaffinch (Fringilla teydea) in the Canary 73 Islands (Dietzen et al. 2003, 2015, Lifjeld et al. 2016, Sangster et al. 2016). Overall, all 74 these results show an interesting pattern at species level of independent but repeated bouts of colonisation from the continental areas to the Canaries, with subsequent 75 processes of genetic isolation (and sometimes of extinction) producing new taxa over 76 77 time. According to these results, it seems clear that the avian Canarian taxonomy needs to be reshuffled using unambiguous, diagnostic and independent traits (Illera et al.2016).

80 The common chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs) has been one of the species most 81 intensively studied using molecular tools in Macaronesia. The pioneer study carried out 82 by Baker et al. (1990) using protein electrophoresis of 42 loci found support for two 83 genetic groups within the Canary Islands. One of them would occur on the western 84 islands of El Hierro and La Palma, and the other on Tenerife, La Gomera and Gran 85 Canaria. Nonetheless, the first comprehensive phylogeographic study to understand the 86 evolutionary history of this taxon in Macaronesia was performed by Marshall and Baker (1999). These authors using nucleotide sequences of four mitochondrial genes revealed 87 88 an unforeseen colonisation pathway from north to south in a stepping stone mode starting in Azores and ending in Gran Canaria Island (Figure 1). In addition, Marshall 89 90 and Baker (1999) found a strong genetic structure among the three Macaronesian archipelagos where the common chaffinch occurs, suggesting long periods of isolation 91 92 mostly without gene flow. This finding has been also confirmed in a subsequent 93 multilocus approach using both mitochondrial and nuclear genes (Samarasin-Dissanayake 2010, Rodrigues et al. 2014). Recently, Suárez and co-workers (2009) 94 studying the genetic structure of the common chaffinch in the Canary Islands found an 95 unexpected result in Gran Canaria. These authors showed a strong genetic structure in 96 97 Gran Canaria, which was compatible with a subspecific rank.

In addition to the molecular markers, the evolutionary biology of this passerine has been repeatedly analysed according to morphological, sperm length, and acoustic datasets (Grant 1979b, Dennison and Baker 1991, Lynch and Baker 1994, Marshall and Baker 1999, Rando et al. 2010, Stensrud 2012). Interesting, in a recent study analysing the loss of acoustic variability along the pathway of colonisation in Macaronesia,

Lachlan et al. (2013) provided evidence of a significant loss of syllable sequencing 103 104 within songs in the Gran Canaria chaffinches, which makes this song distinctive from any other Canarian chaffinch population. However, much of this information, and the 105 interpretation of these findings, is tackled on individual traits, which limits the general 106 understanding of the evolutionary consequences of experiencing long periods of 107 108 isolation. In addition, there is mixed evidence of how morphology can be used to 109 discriminate common chaffinches, and when the genetic divergence occurred within the 110 Canary Islands. Such information is also necessary to reshuffle the taxonomy of this passerine within the Canary Islands. With these precedents, our main goal is to 111 scrutinize whether the Gran Canarian birds can be characterised and identified by 112 multiple traits. To achieve this aim we will use published information, but also new 113 morphological and genetic data to re-analyse and re-evaluate the similarity of the 114 Canarian common chaffinches. Our analysis will show that the common chaffinch in 115 Gran Canaria is a distinguishable population from other Canarian populations from 116 genetic and acoustic perspectives, and to a lesser extent from phenotypic characteristics, 117 representing a new case of cryptic differentiation in the Canary Islands. Our final aim is 118 119 to perform a formal taxonomic description of this novel taxon, and discuss the evolutionary implications of such a radiation in the Canary Islands. 120

121 Material and Methods

122 The species

The common chaffinch with five subspecies described provides the best example of diversification within extant land birds in Macaronesia (Illera et al. 2016; Figure 1). The species is distributed from Europe to the North of Africa, including three Macaronesian archipelagos (Azores, Madeira and the Canary Islands). At present between 15 to 18 subspecies are recognised (Cramp and Perrins 1994, Clement 2018), with one endemic

subspecies per Macaronesian archipelago, except in the Canary Islands where three 128 endemic subspecies are traditionally recognised (Martín and Lorenzo 2001). Azorean 129 populations show no significant morphological (Grant 1979b, Dennison and Baker 130 1991) or genetic (Baker et al. 1990; Samarasin-Dissanayake 2010, Rodrigues et al. 131 2014) differentiation among islands, and they are routinely grouped in a single 132 133 subspecies F. c. moreletti Pucheran, 1859. Such a result is compatible with high levels of gene flow among populations (Rodrigues et al. 2014), which contrasts with the 134 135 significant levels of mutation rates in the song memes found among populations (Lynch and Baker 1994). In Madeira the species only breeds on the Madeira Island with the 136 exclusive subspecies F. c. maderensis Sharpe, 1888. Finally, in the Canary Islands the 137 species occurs in the central and western islands being absent from the eastern islands 138 (Lanzarote and Fuerteventura). Three Canarian subspecies were described according to 139 their phenotypic differences: F. c. palmae Tristram, 1889 on La Palma, F. c. ombriosa 140 Hartert, 1913 on El Hierro, and F. c. canariensis Vieillot, 1817 on Gran Canaria, 141 Tenerife and La Gomera islands (Cramp and Perrins 1994, Martín and Lorenzo 2001). 142

Macaronesian chaffinches have in general shorter and rounded wings, and longer 143 tarsus and bills than continental populations (Grant 1979b). Colour pattern also differs 144 between mainland and oceanic island populations. Thus, like in European populations, 145 cheek front part is ochre, but it is still dark bluish on the side of the head and neck. 146 147 Canarian male chaffinches have an intense blue colour on the back. However, they show a variable extension of reddish-orange-pinkish colour on the breast, which differs 148 149 from the greenish-brownish back of African chaffinches (F. c. africana/spodiogenys) (Corso et al. 2015; Figure 1) and from the ochre-greyish back of European subspecies 150 (F. c. coelebs) (see Cramp and Perrins 1994, and references therein). White on tail and 151

- 152 wings is less extensive, especially the lower wing bar, compared to F. c. coelebs, and
- the white wing-bars are less extensive, especially the lower bar (Figure 1).
- 154 Morphological analyses
- 155 *a)* Skeletal measurements

Dennison and Baker (1991) studied morphological variances in the Macaronesian 156 finches using skeletal measurements (after skeleton preparation) of fresh individuals. 157 They found that Canarian populations are morphologically less variable than Azorean 158 finches, with no significant morphological differentiation within the Canary Islands. 159 However, our own measurements obtained from live individuals caught in different 160 ringing sessions across the five islands suggested conspicuous morphological 161 differences among populations (J.C. Illera unpublished data). Thus, we decided to take 162 morphological measurements from the same individuals (i.e. skeletons) used by 163 Dennison and Baker (1991). 164

165 In total, we measured 110 adult male Canarian chaffinches from 5 islands (El Hierro, La Palma, La Gomera, Tenerife and Gran Canaria) stored at Royal Ontario 166 Museum (Supplementary Table 1). We took measurements from 10 skeletal traits 167 (Table 1, Figure 4). Bones were photographed with a Nikon 3200 digital camera on a 168 graphic paper measured in millimetres, and measurements were scored using the 169 program ImageJ version 1.45s (Rasband 1997). Bones were systematically placed in the 170 same position on the graphic paper and photographed by the same person (JCI) in order 171 to standardise the measurements taken. 172

Length differences among the Canarian common chaffinches were analysed through
two (cranial and postcranial variables) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).
In addition, we explored variation in the morphological traits performing two Principal

176 Component Analysis (PCA), one with cranial (i.e. head and bill) measurements (traits 1177 5), and the other with postcranial lengths (traits 6-10). We performed the statistical
178 analyses using the software SPSS, version 15.0.

179 *b) Plumage characters*

- 180 We roughly compared the external appearance of the Canarian common chaffinch males
- 181 belonging to the same subspecies (*Fringilla coelebs canariensis*), that is, populations
- 182 from Gran Canaria, Tenerife and La Gomera. We focused our analysis on the R4 tail
- 183 feather because was the only tail feather with some kind of conspicuous variation for the
- 184 white colour between some islands (S-Figure 1). We grouped individuals into two
- 185 categories: 1) R4 with 0-3 mm tipped white, 2) R4 with \geq 4 mm tipped white. We
- 186 performed a contingency table analysis to investigate the association of each population
- 187 to these categories.
- 188 *Genetic differentiation*

Rando et al. (2010) and Valente et al. (2017) estimated time of colonisation and 189 diversification of common chaffinches in Macaronesia using mitochondrial DNA 190 dating. However, these authors did not consider time of diversification within the 191 Canarian subspecies. Thus, we estimated time of diversification of each subspecies 192 193 and/or group of islands using the program BEAST version 1.8.1 (Drummond et al. 194 2012). We used the same alignment provided by Rando et al. (2010), adding six new sequences obtained from Gran Canaria (Genbank accession numbers: MH170890-5, 195 Supplementary Table 2). 196

We extracted DNA from tissues stored at -80 °C, following Malagó's et al. (2002) protocol. We carried out PCR reactions in a 12.5 μ l volume, with a buffer consisting of 10 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.3, 2.5 mM MgCl2, 50 mM KCl, 0.2 mM dNTPs, 0.5 μ M of the primers b1 (Kocher et al. 1989) and b6 (Morris-Pocock et al. 2010), and

0.25 U Taq polymerase (Invitrogen). We performed PCRs with an initial denaturation 201 for 1 minute at 94°C, followed by 36 cycles of 45 seconds at 94°C, 45 seconds at 52°C, 202 60 seconds at 72°C, and a final extension for 2 minutes at 72°C. PCR products were 203 separated on 2% agarose gels. Amplicons were recovered from the agarose gel using 204 pipet tip centrifugation (Dean and Greenwald 1995) and sequenced with the primers b1 205 206 and b6, as well as with a nested primer b3 (Morris-Pocock et al. 2010) using ABI 207 BigDye v.3.1 chemistry. The sequenced products were run on an ABI 3730 Genetic 208 Analyzer (Life Technologies).

209 We ran the Bayesian time-tree analyses only using common chaffinch sequences, that is, excluding all outgroups. We proceeded in this way because 210 211 outgroups usually provide long branches and are less sampled than ingroups, which could bias the divergence time estimates (Drummond and Bouckaert 2015). We inferred 212 the most appropriated nucleotide substitution model (HKY + G) from the program 213 JModelTest version 2.1.4 (Darriba et al. 2012). We used a strict molecular clock, and 214 defined the rate prior to have a mean of 0.01 and standard deviation of 0.0075 215 substitutions per site per million years (Illera et al. 2008). We used a Yule tree prior 216 following the recommendation of Drummond and Bouckaert (2015), since our analyses 217 included sequences from populations with deep divergences. We conducted two 218 219 independent MCMC analyses of 50,000,000 steps, with a burn-in of 5,000,000 steps. 220 We assessed the convergence of MCMCs with TRACER v.1.6 (Rambaut et al. 2014).

We used the program MEGA version 7.0 (Kumar et al. 2016) to obtain the uncorrected pairwise genetic distances among populations. Finally, Suárez et al. (2009) inferred the genetic structure within the Canarian common chaffinches, but they did not consider the remaining Macaronesian and continental chaffinches. Thus, we built a haplotype network using Macaronesian and nearby continental cytochrome b sequences

226	(Supplementary Table 2) to track the connections among and within common
227	chaffinches using the software TCS version 1.21 (Clement et al. 2000). We performed
228	the analysis fixing a limit of connection to 94%. Missing data or gaps were considered
229	as a fifth state.

230 **Results**

- 231 Morphological differentiation
- 232 a) Cranial morphology

The MANOVA performed with skull and bill measurements (traits 1-5) identified 233 significant morphological differences among the Canarian common chaffinches (Wilk's 234 Lambda = 0.11; d.f. = 20, 209; p < 0.001). These differences were identified for all 235 traits except premaxilla width (trait 1) (F = 1.33; p = 0.27). Significant differences 236 found in premaxilla height were due to La Gomera chaffinches. This population showed 237 the highest premaxilla height with all comparisons being significant (p < 0.015). 238 239 However, there were no significant differences among the remaining populations (p > 1(0.12). In addition, the common chaffinches from La Gomera showed the longest head 240 241 and mandible of all Canarian populations (p < 0.002 for all comparisons). We did not find any significant differences in any trait between Gran Canaria and Tenerife (p > 0.1242 for all traits). Finally, La Palma and El Hierro showed significant differences only in the 243 mandible length (p = 0.01). 244

The PCA performed with skull and bill measurements (traits 1-5) produced two principal components explaining 76.5% of the total variance. PC1 explained 60.3%, and showed a high positive weighting for traits 2-5 (premaxilla height, skull length, mandible length and width), and a moderate positive weighting for premaxilla width (trait 1). PC2 explained 16.2% of the variance and showed a high positive weighting for

250	premaxilla width, and a negative weighting for traits 2-5 (Figure 2a). PC1 plot depicted
251	all La Gomera individuals with values over zero being most of them segregated from
252	other islands (Figure 2a).

253 b) Post-cranial morphology

The postcranial MANOVA (traits 6-10) showed significant differences in all traits 254 among populations (Wilk's Lambda = 0.11; d.f.= 20, 203; p < 0.001). Such a result was 255 a consequence of significant differences found with any trait comparison between 256 Tenerife and Gran Canaria with the remaining islands (p < 0.005). However, we did not 257 find any significant differences between Tenerife and Gran Canaria (p > 0.25). 258

Postcranial PCA (traits 6-10) provided two principal components explaining 259 260 91% of the total variance. PC1 explained 80% of the total variance and showed a high positive weighting for all traits. PC2 explained the 11% of variance showing a negative 261 weighting for scapula, humerus and ulna lengths (traits 6-8), a moderate positive weight 262 263 for femur (trait 9) and a high positive weight for tarsometatarsus length (trait 10) 264 (Figure 2b). PC1 plot scored all Gran Canaria individuals and most from Tenerife under zero, whereas most birds from the remaining islands scored over zero. Thus, almost all 265 birds of both groups appear segregated on this axis (Figure 2b). 266

c) Plumage characters 267

273

268 The three populations of *Fringilla coelebs canariensis* (i.e. Gran Canaria, Tenerife and

269 La Gomera) are in appearance and size similar. However, significant differences are found at R4 tail feather. There is a highly significant association between the extension 270 of tipped white at R4 and the island ($\gamma_2^2 = 43.15$, P < 0.01). This result is explained 271 272 because males on Gran Canaria show a tiny white edges (81.5%, n = 22) or $\leq 3mm$ white spots (18.5%, n = 5), whereas, Tenerife and La Gomera populations develop a 274 clear tendency to show \geq 4mm extended white spots on R4 (S-Figure 1a). Such a

275 pattern is especially strong on common chaffinch males occurring in Tenerife (85%, n =

276 27) than in La Gomera (65%, n = 29) (S-Figure 1b, 1c).

277 Dating and genetic differentiation

The sequence divergence (i.e. percentage of base differences between sequences) 278 between Canarian common chaffinches subspecies, obtained from 46 sequences of 829 279 base pairs (bp) for the mtDNA cytochrome b (cyt-b) gene is as follows. Fringilla 280 coelebs bakeri (new subspecies from Gran Canaria) and F. c. canariensis (Tenerife and 281 La Gomera) differ between 0.72-1.21%. Meanwhile, the divergence between F. c. 282 bakeri and F. c. palmae/ombriosa (La Palma and El Hierro) ranged between 1.21-283 1.69% (Supplementary Table 3). The diagnostic characteristics (i.e. variable sites) in the 284 285 mitochondrial sequences are shown in Table 2.

286 The haplotype network showed a clear differentiation among archipelagos and the continental areas (Figure 3), which agrees with the pattern previously reported in 287 Macaronesia (Marshal and Baker 1999, Rando et al. 2010, Rodrigues et al. 2014). 288 Within the Canary Islands, our results also agree with the pattern found by Suárez et al. 289 290 (2009), and support a genetic structure determined by three distinctive nodes. One node includes all Gran Canaria sequences; another node is grouping sequences from Tenerife 291 292 and La Gomera and, finally, the third node clumps birds from La Palma and El Hierro (Figure 3). Population connections between the Canarian chaffinches and their 293 Macaronesian counterparts suggests a common ancestor to all of them. In addition, the 294 central islands of Tenerife and La Gomera appear directly connected with the remaining 295 common chaffinch populations. 296

297 Our dating shows slightly lower dates of colonisation and diversification of 298 common chaffinches in Macaronesia than was previously reported (Rando et al. 2010,

Valente et al. 2017). The age estimated for the colonisation of the extant common 299 300 finches in Macaronesia suggests that this species arrived in the Azores during the middle Pleistocene (824,000 years; 0.21-1.87 Mya, lower and upper 95% highest 301 302 posterior density values, respectively). Shortly after this event, chaffinches colonised Madeira (708,000 years; 0.18-1.62 Mya) and the Canary Islands (601,000 years; 0.17-303 304 1.38 Mya). The Gran Canarian population diverged from the remaining Canary Islands 305 approximately 493,000 years (0.13-1.11 Mya) ago. Meanwhile, Tenerife, La Gomera, 306 El Hierro and La Palma appear to have commenced their differentiation processes 383,000 (0.09-0.87 Mya) years ago. 307

308 Discussion

The family Fringillidae constitutes an iconic group for evolutionary biologists to study 309 310 avian speciation because of the high number of species raised by adaptive radiation and hybridisation (Grant and Grant, 2008; Price, 2008; Lamichhaney et al., 2018). In 311 Macaronesia, only the common chaffinch shows a moderate level of differentiation at 312 the subspecies level, and it is not possible to state whether such a differentiation process 313 314 is a consequence of selection (natural or sexual), or alternative evolutionary forces such as mutation, drift and founder effects (Spurgin et al. 2014, Illera et al. 2016, van Doren 315 316 et al. 2017). According to our results it is plausible to conclude that common 317 chaffinches in Gran Canaria are isolated from the remaining Canarian populations, that 318 is, there is no evidence of dispersal movements among islands. As result, Gran Canarian 319 common chaffinches are characterised by multiple distinctive traits. For all the aforementioned reasons, we conclude that the common chaffinch lineage in Gran 320 321 Canaria differs from other Canarian common chaffinches and should be ranked as a new taxon. The formal description is presented in the section taxonomic account. 322

323 *Genetic and morphological differentiation*

Delimiting a cryptic differentiation process is challenging because only few traits can 324 325 experience visible changes. Thus, the limited skeletal differentiation found within the Canary Islands suggests that changes on other less conspicuous traits such as the genetic 326 327 ones have been independently fixed and maintained on each population over time. The phenotypic similarities found among the Canarian populations could be a direct 328 329 consequence of homoplasious evolution among lineages, perhaps because birds are 330 experiencing similar environmental and sexual pressures across islands (Illera et al. 331 2014).

Our genetic results have provided robust evidence that, individuals from each 332 archipelago consistently group together, which suggests long isolation processes with 333 334 strong genetic differentiation on each archipelago. Strikingly, despite that Azores is composed by nine islands, which appear arranged along 600 kilometres (i.e. furthest 335 than the Canary Islands), our findings confirm that the genetic differentiation found in 336 the Canary Islands is deeper than in Azores (Suárez et al. 2009, Rando et al. 2010, 337 Rodrigues et al. 2014). Reasons to explain this pattern are unknown. However, it seems 338 plausible to suggest that such circumstance is a direct consequence of contemporary 339 gene flow, which would preclude genetic differentiation between the Azorean 340 341 populations (Rodrigues et al. 2014). The high chaffinch abundances reported in the 342 Azores in relation to the Canary Islands (Carrascal et al. 2008, Ceia et al. 2009) 343 supports this hypothesis. Thus, in the Azores, there could be a recurrent densitydependent dispersal process, perhaps mediated by competition among individuals 344 345 (Matthysen 2005). Under this scenario, common chaffinches inhabiting islands with high population densities could have developed a dispersal strategy to avoid competitive 346 interactions. In contrast, the lower abundances of common chaffinches recorded in the 347 348 Canary Islands could preclude a similar behaviour in this archipelago. The high genetic

differentiation found among some of the Canarian populations provides evidence for theexistence of limited gene flow.

Our findings support the pattern of three clades within the Canary Islands 351 352 (Suárez et al. 2009), where common chaffinches first came to the central islands of Tenerife and/or La Gomera. This result suggests that both populations have served as 353 the cradle of diversification of the Canarian common chaffinches and acted as source 354 355 for the western and Gran Canaria islands. Our estimates of colonisation and 356 diversification in the Canary Islands suggest that this process started 600,000 years ago, 357 with the longest period of isolation (>490,000 years) recorded for Gran Canaria. Previous studies reported the existence of strong genetic differentiation of some 358 359 passerine species occurring in Gran Canaria in relation to their Canarian counterparts (Pestano et al. 2000, Dietzen et al. 2003, 2008, Kvist et al. 2005, Padilla et al. 2015). 360 This recurrent pattern could be explained due to the geological age of Gran Canaria 361 (\approx 14 my old), which makes it the third oldest island in the Canaries (Fuerteventura and 362 Lanzarote are the oldest ones). Therefore, the ancient age of Gran Canaria has favoured 363 the genetic isolation and final differentiation in allopatry of many avian taxa there 364 inhabiting (Illera et al. 2012). 365

366 Our genetic findings agrees with the results obtained by Lachlan et al. (2013) 367 studying the acoustic differentiation within the common chaffinch, and Stensrud (2012) 368 analysing the sperm morphology. Lachlan et al. (2013) tested the degree of differentiation between the populations of Gran Canaria and Tenerife with an 369 experiment. They raised individuals from both islands in isolation conditions from birth, 370 and exposed them to songs from both islands and the mainland. Results showed the 371 highest responses when the call came from individuals belonging to the same island. 372 Such a result highlights two main ideas: 1) the acoustic characteristics in the common 373

374	finches were more inherited than learned, which is the reverse of patterns found in
375	oscines where song has a strong cultural component (Grant and Grant 2008), and 2)
376	Tenerife and Gran Canaria have a long history of isolation, which agrees with our
377	estimate of divergence. On the other hand, Stensrud (2012) found that Gran Canarian
378	finches showed the lowest sperm length on average, being significantly differentiated
379	from the remaining Canarian populations analysed, although with a high variance.
380	Again, Gran Canarian finches appeared clearly distinguishable from the remaining
381	populations.

Interestingly, morphological differences between individuals from large 382 (Tenerife and Gran Canaria) and small (La Gomera, El Hierro and La Palma) islands 383 384 match with the co-existence or absence of other Fringilla extant species, whose individuals show the largest cranial and postcranial trait values (Rando et al. 2010). 385 Thus, when common chaffinches co-exist in sympatry with the blue chaffinches in 386 Tenerife (F. teydea) and Gran Canaria (F. polatzeki), they do not show significant 387 morphological differences between them. However, when common chaffinches do not 388 co-occur with other finch species (i.e. El Hierro, La Palma and La Gomera) they show 389 larger scapula, humerus and ulna values (traits 6-9), than the common chaffinches from 390 391 Tenerife and Gran Canaria (p < 0.05 in all the cases). In addition, individuals from these 392 three islands (El Hierro, La Palma and La Gomera) show the highest morphological 393 variation in skull traits and, overall, show longer hindlimb bones (Table 1). This morphological pattern suggests the existence of an ecological character displacement 394 395 process driving morphological differentiation between big and small chaffinch species in Tenerife and Gran Canaria. Such a mechanism could explain how sympatric finch 396 species minimise the competition for food resources in Tenerife (Grant and Grant 2006, 397 398 2010, Rando et al. 2010). In contrast, the biggest sizes and the highest morphological

variation recorded in La Gomera, La Palma and El Hierro provide evidence for an 399 400 expansion of their ecological niche, which is compatible with a competitive release phenomenon (Grant and Grant 2008). Although these phenomena are considered central 401 402 to understand how species appear and multiply (Schluter 2000), alternative explanations such as phenotypic plasticity or sexual selection cannot be rule out (Stuart and Losos 403 404 2013). Experimental approaches where the potential role of interspecific competition can be inferred through estimating the population growth in sympatry and allopatry 405 406 (Germain et al. 2018) are now needed to comprehend the ultimate reasons behind the morphological pattern here found. 407

- 408 **Taxonomic account**
- 409 Genus: *Fringilla* Linnaeus 1758
- 410 Species: *Fringilla coelebs* Linnaeus 1758
- 411 *Fringilla coelebs bakeri* ssp. nove.
- 412 *Diagnosis*:
- 413 *a) Appearance*
- 414 Fringilla coelebs bakeri is in appearance and size similar to F. c. canariensis from
- 415 Tenerife and La Gomera islands. However, F. c. bakeri males are different from F. c.
- 416 *canariensis* in the pattern of tail feather R4. F. c. bakeri males show a tiny white edge
- 417 or small white spot (\leq 3mm), whereas, F. c. canariensis males develop a significant
- 418 tendency to show conspicuous and extended white spot on R4 (\geq 4mm) (S-Figure 1a).
- 419 *b) Holotype*
- 420 ROM 151158, adult male (skin and skeleton) from Fontanales (Gran Canaria Island,
- 421 Canary Islands) collected by Michael D. Dennison on 5th May 1985 (Figure 5). Fresh
- 422 measurements were taken by Michael D. Dennison on 1985, and bone measurements
- 423 were taken by us for this study such as is described in Methods (Figure 5).

- 424 *b.1) Genetics*
- 425 The cytochrome b sequence of this specimen has been deposited in the National Center
- 426 for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) gene bank database with the MH170895
- 427 accession number.
- 428 *b.2) Holotype colour pattern:*
- 429 Holotype skin shows dark bluish colour from crown to back. Rump is bright green.
- 430 Upper tail-coverts and centre of tail are bluish-greyish tinged. Tail feathers are blackish-
- 431 greyish except outer rectrices (R6-R5), which show a variable amount of white, and the
- 432 internal rectrices (R1) which have pale green edges. Wing mostly black except for white
- 433 median coverts and narrow white tips of greater coverts. Remiges are black with pale
- 434 green edges. Face and underparts are pinkish, whitish on belly and under tail-coverts.
- 435 **b.3**) Holotype morphological measurements
- 436 *b.3.1) Fresh*
- 437 Data (all in millimetres except weight in grams) from the fresh specimen. Bill exposed
- 438 (12.6); Bill nasal (10.8); Bill depth (7.8); Bill width (6.6), Tarsometatarsus (20.4),
- 439 Middle toe (11.2); Wing length (not available); Tail (not available), Weight (22.5 g).
- 440 *b.3.2) Bones*
- 441 Bone measurements (in mm): Premaxilla width (7.7); Premaxilla height (5.2); Head
- 442 length (33.1); Mandible length (23.8); Mandible width (not available); Scapula (20.9),
- 443 Humerus (19.4); Ulna (23.9); Femur (17.8); and Tarsometatarsus (21.8).
- 444 *c) Paratypes*
- 445 Adult males (skins and skeletons): Paratype1 (ROM 151143), Paratype2 (ROM
- 446 151148), Paratype3 (ROM 151151), Paratype4 (ROM 151153), and Paratype5 (ROM
- 447 151157). All from the same locality as the holotype, collected between 3rd and 5th May
- 448 1985, by Michael D. Dennison. Fresh measurements were taken by Michael D.

- 449 Dennison on 1985, and bone measurements were taken by us for this study such as is
- 450 described in Methods (Figure 5).
- 451 *c.1) Genetics*
- 452 The cytochrome b region sequenced of these specimens have been deposited in the
- 453 NCBI gene bank database with the following accession numbers: Paratype1
- 454 (MH170890); Paratype2 (MH170891); Paratype3 (MH170892); Paratype4
- 455 (MH170893); and Paratype5 (MH170894).
- 456 *c.2) Paratype colour pattern*
- 457 As Holotype.
- 458 *c.3) Paratype morphological measurements*
- 459 In the same order of those of the Holotype. n.a.: not available measurement.
- 460 *c.3.1) Fresh specimen measurements*
- 461 All data in mm except Weight in grams:
- 462 1) ROM 151143: 12.3; 10.9; 7.6; 6.9; n.a.; 10.7; 82.0; n.a.; 23.5 g
- 463 2) ROM 151148: 12.8; 11.1; 7.5; 6.5; 21.5; 10.8; n.a.; n.a.; 22.5 g
- 464 3) ROM 151151: 12.0; 10.4; 7.4; 6.5; 20.7; n.a.; 83.0; n.a.; 23.5 g
- 465 4) ROM 151153: 12.9; 11.1; 7.8; 7.0; n.a.; 10.6; 82.0; n.a.; 23.0 g
- 466 5) ROM 151157: 12.8; 10.8; 7.7; 6.5; 20.6; 11.0; n.a.; n.a.; 24.0 g
- 467 *c.3.2) Bone measurements*
- 468 All data in mm
- 469 1) ROM 151143: 7.2; 5.0; 34.6; 24.4; n.a.; n.a.; 19.5; n.a.; n.a.; n.a.
- 470 2) ROM 151148: 7.3; 4.8; n.a.; 24.3; 13.7; 20.9; 19.4; 23.7; 18.0; n.a.
- 471 3) ROM 151151: 7.3; n.a.; n.a.; 23.9; 14.5; 20.8; 19.7; 23.7; 18.1; n.a.
- 472 4) ROM 151153: 7.6; 4.5; 33.9; 24.1; n.a.; 19.8; 19.2; 23.5; 17.9; n.a.
- 473 5) ROM 151157: n.a.; 4.3; n.a.; 23.9; 14.2; n.a.; 19.1; 23.2; 17.8; 22.0 g

- 474 d) Institution Housing Material (holotype and paratypes):
- 475 Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), Toronto, Canada.
- 476 e) *Status*
- 477 <mark>Extant</mark>
- 478 f) *Etymology*:
- 479 The subspecies name is in honour of Professor Allan John Baker who contributed
- 480 immensely to our understanding of genetic structure, acoustic, and phylogeography of
- 481 common chaffinches in the Macaronesian islands and nearby continental areas.
- 482 g) *Distribution*
- 483 Gran Canaria Island (Canary Islands)
- 484 h) *Habitat*
- 485 This taxon is associated with "monteverde" habitats, which represents both laurel forest
- 486 and 'fayal-brezal' (*Myrica faya-Erica arborea*) woodlands. In addition, this taxon also
- 487 occurs on chestnuts (Castanea sativa) and Canary pine (Pinus canariensis) forests.
- 488 Furthermore, it extends its distribution on lower elevations exploiting the dense
- 489 vegetation of willows (*Salix canariensis*) and reeds (*Phragmites communis*), being able
- 490 to be found in areas as low as 100 meters above sea level (e.g. Barranco de Moya)
- 491 (Martín and Lorenzo 2001).
- 492
- 493

494 **References**

- Alström, P., Jønsson, K.A., Fjeldså, J., Ödeen, A., Ericson, P.G.P. and Irestedt. M.
 2015. Dramatic niche shifts and morphological change in two insular bird
 species. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* 2: 140364.
- Arechavaleta, M., Rodríguez, S., Zurita, N., and García, A. 2010. *Lista de especies silvestres de Canarias. Hongos, plantas y animales terrestres. 2009.* Gobierno
- 500 de Canarias, Tenerife.
- Baker, A. J., Dennison, M. D., Lynch, A., and le Grand, G. 1990. Genetic divergence in
 peripherally isolated populations of chaffinches in the Atlantic islands. *Evolution*44: 981–999.
- Bergmann, H. and Schottler, B. 2001. Tenerife robin *Erithacus (rubecula) superbus* -a
 species of its own. *Dutch Birding* 23: 140–146.
- 506 Carrascal, L. M., Palomino, D. and Polo, V. 2008. Patrones de distribución, abundancia
- 507 y riqueza de especies de la avifauna terrestre de la isla de La Palma (Islas
 508 Canarias). *Graellsia* 64: 209-232.
- 509 Ceia, R., Heleno, R. and Ramos, J.A. 2009. Summer abundance and ecological
 510 distribution of passerines in native and exotic forests in São Miguel, Azores.
 511 *Ardeola* 56: 25-39.
- 512 Clement, M., Posada, D. and Crandall, K. 2000. TCS: a computer program to estimate
 513 gene genealogies. *Mol. Ecol.* 9: 1657-1660.
- 514 Clement, P. 2018. Common Chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs). In: del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A.,
- 515 Sargatal, J., Christie, D.A. and de Juana, E. (eds.). Handbook of the Birds of the

516	World	Alive.	Lynx	Edicions,	Barcelona.	(retrieved	from
517	https://ww	w.hbw.cor	n/node/612	286 on 28 Mai	rch 2018).		

- 518 Corso, A., Vigano, M. and Starnini, L. 2015. Identification of African Chaffinch. *Dutch*519 *Birding* 37: 392-402.
- 520 Cramp, S. (ed.). 1988. Handbook of the birds of Europe, the Middle East, and North
- 521 Africa: the birds of the western Palearctic. Vol. V. Tyrant flycatchers to
 522 thrushes. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 523 Cramp, S., and Perrins, C. M. (eds.). 1994. Handbook of the birds of Europe, the Middle
 524 East, and North Africa: the birds of the western Palearctic. Vol. VIII. Crows to
 525 Finches. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Darriba, D., Taboada, G. L., Doallo, R., Posada, D. 2012. jModelTest 2: more models,
 new heuristics and parallel computing. *Nat. Methods* 9: 772.
- Dean, A. D. and Greenwald J. E. 1995. Use of filtered pipet tips to elute DNA from
 agarose gels. *Biotechniques* 18: 980
- Dennison, M. D. and Baker, A. J. 1991. Morphometric variability in continental and
 Atlantic island populations of chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*). *Evolution* 45: 2939.
- Dietzen, C., Witt, H-H. and Wink, M. 2003. The phylogeographic differentiation of the
 European robin *Erithacus rubecula* on the Canary Islands revealed by
 mitochondrial DNA sequence data and morphometrics: evidence for a new robin
 taxon on Gran Canaria? *Avian Science*, **3**: 115-132.

537	Dietzen, C., Garcia-del-Rey, E., Castro, G. D. and Wink, M. 2008. Phylogeography of
538	the blue tit (Parus teneriffae-group) on the Canary Islands based on
539	mitochondrial DNA sequence data and morphometrics. J. Ornithol. 149: 1-12.
540	Dietzen, C., Michels, J. P. and Wink, M. 2015. Formal Description of a New Subspecies
541	of the European Robin from Gran Canaria Island, Spain (Aves: Muscicapidae:
542	Erithacus rubecula marionae subsp. nov.). Open Ornithol. J. 8: 39-42.
543	Drummond, A.J. and Bouckaert, R.R. 2015. Bayesian Evolutionary Analysis with
544	BEAST. Cambridge University Press.
545	Drummond, A. J., Suchard, M.A., Xie, D. and Rambaut, A. 2012. Bayesian
546	phylogenetics with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. Mol. Biol. Evol. 29: 1969-1973.
547	Emerson, B. C. 2002 Evolution on oceanic islands: molecular phylogenetic approaches
548	to understanding pattern and process. Mol. Ecol. 11: 951-966.
549	Fišer, C., Robinson, C. T. and Malard, F. 2018. Cryptic species as a window into the
550	paradigm shift of the species concept. Mol. Ecol. 27: 613-635.
551	Francisco-Ortega, J., Santos-Guerra, A., Kim, S-C. and Crawford, D. J. 2000. Plant
552	genetic diversity in the Canary Islands: a conservation perspective. Am. J. Bot.
553	87 : 909-919.
554	Germain, R. M., Williams, J. L., Schluter, D. and Angert, A. L. 2018. Moving character
555	displacement beyond characters using contemporary coexistence theory. Trends
556	<i>Ecol. Evol.</i> 33 : 74-84.
557	Grant, P. R. 1979a. Ecological and morphological variation of the Canary Island blue
558	tits, Parus caeruleus (Aves: Paridae). Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 11: 103-129.

- Grant, P. R. 1979b. Evolution of the chaffinch, *Fringilla coelebs*, on the Atlantic
 Islands. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 11: 301-332.
- Grant, P. R. and Grant, B. R. 2008. *How and why species multiply: the radiation of Darwin's finches*. Princeton University Press.
- Grant, P. R. and Grant, B. R. 2006. Evolution of character displacement in Darwin's
 finches. *Science* 313: 224-226.
- Grant, P. R. and Grant, B. R. 2010. Songs of Darwin's finches diverge when a new
 species enters the community. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 107: 20156-20163
- Griswold, C. K. and Baker, A. J. 2002. Time to the most recent common ancestor and
 divergence times of populations of common chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*) in
 Europe and North Africa: insights into Pleistocene refugia and current levels of
 migration. *Evolution* 56: 143–153.
- Illera, J. C., Palmero, A. M., Laiolo, P., Rodríguez, F., Moreno, A. C. and Navascués,
 M. 2014. Genetic, morphological, and acoustic evidence reveals lack of
 diversification in the colonisation process in an island bird. *Evolution* 68: 2259–
 2274.
- Illera, J. C., Rando, J. C., Richardson, D. S. and Emerson, B. C. 2012. Age, origin and
 extinctions of the avifauna of Macaronesia: a synthesis of phylogenetic and fossil
 information. *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 50: 14–22.
- Illera, J. C., Spurgin, L. G., Rodriguez-Exposito, E., Nogales, M. and Rando, J. C. 2016.
 What are we learning on speciation and extinction from the Canary Islands? *Ardeola* 63: 15-33.

581	Illera, J. C., Richardson, D. S., Helm, B., Atienza, J. C., and Emerson, B. C. 2008.
582	Phylogenetic relationships, biogeography and speciation in the avian genus
583	Saxicola. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 48: 1145-1154.
584	Juan, C., Emerson, B.C., Oromí, P. and Hewitt, G. 2000. Colonization and
585	diversification: towards a phylogeographic synthesis for the Canary Islands.
586	<i>Trends Ecol. Evol.</i> 15 : 104–109.
587	Kumar, S., Stecher, G. & Tamura, K. 2016. MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetic
588	Analysis version 7.0 for bigger datasets. Mol. Biol. Evol. 33: 1870-1874.
589	Kvist, L., Broggi, J., Illera, J. C. and Koivula, K. 2005. Colonisation and diversification
590	of the blue tits (Parus caeruleus teneriffae-group) in the Canary Islands. Mol.
591	Phylogenet. Evol. 34 : 501–511.
592	Kocher, T. D., Thomas, W. K., Meyer, A., Edwards, S.V., Pääbo, S., Villablanca, F. X.
593	and Wilson, A. C. 1989. Dynamics of mitochondrial DNA evolution in animals:
594	amplification and sequencing with conserved primers. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
595	USA. 86 : 6196.
596	Lachlan, R. F., Verzijden, M. N., Bernard, C. S., Jonker, P-P., Koese, B., Jaarsma, S.,
597	Spoor, W., Slater, P. J. B. and ten Cate, C. 2013. The progressive loss of

- syntactical structure in bird song along an island colonization chain. *Curr. Biol.*23: 1896–1901.
- 600 Lamichhaney, S., Han, F., Webster, M. T., Andersson, L., Grant, B. R. and Gran, P. R.
- 601 (2018). Rapid hybrid speciation in Darwin's finches. *Science* **359**: 224-228.
- 602 Lifjeld, J.T., Anmarkrud, J.A., Calabuig, P., Cooper, J.E.J., Johannessen, L. E., Johnsen,
- 603 A., Kearns, A. M., Lachlan, R. F., Laskemoen, T., Marthinsen, G., Stensrud, E.

604	& García-del-Rey, E. 2016. Species-level divergences in multiple functional
605	traits between the two endemic subspecies of Blue Chaffinches Fringilla teydea
606	in Canary Islands. BMC Zool. 1: 4.
607	Lynch, A. and Baker, A. J. 1990. Increased vocal discrimination by learning in
608	sympatry in two species of chaffinches. <i>Behaviour</i> 116 : 109–125.
609	Lynch, A. and Baker, A. J. 1994. A population memetics approach to cultural evolution
610	in chaffinch song: differentiation among populations. <i>Evolution</i> 48 : 351–359.
611	Malagó Jr, W., Heitor, M. F., Matheucci Jr, E., Medaglia, A. and Henrique-Silva, F.
612	2002. Large scale sex typing of ostriches using DNA extracted from feathers.
613	BMC Biotechnology 2: 19.
614	Marshall, H. D. and Baker, A. J. 1999. Colonization History of Atlantic Island Common
615	Chaffinches (Fringilla coelebs) Revealed by Mitochondrial DNA. Mol.
616	Phylogenet. Evol. 11: 201–212.
617	Martín, A. and Lorenzo, J. A. 2001. Aves del archipiélago canario. Francisco Lemus
618	Editor.
619	Matthysen, E. 2005. Density dependent dispersal in birds and mammals. Ecography
620	28 : 403-416.

- Morris-Pocock, J. A., Taylor, S. A., Birt. T. P. and Friesen, V. L. 2010. Concerted
 evolution of duplicated mitochondrial control region in three related sea birds.
 BMC Evolutionary Biology 10: 14
- Padial, J. M., Miralles, A., De la Riva, I. and Vences, M. 2010. The integrative future of
 taxonomy. *Front. Zool* 7: 1–14.

626	Päckert, M., Dietzen, C., Martens, J., Wink, M. and Kvist, L. 2006. Radiation of
627	Atlantic goldcrests Regulus regulus spp.: evidence of a new taxon from the
628	Canary Islands. J. Avian Biol. 37: 364–380.
629	Padilla, D. P., Spurgin, L. G., Fairfield, E., Illera, J. C. and Richardson, D. S. 2015.
630	Population history, gene flow and bottlenecks in island populations of a
631	secondary seed disperser, the southern grey shrike (Lanius meridionalis koenigi).
632	<i>Ecol. Evol.</i> 5 : 36-45.
633	Pestano, J., Brown, R. P., Rodriguez, F. and Moreno, A. 2000. Mitochondrial DNA
634	control region diversity in the endangered blue chaffinch, Fringilla teydea. Mol.
635	<i>Ecol.</i> 9 : 1421–1425.
636	Price, T. 2008. The speciation in birds. Roberts and company publishers, Colorado,
637	USA.
638	Rambaut, A., Suchard, M.A., Xie, D. and Drummond, A. J. 2014. Tracer v1.6.
639	Available from http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/
640	Rando, J. C., Alcover, J. A. and Illera, J. C. 2010. Disentangling Ancient Interactions: A
641	New Extinct Passerine Provides Insights on Character Displacement among
642	Extinct and Extant Island Finches. PLoS ONE 5: e12956.
643	Rasband, W. S. 1997. ImageJ. U.S. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland,
644	USA. http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/
645	Rodrigues, P., Lopes, R. J., Reis, S., Resendes, R., Ramos, J. A. and Tristão da Cunha,
646	R. 2014. Genetic diversity and morphological variation of the common chaffinch
647	Fringilla coelebs in the Azores. J. Avian Biol. 45: 167–178.

- 648 Samarasin-Dissanayake, P. (2010) Population differentiation, historical demography
 649 and evolutionary relationships among widespread common chaffinch
 650 populations (Fringilla coelebs ssp.). Master of Science. University of Toronto.
- Sangster, G. 2006. The taxonomic status of "phylogroups" in the *Parus teneriffae*complex (Aves): comments on the paper by Kvist *et al.* (2005). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 38: 288–289.
- Sangster, G., Rodríguez-Godoy, F., Roselaar, C. S., Robb, M. S. and Luksenburg, J. A.
 2016. Integrative taxonomy reveals Europe's rarest songbird species, the Gran
 Canaria Blue Chaffinch *Fringilla polatzeki*. J. Avian Biol. 47: 159-166.
- 657 Schluter, D. 2000. *The ecology of adaptive radiation*. Oxford University Press.
- Spurgin, L. G., Illera, J. C., Jorgensen, T. H., Dawson, D. A. and Richardson, D. S.
 2014. Genetic and phenotypic divergence in an island bird: isolation by distance,
 by colonization or by adaptation?. *Mol. Ecol.* 23: 1028-1039.
- Stensrud, E. 2012. Allopatric speciation and multi-trait variation in the common
 *chaffinch (*Fringilla coelebs) complex. Master of Science Thesis. University of
 Oslo.
- Stervander, M., Illera, J. C., Kvist, L., Barbosa, P., Keehnen, N. P., Pruisscher, P.,
 Bensch, S. and Hansson, B. 2015. Disentangling the complex evolutionary
 history of the Western Palearctic blue tits (*Cyanistes* spp.) phylogenomic
 analyses suggest radiation by multiple colonization events and subsequent
 isolation. *Mol. Ecol.* 24: 2477–2494.
- Stuart, Y.E. & Losos, J. B. 2013. Ecological carácter displacement: glass half full or
 half empty? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 28: 402-408.

671	Suárez, N. M., Betancor, E., Klasert, T. E., Almeida, T., Hernández, M. and Pestano, J.
672	J. 2009. Phylogeography and genetic structure of the Canarian common
673	chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs) inferred with mtDNA and microsatellite loci. Mol.
674	<i>Phylogenet Evol.</i> 53 : 556–564.
675	Tietze, D. T., Martens, J., Fischer, B. S., Y-Sun, H., Klussmann-Kolb, A. and Päckert,
676	M. 2015. Evolution of leaf warbler songs (Aves: Phylloscopidae). Ecol. Evol. 5:
677	781–798.
678	Valente, L., Illera, J. C., Havenstein, K., Pallien, T., Etienne, R. S. and Tiedemann, R.
679	2017. Macroevolutionary dynamics in Atlantic island avifaunas support
680	MacArthur and Wilson's equilibrium prediction. Curr. Biol. 27: 1660-1666.
681	Van Doren, B. M., Campagna, L. Helm, B., Illera, J. C., Lovette, I. J. and Liedvogel, M.
682	2017. Correlated patterns of genetic diversity and differentiation across an avian
683	family. <i>Mol. Ecol.</i> 26 : 3982-3997.
684	Vaurie, C. 1959. The birds of the Palearctic fauna: a systematic reference. Order
685	Passeriformes vol. 1. H.F. & G. Witherby.
686	

Figure 1. Distribution of the common chaffinch (*Fringilla coelebs*) in Macaronesia and
nearby continental areas. Green lines depict pathway of colonisation of chaffinches in
Macaronesia suggested by Marshall and Baker (1999).

Figure 2. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) plots for the cranial (A) and postcranial (B) traits. Cranial PCA (A) includes the following traits: bill width and height, head length, mandible length and width (traits 1-5). Post-Cranial PCA (B): includes: scapula, humerus, ulna, femur and tarsometatarsus lengths (traits 6-10). Common chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*) from Gran Canaria (yellow circles), Tenerife (blue triangles), La Gomera (red rhombus), La Palma (green squares) and El Hierro (black stars).

Figure 3. Parsimony network of the common chaffinch (*Fringilla coelebs*) in Macaronesia and the nearby continental areas (Iberian Peninsula and North Africa) based on the cytochrome b. Open small circles depict one-step mutation edge. The size of haplotypes (circles) represents its abundance, that is, the number of individuals sharing such a haplotype. The three groups (clusters) identified with the mitochondrial cytochrome b are shaded in blue.

Figure 4. Morphological (cranial and post-cranial) traits measured on the Canarian
common chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*). 1: Premaxilla width, 2: Premaxilla height, 3:
Skull length, 4: Mandible length, 5: Mandible width, 6: Scapula length, 7: Humerus
length, 8: Ulna length, 9: Femur length, and 10: Tarsometatarsus length.

Figure 5. *Fringilla coelebs bakeri*'s holotype. Frontal, back and right lateral views.

709 Supplementary Figure 1. Tail colour pattern of common chaffinches of adult

710 (EURING 6) and sub-adult (EURING 5) in Gran Canaria (Fringilla coelebs bakeri), La

711 Gomera and Tenerife (*F. c. canariensis*). A: Gran Canaria, B: La Gomera, C: Tenerife.

712

to Review Only

713	Table 1. Morphological measurements (mean ± standard error) of extant <i>Fringilla coelebs</i> occurring in the Canary Islands. Sample
714	size (in brackets) and range (in square brackets) are also provided. Numbers before morphological trait names correspond with the
715	trait numbers used in the text.

716

	El Hierro	La Palma	La Gomera	Tenerife	Gran Canaria
¹ Bill width	7.3 ± 0.2	7.4 ± 0.2	7.3 ± 0.3	7.2 ± 0.2	7.3 ± 0.3
	(15) [6.8-7.6]	(14) [7.1-7.7]	(23) [6.6-7.8]	(20) [6.7-7.6]	(19) [6.8-7.7]
² Bill height	5.0 ± 0.3	5.0 ± 0.2	5.3 ± 0.2	4.9 ± 0.3	4.7 ± 0.3
Din neight	(13) [4.5-5.5]	(17) [4.6-5.4]	(22) [4.9-5.8]	(20) [4.2-5.6]	(22) [4.1-5.2]
³ Hood longth	32.5 ± 0.5	33.3 ± 0.9	34.4 ± 1	32 ± 0.8	32.8 ± 1.1
neau length	(14) [31.7-33.6]	(17) [31.8-34.8]	(22) [32.1-36.1]	(18) [31-33.8]	(18) [30.6-34.6]
⁴ Mondible longth	24.4 ± 0.3	24.9 ± 0.4	25.9 ± 0.4	24.3 ± 0.5	23.8 ± 0.4
Manufile length	(10) [23.8-24.8]	(20) [24.1-25.9]	(19) [25.1-27]	(16) [23.6-25.1]	(22) [22.7-24.6]
⁵ Mandible width	14.5 ± 0.3	14.6 ± 0.3	15.4 ± 0.4	14.6 ± 0.3	14.1 ± 0.2
	(9) [14.1-14.9]	(19) [14-15.2]	(15) [14.9-16.1]	(17) [14-15]	(15) [13.7-14.5]
6 Saanula	21.5 ± 0.5	21.7 ± 0.5	21.8 ± 0.4	20.9 ± 0.4	20.7 ± 0.5
Scapula	(16) [20.6-22.3]	(18) [20.5-22.7]	(23) [21.2-22.5]	(17) [20.1-21.7]	(24) [19.8-21.5]
7Uumorus	20.4 ± 0.3	20.4 ± 0.5	20.5 ± 0.4	19.6 ± 0.4	19.1 ± 0.4
numerus	(15) [19.7-21]	(24) [19.6-21.2]	(21) [19.8-21.1]	(19) [18.5-20.3]	(26) [18.3-19.8]
⁸ Ulna longth	25.2 ± 0.3	25.1 ± 0.5	25.1 ± 0.5	24 ± 0.6	23.5 ± 0.5
Ullia length	(12) [24.4-25.9]	(21) [24-26]	(21) [24.2-26]	(18) [22.6-25]	(25) [22.7-24.2]
⁹ Fomur	18.1 ± 0.4	18.3 ± 0.4	18.7 ± 0.4	17.9 ± 0.5	17.8 ± 0.4
remui	(16) [17.3-19]	(24) [17.6-19.1]	(22) [18-19.4]	(21) [16.8-18.7]	(24) [17-18.5]
10 Tarsomatatarsus	22.0 ± 0.4	22.1 ± 0.6	22.5 ± 0.6	21.5 ± 0.7	21.8 ± 0.5
i arsonnetatarsus	(15) [21.2-22.7]	(20) [20.9-22.9]	(21) [21.5-23.7]	(19) [20.1-22.8]	(21) [20.7-22.7]

718 **Table 2**. Cytochrome b diagnostic bases (i.e. variable sites) for *Fringilla coelebs bakeri* in relation to the remaining Canarian common chaffinch

- subspecies. Pure cyt-b diagnostic bases for discriminating all *F. c. bakeri* individuals from other Canarian populations for cyt-b are shown in red.
- Numbers are according to the base position along a cyt-b fragment of 829 bp.

721

Position	293	299	305	374	390	443	503	659	707	785
F. c. bakeri	G	C	C	Т	Т	Т	Α	A	Т	A
F. c. canariensis	G	Т	Т	С	T/C	С	С	A	С	A
F. c. ombriosa	A	Т	Т	С	С	С	С	Т	С	G
F. c. palmae	A	Т	Т	С	С	С	С	Т	С	G
								2	1	

Figure 1



Fringilla coelebs canariensis



🔶 La Gomera 🛛 😐 Gran Canaria





Figure 4

124x93mm (300 x 300 DPI)







Holotype of *Fringilla coelebs bakeri* ROM 151158 / AJB4561 **Supplementary File 1**. Specimens of common chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*) from the Canary Islands measured for the present study. All individuals were males and adults, and are stored at Royal Ontario Museum (ROM). Dates of capture of each specimen are also shown.

Specimen	Island	Date	
ROM_148875	El Hierro	21/04/1984	
ROM_148876	El Hierro	21/04/1984	
ROM_148877	El Hierro	21/04/1984	
ROM_148878	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148880	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148883	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148884	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148886	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148888	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148890	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148892	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148896	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148898	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_148901	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_154227	El Hierro	20/05/1988	
ROM_154228	El Hierro	20/05/1988	
ROM_154229	El Hierro	20/05/1988	
ROM_154230	El Hierro	20/05/1988	
ROM_148894	El Hierro	22/04/1984	
ROM_151139	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	
ROM_151140	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	7
ROM_151142	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	
ROM_151143	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	
ROM_151145	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	
ROM_151147	Gran Canaria	03/05/1985	
ROM_151148	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151149	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151150	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151151	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151152	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151153	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151154	Gran Canaria	05/05/1985	
ROM_151155	Gran Canaria	05/05/1985	
ROM_151156	Gran Canaria	05/05/1985	
ROM_151157	Gran Canaria	05/05/1985	
ROM_151158	Gran Canaria	05/05/1985	
ROM_151160	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151161	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151162	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151163	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151165	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_151166	Gran Canaria	04/05/1985	
ROM_154204	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	

ROM_154205	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	
ROM_154206	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	
ROM_154207	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	
ROM_154208	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	
ROM_154209	Gran Canaria	16/05/1988	
ROM_148903	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148905	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148907	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148909	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148913	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148915	La Gomera	26/04/1984	
ROM_148917	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
ROM_148919	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
ROM_148921	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
ROM_148922	La Gomera	27/04/1984	1
ROM_148925	La Gomera	27/04/1984	1
	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
	La Gomera	27/04/1984	1
ROM 148930	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
 ROM 148931	La Gomera	27/04/1984	
ROM 151212	La Gomera	27/02/1985	
ROM 151213	La Gomera	28/02/1985	
ROM 151216	La Gomera	28/02/1985	
ROM 151218	La Gomera	28/02/1985	
ROM 151221	La Gomera	28/02/1985	
ROM 151223	La Gomera	01/03/1985	
ROM 151224	La Gomera	01/03/1985	
ROM 151225	La Gomera	01/03/1985	
ROM 151226	La Gomera	01/03/1985	
ROM 154232	La Gomera	21/05/1988	
ROM 154233	La Gomera	21/05/1988	
ROM 154234	La Gomera	21/05/1988	
ROM 147800	La Palma	06/07/1983	
 ROM_147801	La Palma	06/07/1983	
ROM_147807	La Palma	06/07/1983	
 ROM_147808	La Palma	06/07/1983	
	La Palma	06/07/1983	
ROM 147814	La Palma	06/07/1983	
ROM 147816	La Palma	06/07/1983	1
ROM 147817	La Palma	06/07/1983	1
ROM 147819	La Palma	06/07/1983	1
ROM 147820	La Palma	06/07/1983	1
ROM 147824	La Palma	07/07/1983	1
ROM 147828	La Palma	07/07/1983	
ROM 147829	La Palma	07/07/1983	
ROM 151191	La Palma	22/02/1985	
ROM 151193	La Palma	22/02/1985	1
ROM 151203	La Palma	24/02/1985	1
ROM 151205	La Palma	24/02/1985	1
ROM 151205	La Palma	24/02/1985	
1.0141 1.01200	La ranna		1

ROM_151208	La Palma	24/02/1985	
ROM_154218	La Palma	19/05/1988	
ROM_154219	La Palma	19/05/1988	
ROM_154222	La Palma	19/05/1988	
ROM_154223	La Palma	19/05/1988	
ROM_147797	Tenerife	24/05/1983	
ROM_147798	Tenerife	24/05/1983	
ROM_147799	Tenerife	24/05/1983	
ROM_147838	Tenerife	11/07/1983	
ROM_147841	Tenerife	12/07/1983	
ROM_148858	Tenerife	23/05/1983	
ROM_148859	Tenerife	23/05/1983	
ROM_148867	Tenerife	12/07/1983	
ROM_148870	Tenerife	12/07/1983	
ROM_148872	Tenerife	12/07/1983	
ROM_149093	Tenerife	??/07/1983	
ROM_151176	Tenerife	15/02/1985	
ROM_151177	Tenerife	15/02/1985	
ROM_151178	Tenerife	15/02/1985	
ROM_151179	Tenerife	15/02/1985	
ROM_151183	Tenerife	16/02/1985	
ROM_151186	Tenerife	16/02/1985	
ROM_151188	Tenerife	17/02/1985	
ROM_154215	Tenerife	18/05/1988	
ROM_154216	Tenerife	18/05/1988	
ROM_154226	Tenerife	19/05/1988	

Supplementary Table S2. List of sequences used in the present study per taxa and Genbank accession numbers. The haplotype codes (in brackets) represent the sequences used in the haplotype network analysis depicted at Figure 3.

Species	Subspecies	Origin	Genbank accession
			number and haplotype
			codes
Fringilla coelebs	ombriosa	El Hierro/CI	GQ330543 (EH1)
			GQ330544 (EH2)
Fringilla coelebs	palmae	La Palma/CI	GQ330545 (LP1)
			GQ330554 (LP2)
			GQ330549 (LP2)
			GQ330550 (LP3)
			GQ330551 (LP4)
			GQ330552 (LP5)
			GQ330553 (LP6)
Fringilla coelebs	canariensis	La Gomera/CI	GQ330546 (LG1)
			GQ330547 (LG2)
			GQ330548 (LG3)
Fringilla coelebs	canariensis	Tenerife/CI	GQ330555 (TF1)
			GQ330556 (TF2)
Fringilla coelebs	canariensis	Gran Canaria/CI	MH170890 (GC1)*
			MH170895 (GC1)*
			MH170891 (GC2)*
			MH170892 (GC2)*
			GU592658 (GC2)
			GQ330559 (GC3)
			MH170893 (GC4)*
			MH170894 (GC4)*
			GQ330557 (GC4)
			GQ330558 (GC4)
Fringilla coelebs	maderensis	Madeira/MD	GU592659 (MD1)
			GU592660 (MD2)
Fringilla coelebs	moreletti	Terceira/AZ	GU592662 (AZ1)
			GU592661 (AZ2)
Fringilla coelebs	coelebs	IP	GU592664 (IP1)
			GU592666 (IP1)
			GU592663 (IP2)
			GU592665 (IP3)
Fringilla coelebs	africana	Rabat/MO	GU592667 (MO)

CI: Canary Islands. EH: El Hierro. LP: La Palma. LG: La Gomera. TF: Tenerife. GC: Gran Canaria. MD: Madeira. AZ: Azores. IP: Iberian Peninsula. MO: Morocco. *: new sequences used in this study.

Supplementary Table 3. Percentage of mean divergences (uncorrected pairwise sequence) among populations of common chaffinches (*Fringilla coelebs*). We used 46 sequences of 829 base pairs (bp) for the mtDNA cytochrome b gene. Number of sequences used per population is also shown in brackets.

	El Hierro (2)	La Palma (7)	La Gomera (3)	Tenerife (2)	Gran Canaria (13)	Madeira (4)	Azores (9)	Iberia (5)
La Palma (7)	0.45							
La Gomera (3)	0.88	0.85	5					
Tenerife (2)	0.97	0.93	0.24					
Gran Canaria (13)	1.41	1.51	1.02	1.02				
Madeira (4)	1.72	1.68	1.40	1.36	1.81			
Azores (9)	2.14	2.11	1.82	1.78	2.24	2.17		
Iberia (5)	2.22	2.18	1.90	1.86	2.31	2.25	2.41	
North Africa (1)	2.29	2.26	1.81	1.69	2.14	2.32	2.48	0.65

(A)





Male_EURING 5_Gran Canaria Fringilla coelebs bakeri



Male_EURING 5_La Gomera Fringilla coelebs canariensis



(C)

Male_EURING 5_Tenerife Fringilla coelebs canariensis



Male_EURING 6_Gran Canaria Fringilla coelebs bakeri



Male_EURING 6_La Gomera Fringilla coelebs canariensis

(B)



Male_EURING 6_Tenerife Fringilla coelebs canariensis

(C)

(A)