



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

**GENETIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INVESTIGATION OF
POPULATION STRUCTURE AND SOCIAL SYSTEM IN
FOUR DELPHINID SPECIES**

Marc Oremus

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Biological Sciences

The University of Auckland

2008

Thesis Abstract

Population structure, genetic diversity and social system were investigated in four species of dolphins, thought to present contrasting habitat preferences and social organisation: spinner dolphins, rough-toothed dolphins, long-finned and short-finned pilot whales. To overcome methodological limitations, I combined molecular markers (mitochondrial DNA, -or mtDNA-, and microsatellite loci) and observational data (photo-identification and mass strandings) where possible. Genetic samples were obtained from skin biopsies of free-ranging ($n = 243$) and stranded ($n = 375$) dolphins.

As with many species of delphinids, spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*) form communities in which social and reproductive boundaries are poorly understood. In French Polynesia, capture-recapture analyses based on photographs of distinctly marked individuals (DMIs) and microsatellite genotypes (12 loci) indicated a community of about 150 dolphins around Moorea that is relatively closed on a generational time scale. Distinct communities, likely to follow a similar demographic pattern, were observed around neighbouring islands (Tahiti, Raiatea, Huahine and Bora Bora), as indicated by photo-identification data and restricted gene flow ($F_{ST} = 0.143$, $n = 154$). Surprisingly high levels of insular mtDNA genetic diversity (average $\pi = 1.44\%$, suggesting $N_{ef} \sim 100,000$) contrasted with demographic characteristics of these communities. There was no evidence for a recent bottleneck effect, suggesting that this pattern is the result of metapopulation structure, based on numerous insular communities connected through male and female gene flow.

Investigation of the worldwide mtDNA diversity and phylogeography of long-finned and short-finned pilot whale species revealed a complex evolutionary history (*Globicephala melas*, $n = 434$; and *G. macrorhynchus*, $n = 134$, including published and unpublished sequences). Strong genetic differentiation between long-finned pilot whales from the North Atlantic (*G. m. melas*) and Southern Hemisphere (*G. m. edwardii*) indicated severely restricted gene flow, although shared haplotypes suggested some recent contact between the two subspecies. Low genetic distances among haplotypes and a star-like phylogeny suggested a recent worldwide expansion for this species. Higher levels of diversity (although low compared to other cetaceans) were found in short-finned pilot whales, in particular among samples from around Japan. Phylogeographic studies suggested that Japanese samples originate from three distinct populations, one of which could be the ancestral population of the species. Overall, my results confirmed that worldwide mtDNA diversity is low in the two species, probably due to a recent worldwide population expansion and, potentially, to a matrilineal social structure.

The molecular ecology of the mass strandings of long-finned pilot whales around New Zealand was investigated to test the hypothesis that individuals stranding together are part of an extended matrilineal group. Analyses of mtDNA sequences indicate that more than one haplotype was found in five of the seven mass strandings

investigated (n = 275), demonstrating that groups are sometimes composed of unrelated maternal lineages. This was further supported by analyses of relatedness within and between strandings based on microsatellites (14 loci). These analyses discount kinship as the only factor causing large mass strandings in long-finned pilot whales. Parentage analyses confirmed some aspects of previous studies in the North Atlantic, suggesting a social system with at least some level of male and female philopatry to the maternal group, and infrequent paternities within the group. In a detailed study of a large mass stranding (Stewart Island 2003, n = 122), there was no correlation between position of the whales on the beach and genetic relatedness (based on 20 microsatellite loci), discounting the assumption that kinship bonds are maintained during these traumatic events. This was further supported by the striking separation of stranded mothers and dependant calves. This disruption of kinship bonds could help explain the behavioural distress of stranded individuals and the tendency of many whales to re-strand even after being re-floated.

Finally, a study of rough-toothed dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) in the Society Archipelago, French Polynesia, provided new insights in the ecology of this poorly-known species. Although traditionally viewed as a pelagic dolphin, analyses supported a pattern of local communities, in some ways similar to spinner dolphins, with fine-scale population genetic structure ($F_{ST} = 0.60$, $p < 0.001$ based on mtDNA, n = 65) and local fidelity. These communities also showed a low level of mtDNA haplotype diversity (four unique haplotypes at Moorea compared to 18 for spinner dolphins), suggesting the potential influence of a matrilineal social structure similar to long-finned pilot whales.

Dedication

To my parents
Bernadette and Jean-Louis OREMUS

For always being here for me

Acknowledgments

During the first weeks of my thesis, preparing my fieldwork at Moorea, I have to say that I felt very lonely far from home and family left behind in France. As my next three (to five...) years were meant to be spent in French Polynesia and New Zealand, I had the first impression that I was about to live a great but rather solitary experience. Instead, it did not take very long for me to realise that I would not go anywhere in this endeavour alone. From fixing holes in the inflatable boat (which is pretty much how I started my PhD) to the last proof readings of my chapters, I received continuous and tremendous help and support from many many people that I wish to thank here.

My first acknowledgments go to my main supervisor, Prof. C. Scott Baker, and my co-supervisor, Dr. M. Michael Poole. Thanks Scott for all your guidance, support and encouragement during this thesis (without forgetting your tonnes of editing). Thanks for the freedom you gave me, but always keeping an eye on my work to put me back on the right direction when I needed it. Michael, I'll never be grateful enough for giving me this incredible opportunity to continue your research on dolphins in French Polynesia, and for sharing so much with me. This could well remain the greatest experience of my life. Thank you.

This research has been possible thanks to the New Zealand Marsden Fund which provided the main funding for this project. I also thank the following institutions for providing additional funding: the Whale and Dolphin Adoption Project, the University of Auckland Graduate Research Fund, IFAW, Vista Press, Englehard Foundation, the SBS contestable travel fund and the Society for Marine Mammalogy student travel grant.

To people in French Polynesia:

Many thanks to Prof. René Galzin for all his advices and support during my fieldwork at Moorea. You always took the time to enquire about the progress of my thesis even though I was not your student. It has been very valuable help for me.

Thanks to all my fellows at CRIOBE for all these great moments together and for coming on the boat with me when nobody else was there: I think in particular of Caroline Vieux, Marie Younger, Julien Million, Romain Foki, Elodie Lagouy, Catherine Gonnot, Thomas Binet, Lucie Penin, Medhi Adjerhoud, Moira Decima, and, of course, my dear Féroce & Rotui. Thanks to Yannick Chancerelle, Pascal Ung and James Algret from CRIOBE, for helping me so much with logistic. Thanks also to Emilie Leprêtre and Pierre Petitjean for your help on the field.

Special thanks go to my friend Andrew Carroll, one of the most caring and loveable people I have ever met, with who I shared so much during my time at Moorea (including a lot of Hinano). I wish you all the best my friend.

Big thanks to Rodolphe Holler and his family. I really hope that we'll get the chance to go back on the field together during the whale season. I want to thank Yves Ducreux

and Véronique Pérard with the help of who I have been able to conduct some surveys in the Leeward Islands of the Society Archipelago and in the Tuamotu, aboard the superb Touaou. God, I was so sick on this boat... but the trip was still worth it, that's for sure! Thanks also to Nelly and Laurent from Raiatea. I had a great time with you, driving the poti marara and going diving at night. All of you guys are so devoted to the cause; I truly admire you for your commitment. You offer the best help we (the 'bloody scientists') can hope for and we owe you a lot for our 'scientific' achievements. Thanks.

Thank you to my "impeccable" colleague and friend, Manuel Ballesteros, who came to give me a hand during my first field season. It was a lot of fun. Please, let me know if I can give you a hand with your birds, it would be a pleasure for me to help you back. Thanks to Fred Jacques at Raiatea and Xavier Curvat from the Diving Club in Nuku Hiva for kindly providing me with a roof or a boat during my time in the outer islands.

I wish to thank the "Ministère de l'Environnement" and the "Délégation à l'Environnement" of French Polynesia for allowing my research to be conducted under the research permit attributed to Dr. Poole.

To the people in New Zealand:

I would like to acknowledge the staff, past and present, of the Department of Conservation, for collecting so many stinky samples of stranded whales around New Zealand. In particular, I thank Helen Kettles and Caren Schröder, who dealt with large mass strandings in Stewart Island and Farewell Spit. Thanks to Sheryl Gybney for interesting discussions and for passing on some of her knowledge on cetacean mass strandings.

Thank you to my lab mates from the laboratory of Molecular Ecology and Evolution for entertaining me, helping me, taking me on the field, and for enduring my moaning in French when PCRs were not working. An incredible mix of people with, I believe, as many as 11 nationalities represented. It's not something that I would have got the chance to experience in a French laboratory! So a big thanks to you guys: Carlos Olavarría, Nicky Wiseman, Dorothea Heimeier, Gabriela de Tezanos Pinto, Susanna Caballero, Shane Lavery, Fabianna Mourão, Kirsty Russell, Colm Carragher, Alana Alexander, Jess Hayward, Hamish MacInnes, Murdock Vant, Emma Carroll, Vimoksalehi Lukoschek, Jennifer Jackson, Lida Pimper, Rebecca Hamner, Danielle Hannan, Andrew Veale and Agnes Le Port. I also wish good luck to the new ones in the Lavery lab: Leah, Claire, Martin and Frank. Thanks to my other fellows at SBS, I think in particular of Karin Farreyrol (now in La Reunion) and Björn Heijstra. I also want to thank Kristine Boxen for great help and great smile in the sequencing room.

Thanks to the glorious ancients of the Baker lab: Merel Dalebout, Rochelle Constantine, Franz Pichler, Nathalie Patenaude and Tony Hickey. That was not an easy task to come after you guys, because you all did such a great job for your PhD. I tried to find inspiration in your manuscript, but I often ended up getting quite depressed, realising that it will be pretty hard for me to reach the same quality. Anyway, you all helped me in various ways at one stage or another of my thesis, so

thank you. Special thank to you, Rochelle, for helping me finding extra funding to work on the pilot whale samples, first with the WADAP and now with the ACCAMS.

Last in the lab but not least, I thank Debbie Steel for her tremendous help from day 1 to the day of submission. I should have counted the number of questions I asked you during my thesis. I'm sure it is quite an impressive number... Thank you very much Debbie, I owe you a lot (sorry I was not able to teach you how to pronounce a proper "r" in French...).

Thanks to the French community in Auckland for providing me with a taste of France, and a lot of fun parties: in particular, I thank Louis Ranjard (thanks also for your help with MATLAB, and appreciable coffee breaks at the lab), Jean Markarian, Julien Arnoux, Karine David, Stéphane Guindon, Elsa Kassardjian and Bénédicte Madon.

To people around the world:

I wish to thanks Tetsuya Endo and Naoko Funahashi in Japan, and Rosemary Gales in Australia for providing samples of long-finned pilot whale from 'whale-meat' market and strandings. Thanks to Michael Russello, Christina Pomilla, Michael Krützen, Anna Chao and Steven Kalinowski for help with computer programs.

Many thanks to Claire Garrigue from Opération Cétacés for her help, friendship and for giving me the opportunity to go in New Caledonia during the whale season. Thanks also for being such a great example for me. I thank the rest of the Opération Cétacés team, including Aline Schaffar, Remy Dodemont and Hughes Ducreux.

Thanks to the members of the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium for supporting my research through collaborative work and accepting one more Frenchman into the circle. Thanks to Lui Bell and SPREP for giving me the opportunity to present my results during the workshop at Samoa, in August 2005.

To people in France (so it will be in French):

Je remercie la famille Moreau pour leur soutien et leur amitié depuis temps d'années. Merci à Arnaud Legrand et sa petite famille. Je ne désespère pas de pouvoir travailler un jour avec toi mon ami. En Polynésie ou à Chizé les Bains, peu importe... Je salue Sandra Gaborit, Julie Pradera, Caroline Poupart, Badr Slassi, Arnaud Delaire, les familles Legarrec et Renaud, ainsi que tous mes amis en France. Merci à Laurent Grammont pour avoir été présent dans les moments difficiles. Egalement un énorme merci à mes amis très chers que sont Etienne Preys, Yohann Cardon et Mallorie Baussey. Pleins de bonnes choses à tous.

Merci à toute ma famille, côté Oremus et côté Blanchard, pour leur soutien moral et mais aussi financier. Je n'oublie pas que mes parents et ma grand mère Oremus m'ont évité la banqueroute dans les moments difficiles. Merci pour tout, sans vous j'y serai encore... Une pensée toute particulière va à mes deux grands pères, Johnny Oremus et Claude Blanchard.

Un remerciement tout spécial revient à Elise Mechain qui, durant cette thèse, m'a tant donné et apporté sans jamais compter. Difficile de trouver les mots bien évidemment mais sache que...

Enfin, je remercie mes « brothers » - Cedric Delaire, Vincent Legarrec, Alexandre Renaud, Willy Praud et Jérémie Batsalle - pour être resté fidèle à eux même et fidèle à nous. Je vais essayer de ne pas trop sombrer dans le sentimental car ce n'est pas trop le style de la maison (excepté à 2 g) mais je tiens à vous dire que pour moi, derrière le terme un peu puéril de « brothers » se cache une vérité : vous êtes la famille. Merci d'être là.

Lasts but not least (English and French):

A huge thanks to Sarah "limpet" Wells for giving me a normal life back and for her invaluable help, support and love during these last two years. I can't believe you managed to live aside a PhD student in the last part of his thesis (probably one of the worst types of human being). I promise you that I'll try to do as well as you when you'll come to do your PhD. Thank you so much limpet, you cannot imagine how lucky I feel to have you next to me.

Je fini avec ceux avec qui tout a commencé, mes parents Bernadette et Jean-Louis Oremus. Il n'y pas de mot suffisamment fort pour vous remercier comme il se doit. Sans votre soutient, sans votre amour, il n'y aurait rien eu de tout ca. On entend souvent des parents dire combien ils sont fiers de leurs enfants ; je peux vous dire aujourd'hui combien je suis fier de mes parents.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Thesis Abstract | i |
| Dedication | iii |
| Acknowledgments..... | iv |
| Table of Contents | viii |
| List of Tables | xiii |
| List of Figures..... | xv |
| 1. General Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Overview..... | 1 |
| 1.2. Brief review on the systematics of dolphins | 2 |
| 1.2.1. Mechanisms of speciation in dolphins..... | 3 |
| 1.2.2. Phylogeny and sources of paraphyly | 4 |
| 1.2.3. Convergence with terrestrial mammals | 5 |
| 1.3. Investigation of population structure | 7 |
| 1.3.1. A challenging task in delphinid species..... | 7 |
| 1.3.2. Factors driving dolphin population structure..... | 9 |
| 1.4. Genetic diversity | 12 |
| 1.5. Social system | 14 |
| 1.6. Principal methodological tools used in this study..... | 19 |
| 1.6.1. Photo-identification..... | 19 |
| 1.6.2. Biopsy sampling | 20 |
| 1.6.3. Molecular markers..... | 22 |
| 1.7. Thesis outline and collaborators..... | 24 |
| 2. Isolation and interchange among insular spinner dolphin communities in the South Pacific revealed by individual identification and genetic diversity 28 | |
| 2.1. Abstract..... | 29 |
| 2.2. Introduction | 30 |
| 2.3. Materials & Methods..... | 34 |
| 2.3.1. Study area and small-boat surveys..... | 34 |
| 2.3.2. Collection and analysis of photo-identification data | 35 |
| 2.3.3. Biopsy sampling and DNA extraction | 36 |
| 2.3.4. mtDNA sequencing, genotyping and sex identification | 36 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 2.3.5. | Moorea community size estimate..... | 37 |
| 2.3.6. | mtDNA and microsatellite diversity..... | 38 |
| 2.3.7. | Population structure and sex specific dispersal | 39 |
| 2.3.8. | Female long-term effective population size (N_{ef})..... | 39 |
| 2.3.9. | Testing for recent bottleneck effect | 40 |
| 2.4. | Results..... | 41 |
| 2.4.1. | Survey effort and sample size..... | 41 |
| 2.4.2. | Demographic closure at Moorea | 42 |
| 2.4.3. | Abundance of Moorea community..... | 44 |
| 2.4.4. | Individual interchange among islands | 45 |
| 2.4.5. | mtDNA diversity and effective population size | 46 |
| 2.4.6. | Population differentiation..... | 48 |
| 2.4.7. | Sex-biased dispersal | 49 |
| 2.4.8. | Genetic signature of community bottleneck | 50 |
| 2.5. | Discussion | 51 |
| 2.5.1. | Demographic closure of Moorea community..... | 51 |
| 2.5.2. | Demographic community trends in the Society Archipelago | 51 |
| 2.5.3. | Population genetic structure and sex-biased dispersal | 52 |
| 2.5.4. | Pelagic colonisation or island metapopulation? | 54 |
| 3. | Worldwide mtDNA phylogeography and diversity of pilot whale species (<i>Globicephala</i> spp.)..... | 57 |
| 3.1. | Abstract..... | 58 |
| 3.2. | Introduction..... | 59 |
| 3.3. | Materials & Methods..... | 65 |
| 3.3.1. | Sample collection and additional sequences | 65 |
| 3.3.2. | Laboratory analyses of tissue samples | 67 |
| 3.3.3. | Phylogenetic reconstruction | 68 |
| 3.3.4. | Geographical areas and adjusted sampling | 69 |
| 3.3.5. | Genetic diversity and population structure | 70 |
| 3.3.6. | Demographic history | 71 |
| 3.4. | Results..... | 72 |
| 3.4.1. | Phylogenetic reconstruction and sequence variation | 72 |
| 3.4.2. | Long-finned pilot whales (<i>Globicephala melas</i>)..... | 76 |
| 3.4.3. | Short-finned pilot whales (<i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>)..... | 80 |
| 3.5. | Discussion | 85 |
| 3.5.1. | Pilot whale species and sub-species..... | 85 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 3.5.2. | Long-finned pilot whale phylogeography | 86 |
| 3.5.3. | Short-finned pilot whales phylogeography | 88 |
| 4. | Patterns of kinship and mtDNA lineage within mass strandings of long-finned pilot whales around New Zealand | 94 |
| 4.1. | Abstract..... | 95 |
| 4.2. | Introduction | 96 |
| 4.3. | Materials & Methods..... | 100 |
| 4.3.1. | Data collection..... | 100 |
| 4.3.2. | DNA extraction and sequencing..... | 102 |
| 4.3.3. | Microsatellite genotyping..... | 102 |
| 4.3.4. | Age/sex classes | 103 |
| 4.3.5. | mtDNA control region | 104 |
| 4.3.6. | Patterns of relatedness | 104 |
| 4.3.7. | Parentage analyses | 105 |
| 4.4. | Results..... | 107 |
| 4.4.1. | Molecular sexing and age/sex classes..... | 107 |
| 4.4.2. | Overall mtDNA diversity | 107 |
| 4.4.3. | mtDNA haplotype distribution..... | 108 |
| 4.4.4. | Microsatellite statistics..... | 110 |
| 4.4.5. | Relatedness estimator..... | 110 |
| 4.4.6. | Within-stranding mean relatedness..... | 111 |
| 4.4.7. | mtDNA haplotypes and microsatellite relatedness..... | 113 |
| 4.4.8. | Parentage inference | 114 |
| 4.5. | Discussion | 115 |
| 4.5.1. | Unrelated maternal lineages in mass strandings | 115 |
| 4.5.2. | Using mass stranding data to infer social structure..... | 117 |
| 4.5.3. | A scenario of “unrelated matrilineal groups”..... | 117 |
| 4.5.4. | A similar social system to the North Atlantic | 118 |
| 4.5.5. | Comparison to other matrilineal species of odontocetes..... | 120 |
| 5. | “O’ mother where art thou?” Social disruption in a mass stranding of long-finned pilot whales | 122 |
| 5.1. | Abstract..... | 123 |
| 5.2. | Introduction | 124 |
| 5.3. | Materials & Methods..... | 127 |
| 5.3.1. | Circumstances of the stranding..... | 127 |
| 5.3.2. | Data collection..... | 128 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 5.3.3. | DNA extraction and microsatellite genotyping..... | 129 |
| 5.3.4. | Age/sex class | 130 |
| 5.3.5. | Spatial autocorrelation analyses | 131 |
| 5.3.6. | Relatedness analyses | 131 |
| 5.3.7. | Parentage analyses | 132 |
| 5.4. | Results..... | 133 |
| 5.4.1. | Sex/age class information | 133 |
| 5.4.2. | Microsatellite analyses | 134 |
| 5.4.3. | Spatial autocorrelation analyses | 134 |
| 5.4.4. | Relatedness and overall spatial distribution..... | 135 |
| 5.4.5. | Parentage inference | 136 |
| 5.5. | Discussion | 140 |
| 5.5.1. | Missing mothers | 140 |
| 5.5.2. | Potential scenarios explaining social disruption..... | 141 |
| 5.5.3. | Management of future strandings and animal welfare | 143 |
| 6. | Evidence of fine-scale population structure in rough-toothed dolphins from the Society Archipelago, French Polynesia | 145 |
| 6.1. | Abstract..... | 146 |
| 6.2. | Introduction..... | 147 |
| 6.3. | Materials and Methods | 149 |
| 6.3.1. | Study site and sample collection | 149 |
| 6.3.2. | Laboratory procedures | 150 |
| 6.3.3. | Microsatellite loci statistics | 151 |
| 6.3.4. | Mitochondrial DNA diversity and haplotype network..... | 152 |
| 6.3.5. | Kinship and population structure | 153 |
| 6.3.6. | Testing for recent genetic bottleneck | 154 |
| 6.4. | Results..... | 154 |
| 6.4.1. | Data collection..... | 154 |
| 6.4.2. | Photo-identification..... | 154 |
| 6.4.3. | Microsatellite diversity and sex identification..... | 155 |
| 6.4.4. | Mitochondrial DNA diversity | 157 |
| 6.4.5. | Kinship and population structure | 159 |
| 6.4.6. | Bottleneck tests | 161 |
| 6.5. | Discussion | 161 |
| 6.5.1. | Rough-toothed dolphins in the Society Archipelago..... | 161 |
| 6.5.2. | Fine-scale population structure | 162 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 6.5.3. Sex-biased dispersal..... | 163 |
| 6.5.4. A spinner dolphin community structure with a pilot whales social organisation? | 164 |
| 6.5.5. Conclusions..... | 165 |
| 7. General Discussion and Future Work..... | 167 |
| 7.1. Overview..... | 167 |
| 7.2. Metapopulation of spinner dolphins..... | 171 |
| 7.3. Pilot whales evolutionary history | 173 |
| 7.4. Social systems and matrilineality | 175 |
| 8. Appendices | 178 |
| Appendix 1..... | 179 |
| Appendix 2:..... | 180 |
| Appendix 3..... | 181 |
| Appendix 4..... | 183 |
| Appendix 5..... | 184 |
| Electronic Appendices..... | 187 |
| Appendix 6 | 187 |
| Appendix 7 | 187 |
| Appendix 8 | 187 |
| Appendix 9 | 188 |
| Appendix 10 | 188 |
| 9. References | 189 |

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1.1. Social system and life history attributes of dolphins under investigation in this thesis. | 24 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER 2

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2.1. Boat surveys conducted from 2002 to 2004 in French Polynesia. | 34 |
| Table 2.2. Microsatellite diversity for spinner dolphins from French Polynesia. | 37 |
| Table 2.3. Sex identification and genetic diversity statistics for spinner dolphins. | 42 |
| Table 2.4. Analysis of genetic differentiation among island communities. | 48 |
| Table 2.5. Differences in sex-specific F_{ST} values and variance of corrected assignment index. | 49 |
| Table 2.6. Summary statistics of various tests to detect a recent bottleneck effect. | 50 |

CHAPTER 3

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 3.1. Sample data for all pilot whale specimens used in this study. | 63 |
| Table 3.2. Variable nucleotide positions within the mtDNA control region of <i>Globicephala</i> sp. | 73 |
| Table 3.3. Genetic diversity statistics and neutrality tests in long-finned pilot whales. | 76 |
| Table 3.4. Analysis of genetic differentiation in long-finned pilot whales. | 78 |
| Table 3.5. Genetic diversity statistics and neutrality test in short-finned pilot whales. | 80 |
| Table 3.6. Analysis of genetic differentiation in short-finned pilot whales. | 81 |

CHAPTER 4

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 4.1. Summary of seven mass strandings from around New Zealand. | 103 |
| Table 4.2. Summary statistics of the 14 microsatellite loci in long-finned pilot whales. | 103 |
| Table 4.3. Statistical behaviour of four relatedness estimators. | 114 |
| Table 4.4. Results of parentage analyses within three mass strandings. | 115 |
| Table 4.5. Results of parentage analyses between three mass strandings. | 116 |

CHAPTER 5

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 5.1. Microsatellite diversity of long-finned pilot whales from Stewart Island. | 130 |
| Table 5.2. Results of the parentage analyses in the mass stranding at Stewart Island 2003. | 138 |

CHAPTER 6

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 6.1. Microsatellite diversity of rough-toothed dolphins from the Society Archipelago. | 151 |
| Table 6.2. Samples of rough-toothed dolphins collected outside French Polynesia. | 152 |
| Table 6.3. List of samples identified as genetic re-sampling. | 156 |
| Table 6.4. Sex identification and genetic diversity in rough-toothed dolphins. | 157 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 6.5. Mitochondrial DNA haplotypes in rough-toothed dolphins of the Society Archipelago..... | 158 |
| Table 6.6. List of the pairs of individuals showing a high-level of microsatellite relatedness. | 160 |
| Table 6.7. Summary statistics of various tests to detect a bottleneck effect..... | 161 |

CHAPTER 7

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 7.1. Summary of genetic parameters for the four species investigated in this study. | 171 |
|--|-----|

APPENDICES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 8.1. Description of criteria used to assess the quality of dorsal fin images..... | 182 |
| Table 8.2. Behavioural responses to biopsy sampling in three species of dolphins. | 183 |
| Table 8.3. Genotypes of four pilot whales from the mass stranding of Stewart Island 2003..... | 187 |

List of Figures

CHAPTER 2

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 2.1. Location and details of the study area in relationship to worldwide distribution of spinner dolphins. | 31 |
| Figure 2.2. Discovery curves based on the cumulative number of new DMIs. | 43 |
| Figure 2.3. Inferred genealogical relationship among mtDNA haplotypes from spinner dolphins. | 47 |

CHAPTER 3

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 3.1. Lateral view of the short-finned pilot whale and long-finned pilot whale. | 60 |
| Figure 3.2. Global distribution of <i>Globicephala</i> spp. | 61 |
| Figure 3.3. The origin and number of Japanese and Korean short-finned pilot whale products. | 67 |
| Figure 3.4. Phylogenetic relationships among pilot whale haplotypes. | 75 |
| Figure 3.5. Inferred genealogical relationships among long-finned pilot whale haplotypes. | 79 |
| Figure 3.6. Inferred genealogical relationships among short-finned pilot whale haplotypes. | 84 |

CHAPTER 4

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 4.1. Alternative scenarios of the social system of long-finned pilot whales. | 98 |
| Figure 4.2. Distribution and size of the mass strandings around New Zealand. | 109 |
| Figure 4.3. Observed mean relatedness within mass strandings. | 113 |

CHAPTER 5

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 5.1. Aerial view of the mass stranding at the Old Sand Neck, Stewart Island. | 122 |
| Figure 5.2. Illustration and interpretation of the progression of a mass stranding. | 126 |
| Figure 5.3. Geographical location of the mass stranding at Stewart Island. | 128 |
| Figure 5.4. Correlogram plots of the genetic correlation coefficient as a function of distance. | 135 |
| Figure 5.5. Distribution frequency of pairwise relatedness (r_{ML}). | 136 |
| Figure 5.6. Spatial distribution of long-finned pilot whales on the beach of Stewart Island. | 141 |

CHAPTER 6

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 6.1. Discovery curve based on the cumulative number of new DMIs. | 155 |
| Figure 6.2. Inferred genealogical relationship among rough-toothed dolphin mtDNA haplotypes | 159 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 8.1. Patterns of behavioural reactions to biopsy sampling for three species of dolphin. | 184 |
| Figure 8.2. Parental connexions between four pilot whales from the Stewart Island 2003 stranding | 188 |