
1 **Supplementary Material 3:**

2 Detailed discussion regarding the classification putative hybrids, and detailed sample
3 allocation data
4

5 Associated paper: Assessing a Bayesian approach for detecting exotic hybrids between
6 plantation and native eucalypts

7 In: *International Journal of Forestry Research*

8 Larcombe MJ, Vaillancourt RE, Jones RC, Potts BM

9 Corresponding email: ml5@utas.edu.au
10

11 Of the 15 putative hybrids 12 were classified as hybrids and three could not be distinguished
12 from their pure parents in the two-way analysis. Of the three indistinguishable samples, the
13 two putative *E. cypellocarpa* F₁s are probably correctly classified as pure *E. cypellocarpa*.
14 These two samples were collected from seedlings growing among native *E. cypellocarpa*
15 beside a 10 year old *E. globulus* plantation in Gippsland in the absence of native *E. globulus*
16 – ruling out the possibility that they are backcrosses (i.e. no mature F₁s available to facilitate
17 backcrossing). As noted previously the seedling morphology of these two species is very
18 similar and can be difficult to distinguish, and these two samples were only tentatively
19 classified as “possible” F₁s (with a low degree of certainty) based on the degree of
20 glaucousness, which can be a highly variable trait, even within species [69]. Therefore given
21 that they overlap the 95% confidence intervals of simulated pure *E. cypellocarpa*, and there
22 was low confidence in the morphological assessment, it is likely that they are correctly
23 allocated as pure *E. cypellocarpa*.

24 The situation with the putative *E. viminalis* x *globulus* hybrid that was classified as *E.*
25 *globulus* is less clear. This sample was identified in open pollinated *E. globulus* seed,
26 collected from native forest in southern Tasmania, where the species co-occur in the absence
27 of other cross-compatible eucalypts in close proximity. The sample showed distinctively
28 intermediate morphology, with linear, non-glaucous leaves compared to the broadly-linear,
29 glaucous leaves of *E. globulus* and the narrowly-linear non- glaucous leaves of *E.viminalis*.
30 The sample could be a morphologically unusual pure *E. globulus* that is coincidentally
31 intermediate between the species. However, the likelihood of random morphological
32 deviations on multiple traits resulting in intermediate characteristics is low, and is more easily

33 explained by inter-specific hybridisation [70, 71]. Therefore, considering the model
34 inaccuracy when identifying backcrosses, the native forest setting of the mother, and the
35 morphology, it is possible that this sample is actually a first or perhaps later generation
36 backcross.

37 Of the four putative *E. camaldulensis* x *globulus* samples collected from open pollinated
38 seed, three were within the 95% confidence intervals of the mean of the simulated F₁'s,
39 providing good evidence they are F₁ hybrids between *E. camaldulensis* and *E. globulus* Table
40 1. This supports Barbour *et al.* [30] who also identified putative *E. camaldulensis* x *globulus*
41 F₁s in seedlots from the same region based on morphology. The fourth sample from this
42 seedlot had mean *q* values outside the 95% confidence intervals of the simulated F₁s, but its
43 95% confidence intervals did include the mean of the simulated F₁s (Table 1). These four
44 samples were classified as putative F₁s because the age of plantation neighbouring the
45 mothers (10 years) made it unlikely that a mature F₁ hybrid could occur to facilitate
46 backcrossing. Moreover, the *q* values of the fourth sample resemble a backcross to *E.*
47 *globulus* (Table 1), which is impossible given that it came from an *E. camaldulensis* seedlot.
48 The sample could be a hybrid with another species, although the six-way analysis shows that
49 none of the other species in the model were involved, despite *E. ovata* and *E. viminalis*
50 occurring in the area where the seed was collected. Therefore given the somewhat divergent
51 nature of this sample it could be an exotic F₁, or it could be a hybrid with an unknown
52 species.

53 The putative *E. viminalis* x *globulus* hybrids (generation unknown) were mature trees
54 identified on the basis of intermediate capsule morphology within native forests, and were
55 classified as hybrids in the two-way model. Both natural and manipulated hybridisation
56 between the species has been reported [56]. All three samples here have *q* values that are
57 more consistent with backcrosses towards *E. globulus* than F₁s or F₂s (Table 5). They were
58 collected from native forests that were dominated by *E. globulus* with scattered *E. viminalis*.
59 This demographic ratio might be conducive to the formation of hybrids due to pollen
60 swamping by the more numerous species [72], and in such a situation backcross hybrids
61 towards *E. globulus* would be common. Patterns of asymmetrical gene flow in native
62 eucalypts have also arisen through differences in flower size [73]. It has been shown that in
63 many cases the pollen tube of small flowered species cannot reach the ovaries of large
64 flowered species, while the reverse cross can work [74]. *Eucalyptus globulus* has

65 significantly larger flowers than *E. viminalis* [69] again making backcrosses towards *E.*
66 *globulus* more likely. Therefore these samples are most likely backcrosses to *E. globulus* as
67 suggested by the admixture analysis, rather than F₁ or F₂ hybrids.

68 The five putative *E. cypellocarpa* x *globulus* hybrids (generation unknown) have *q* values
69 that are consistent with F₁s/F₂s or backcrosses towards *E. cypellocarpa* (Table 2). The sample
70 from a mature tree in native forest at Moonlight Head has *q* values that fall within the 95%
71 confidence intervals of the simulated F₁s. It was found in forest where both species were
72 common, and was unique among the trees inspected in that it had intermediate capsule
73 morphology. Natural F₁ hybrids between these species have been reported from mixed stands
74 elsewhere in Victoria [38, 75] and the simplest explanation is probably that this sample is an
75 F₁ that has survived to reproductive maturity.

76 The hybrid status of the population where the four Mallacoota samples were collected has
77 been the focus of considerable study [38, 39, 76]. All trees in the population appear to be
78 intermediate to varying degrees between *E. cypellocarpa* and *E. globulus*. Despite nearby
79 sources of *E. cypellocarpa* the nearest *E. globulus* is 6.4 km away. This led to the population
80 being one of the first reported examples of a phantom hybrid zone [38, 39]. There are several
81 other well documented examples of hybrid swarms between the two species in river valleys
82 to the west of Mallacoota where both species are present [38, 39, 75]. The trees in the
83 Mallacoota population occur basically at sea level and are large, probably ranging in age
84 from tens to hundreds of years old. Morphometric analysis showed that none of the trees
85 could be definitively classified as *E. cypellocarpa* or *E. globulus*, but two trees in particular
86 were very *E. globulus*-like [38]. However, terpene analysis found all trees to be
87 indistinguishable from *E. cypellocarpa* [38]. It was concluded that the population is probably
88 of hybrid origin and represents a genetic remnant of the past distribution of *E. globulus* that
89 was flooded when sea level rose after the last glacial maximum [38]. Although we only
90 analysed four samples from this population, they do appear to fit with the Kirkpatrick *et al.*
91 [38] hypothesis, with one sample being consistent with an F₁ or F₂ (although its 95% CIs did
92 include the simulated backcross means; Table 2) and the other three being more similar to
93 backcrosses towards *E. cypellocarpa* (Table 2).

94

95

96

97

98

99 **Table 1.** Assignment of simulated, pedigreed and putative hybrid samples between *E. camaldulensis* and *E.*
 100 *globulus* obtained from STRUCTURE using a *q* cut-off of 0.2.

Simulated samples	<i>n</i>	% correctly assigned at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>E. camaldulensis</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
Simulated <i>E. camaldulensis</i>	50	98	0.902	(0.910,0.891)	0.098	(0.109,0.086)
Simulated <i>E. globulus</i>	50	100	0.084	(0.093,0.076)	0.916	(0.924,0.907)
Simulated F1	50	100	0.530	(0.560,0.501)	0.470	(0.499,0.440)
Simulated F2	50	90	0.526	(0.573,0.478)	0.474	(0.522,0.427)
Simulated BCc	50	60	0.738	(0.770,0.706)	0.262	(0.294,0.230)
Simulated BCg	50	80	0.305	(0.339,0.270)	0.686	(0.721,0.652)
simulation total	300	88.3				
Pedigreed and putative hybrids	<i>n</i>	assignment at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.506	(0.247,0.768)	0.495	(0.232,0.753)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.580	(0.308,0.853)	0.421	(0.147,0.692)
Putative F1*	1	hybrid	0.335	(0.108,0.587)	0.665	(0.413,0.892)
Putative F1	1	hybrid	0.536	(0.271,0.799)	0.464	(0.201,0.729)
Putative F1	1	hybrid	0.583	(0.303,0.854)	0.417	(0.146,0.697)
Putative F1	1	hybrid	0.416	(0.171,0.685)	0.584	(0.315,0.829)

101 * Divergent sample referred to in the text

102

103

104

105 **Table 2.** Assignment of simulated, pedigreed and putative hybrid samples between *E. cypellocarpa* and *E.*
 106 *globulus* obtained from STRUCTURE using a *q* cut-off of 0.2. . Putative hybrid[?] = putative hybrid samples
 107 collected from mature trees in native forest where the generation is unknown.

Simulated samples	<i>n</i>	% correctly assigned at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>E. cypellocarpa</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
Simulated <i>E. cypellocarpa</i>	50	70	0.815	(0.842,0.789)	0.185	(0.211,0.158)
Simulated <i>E. globulus</i>	50	72	0.165	(0.184,0.148)	0.834	(0.852,0.816)
Simulated F1	50	98	0.490	(0.524,0.456)	0.510	(0.544,0.476)
Simulated F2	50	100	0.488	(0.526,0.450)	0.512	(0.550,0.474)
Simulated BCc	50	80	0.677	(0.714,0.639)	0.323	(0.361,0.286)
Simulated BCg	50	86	0.339	(0.378,0.299)	0.648	(0.687,0.609)
Total	300	84.4				
Pedigreed and putative hybrids	<i>n</i>	assignment at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
putative hybrid [?]	1	hybrid	0.563	(0.155,0.940)	0.437	(0.060,0.845)
putative hybrid [?] *	1	hybrid	0.669	(0.322,0.960)	0.331	(0.040,0.678)
putative hybrid [?] *	1	hybrid	0.628	(0.278,0.941)	0.372	(0.059,0.722)
putative hybrid [?] *	1	hybrid	0.726	(0.347,0.983)	0.274	(0.017,0.653)
putative hybrid [?] *	1	hybrid	0.494	(0.127,0.868)	0.506	(0.132,0.873)
putative F1	1	<i>E. cypellocarpa</i>	0.864	(0.616,0.996)	0.136	(0.004,0.384)
putative F1	1	<i>E. cypellocarpa</i>	0.848	(0.568,0.995)	0.152	(0.005,0.432)

108 * Samples from the putative phantom hybrid zone at Mallacoota discussed in the text

109

110

111

112 **Table 3.** Assignment of simulated, pedigreed and putative hybrid samples between *E. nitens* and *E. globulus*
 113 obtained from STRUCTURE using a *q* cut-off of 0.2.

Simulated samples	<i>n</i>	% correctly assigned at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>E. nitens</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
Simulated <i>E. nitens</i>	50	98	0.917	(0.927,0.907)	0.083	(0.093,0.073)
Simulated <i>E. globulus</i>	50	98	0.086	(0.096,0.075)	0.914	(0.925,0.904)
Simulated F1	50	100	0.504	(0.527,0.482)	0.496	(0.518,0.473)
Simulated F2	50	88	0.520	(0.567,0.474)	0.480	(0.526,0.433)
Simulated BCn	50	66	0.728	(0.760,0.696)	0.272	(0.304,0.240)
Simulated BCg	50	68	0.256	(0.289,0.223)	0.730	(0.763,0.698)
Total	300	86.3				

Pedigreed hybrid samples	<i>n</i>	assignment at <i>q</i> >0.2	<i>E. nitens</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)	<i>mean q</i>	95% CI (+ -)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.6562	(0.408,0.869)	0.3438	(0.131,0.592)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.442	(0.153,0.721)	0.558	(0.279,0.847)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.5108	(0.267,0.743)	0.4892	(0.257,0.733)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.5187	(0.274,0.753)	0.4813	(0.247,0.726)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.4818	(0.191,0.764)	0.5182	(0.236,0.809)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.3872	(0.150,0.645)	0.6128	(0.355,0.850)
pedigreed F1	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1659	(0.011,0.402)	0.8341	(0.598,0.989)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.4274	(0.169,0.700)	0.5726	(0.300,0.831)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.4327	(0.164,0.694)	0.5673	(0.306,0.836)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.2366	(0.041,0.491)	0.7634	(0.509,0.959)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.4423	(0.178,0.711)	0.5577	(0.289,0.822)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.427	(0.175,0.688)	0.573	(0.312,0.825)
pedigreed F2	1	hybrid	0.6063	(0.353,0.833)	0.3937	(0.167,0.647)
pedigreed F2	1	hybrid	0.4833	(0.218,0.736)	0.5167	(0.264,0.782)
pedigreed F2	1	hybrid	0.5528	(0.271,0.814)	0.4472	(0.186,0.729)
pedigreed F2	1	hybrid	0.3944	(0.137,0.659)	0.6056	(0.341,0.863)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1713	(0.012,0.404)	0.8287	(0.596,0.988)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1615	(0.011,0.388)	0.8385	(0.612,0.989)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1613	(0.018,0.383)	0.8387	(0.617,0.982)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1434	(0.009,0.346)	0.8566	(0.654,0.991)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.185	(0.022,0.406)	0.815	(0.594,0.978)
pedigreed BCg	1	hybrid	0.2244	(0.028,0.466)	0.7756	(0.534,0.972)
pedigreed BCg	1	hybrid	0.2247	(0.051,0.435)	0.7753	(0.565,0.949)
pedigreed BCg	1	hybrid	0.2204	(0.038,0.445)	0.7796	(0.555,0.962)
pedigreed BCg	1	hybrid	0.2713	(0.062,0.527)	0.7287	(0.473,0.938)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1317	(0.004,0.356)	0.8683	(0.644,0.996)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1866	(0.028,0.410)	0.8134	(0.590,0.972)
pedigreed BCg	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.115	(0.010,0.284)	0.885	(0.716,0.990)

114

115

116 **Table 4.** Assignment of simulated, pedigreed and putative hybrid samples between *E. ovata* and *E. globulus*
 117 obtained from STRUCTURE using a q cut-off of 0.2.

Simulated samples	n	% correctly assigned at $q > 0.2$	<i>E. ovata</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			mean q	95% CI (+ -)	mean q	95% CI (+ -)
Simulated <i>E. ovata</i>	50	100	0.925	(0.933,0.917)	0.075	(0.083,0.067)
Simulated <i>E. globulus</i>	50	98	0.090	(0.102,0.078)	0.910	(0.922,0.898)
Simulated F1	50	94	0.477	(0.514,0.440)	0.523	(0.560,0.486)
Simulated F2	50	98	0.502	(0.544,0.461)	0.498	(0.539,0.456)
Simulated BCo	50	72	0.721	(0.757,0.686)	0.279	(0.314,0.243)
Simulated BCg	50	74	0.278	(0.313,0.242)	0.708	(0.744,0.673)
Total	300	89.3				
Pedigreed hybrid samples		assignment at $q > 0.2$	mean q	95% CI (+ -)	mean q	95% CI (+ -)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.5365	(0.266,0.804)	0.4635	(0.196,0.734)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.5316	(0.273,0.788)	0.4684	(0.212,0.727)

118

119 **Table 5.** Assignment of simulated, pedigreed and putative hybrid samples between *E. viminalis* and *E. globulus*
 120 obtained from STRUCTURE using a q cut-off of 0.2. Putative hybrid[?] = putative hybrid samples collected from
 121 mature trees in native forest where the generation is unknown.

Simulated samples	n	% correctly assigned at $q > 0.2$	<i>E. viminalis</i> cluster		<i>E. globulus</i> cluster	
			mean q	95% CI (+ -)	mean q	95% CI (+ -)
Simulated <i>E. viminalis</i>	50	88	0.868	(0.886,0.849)	0.132	(0.151,0.114)
Simulated <i>E. globulus</i>	50	88	0.133	(0.151,0.115)	0.867	(0.885,0.849)
Simulated F1	50	100	0.507	(0.544,0.470)	0.493	(0.530,0.456)
Simulated F2	50	90	0.487	(0.537,0.438)	0.513	(0.562,0.462)
Simulated BCv	50	78	0.717	(0.749,0.688)	0.281	(0.312,0.251)
Simulated BCg	50	76	0.284	(0.314,0.254)	0.716	(0.746,0.685)
Total	300	86.7				
Pedigreed and putative hybrids		assignment at $q > 0.2$	mean q	95% CI (+ -)	mean q	95% CI (+ -)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.6896	(0.378,0.944)	0.3104	(0.056,0.622)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.5601	(0.276,0.840)	0.4399	(0.160,0.724)
pedigreed F1	1	hybrid	0.4754	(0.200,0.759)	0.5246	(0.241,0.800)
putative hybrid [?]	1	hybrid	0.3296	(0.104,0.591)	0.6704	(0.409,0.896)
putative hybrid [?]	1	hybrid	0.2058	(0.019,0.464)	0.7942	(0.536,0.981)
putative hybrid [?]	1	hybrid	0.3522	(0.083,0.654)	0.6478	(0.346,0.917)
putative hybrid [?]	1	<i>E. globulus</i>	0.1137	(0.002,0.355)	0.8863	(0.645,0.998)

122

123

124