1 Supplementary material

2 **Table S1** Summary of sample sizes (N), number of alleles (N_A), observed (H_o) and expected (H_e) heterozygosity, and F_{IS} -estimates of the

3 vendace populations at 10 microsatellite loci. F_{IS} * indicate possible null alleles estimated by MICROCHECKER. Underscored and bold

- 4 *F*_{IS} values indicate significant departure from HWE before and after sequential Bonferroni corrections, respectively. Sample abbreviations
- 5 as in Table 1.

Pop		BFRO-018[1]	BWF1[2]	ClaTet06[3]	ClaTet13[3]	Cocl-lav04[4]	Cocl-lav06[4]	Cocl-lav10[4]	Cocl-lav27[4]	Cocl-lav49[4]	C2-157[5]
Ke	Ν	52	52	52	50	52	52	51	52	52	52
	$N_{\rm A}$	2	5	6	4	3	7	4	2	12	2
	$H_{\rm o}$	0.019	0.442	0.462	0.520	0.288	0.654	0.490	0.038	0.712	0.135
	$H_{\rm e}$	0.019	0.365	0.615	0.576	0.302	0.674	0.588	0.038	0.708	0.126
	$F_{\rm IS}$	-0.010	-0.212	0.249*	0.097	0.045	0.030	0.167	-0.020	<u>0.034</u>	-0.072
Si	Ν	57	58	57	57	58	57	57	58	55	58
	N_{A}	7	13	6	16	2	19	3	3	12	8
	$H_{ m o}$	0.702	0.741	0.579	0.807	0.293	0.754	0.211	0.121	0.782	0.448
	$H_{\rm e}$	0.594	0.796	0.674	0.896	0.274	0.874	0.610	0.114	0.806	0.449
	$F_{\rm IS}$	-0.181	<u>0.068</u>	0.141	<u>0.099*</u>	-0.070	<u>0.137*</u>	<u>0.655*</u>	-0.056	0.031	0.001
In	Ν	55	52	55	54	55	52	51	55	55	55
	$N_{\rm A}$	5	11	5	16	2	25	4	4	11	6
	$H_{ m o}$	0.473	0.692	0.491	0.889	0.309	0.808	0.314	0.073	0.782	0.636
	$H_{\rm e}$	0.469	0.738	0.573	0.898	0.261	0.916	0.596	0.071	0.808	0.613
	$F_{\rm IS}$	-0.007	0.062	0.143	0.010	-0.183	0.119*	<u>0.474*</u>	-0.026	<u>0.033</u>	-0.037
Vg	Ν	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57

	$N_{\rm A}$	7	9	5	15	3	22	3	3	8	6
	$H_{\rm o}$	0.474	0.632	0.561	0.895	0.246	0.807	0.404	0.088	0.754	0.596
	$H_{\rm e}$	0.482	0.743	0.603	0.878	0.217	0.913	0.600	0.085	0.812	0.572
	$F_{\rm IS}$	0.017	0.149*	0.068	-0.019	-0.130	<u>0.116*</u>	0.327*	-0.034	0.071	-0.042
Sb	Ν	54	53	54	53	54	54	54	53	54	54
	$N_{\rm A}$	6	10	6	16	2	19	3	3	8	6
	$H_{\rm o}$	0.500	0.491	0.574	0.717	0.389	0.778	0.333	0.094	0.630	0.500
	$H_{\rm e}$	0.431	0.716	0.661	0.873	0.335	0.899	0.501	0.091	0.784	0.604
	$F_{\rm IS}$	-0.159	<u>0.315*</u>	0.132	<u>0.178*</u>	<u>-0.160</u>	0.135*	<u>0.335*</u>	-0.037	<u>0.197*</u>	0.173*

6 [1] Susnik et al. 1999; [2] Patton et al. 1997; [3] Winkler & Weiss 2008; [4] Rogers et al. 2004; [5] Turgeon et al. 1999

- ---

	Geographical distance (km)			Time (years)	
		-	Initial_observation	Total_coverage	Peak_abundance
Si_In		302	8	8	8
Si_Vgt		334	26	26	26
Si_Sb		383	28	28	28
In_Vgt		47	18	11	2
In_Sb		95	20	13	4
Vgt_Sb		51	2	2	2

Table S2 Geographical distances and expansion times of vendace populations used for the Mantel test. Sample abbreviations as in Table 1.

Table S3 Estimates of genetic differentiation between the five populations of vendace revealed by F_{ST} (Below diagonal) and the permutated (10,000) *P*-values (above diagonal). Significance levels (*P*-values) were adjusted according to the sequential Bonferroni procedure (Rice 1989). Sample codes as in Table I.

	Ke	Si	In	Vg	Sb
Ke	-	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
Si	0.141	-	0.0027	0.0013	0.0014
In	0.158	0.011	-	0.0015	0.0032
Vg	0.154	0.011	0.011	-	0.1603
Sb	0.157	0.012	0.011	0.004	_

27

28 Fig. S1. Summary of results from STRUCTURE for inferring K populations among the tested 29 vendace populations when omitting three loci that may be associated with null alleles. The most likely grouping was estimated by 5 independent runs for each K (A). In B the genetic 30 31 structure among L. Kelujärvi (Ke). L. Sinettäjärvi (Si). L. Inari (In), L. Vaggatem (Vg) and L. 32 Skrukkebukta (Sb) was tested using the same set of seven loci and Bayesian clustering 33 assuming two genetic clusters of individuals (K = 2). In the STRUCTURE analysis black 34 lines separate individuals from different sampling sites and each individual is represented by a 35 thin horizontal line, which is partitioned into K-coloured segments representing individual's 36 estimated membership fractions in K clusters.

37





39

- 40 Fig. S2 Summary of results from STRUCTURE for inferring K populations among the tested
- vendace populations. The most likely grouping was estimated by 10 independent runs for 41
- 42 each K.
- 43 -7200 0 -7300 Mean of est. Ln prob of data -7400 -7500 -7600 -7700 -7800 0 з к 1 2 4 5 44 45
- 46

47 References

48	
49	Patton JC, Gallaway BJ, Fechhelm RG, Cronin MA (1997) Genetic variation of
50	microsatellite and mitochondrial DNA markers in broad whitefish (<i>Coregonus nasus</i>)
51	in the Colville and Sagavanirktok rivers in northern Alaska. Canadian Journal of
52	Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 54 , 1548-1556.
53	Rogers SM, Marchand MH, Bernatchez L (2004) Isolation, characterization and cross-
54	salmonid amplification of 31 microsatellite loci in the lake whitefish (Coregonus
55	clupeaformis, Mitchill). Molecular Ecology Notes 4, 89-92.
56	Susnik S, Snoj A, Dovc P (1999) Microsatellites in grayling (Thymallus thymallus):
57	comparison of two geographically remote populations from the Danubian and Adriatic
58	river basin in Slovenia. Molecular Ecology 8, 1756-1758.
59	Turgeon J, Estoup A, Bernatchez L (1999) Species flock in the North American Great Lakes:
60	Molecular ecology of Lake Nipigon Ciscoes (Teleostei : Coregonidae : Coregonus).
61	<i>Evolution</i> 53 , 1857-1871.
62	Winkler KA, Weiss S (2008) Eighteen new tetranucleotide microsatellite DNA markers for
63	Coregonus lavaretus cloned from an alpine lake population. Molecular Ecology
64	<i>Resources</i> 8 , 1055-1058.
65	
66	