# A new species of Deltamys Thomas, 1917 (Rodentia: Cricetidae) endemic to the southern Brazilian Araucaria Forest and notes on the expanded phylogeographic scenario of $\boldsymbol{D}$. kempi 
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#### Abstract

Deltamys is a monotypic sigmodontine rodent from the Pampas of South America. In addition to the formally recognized D. kempi that inhabits lowlands, an undescribed form Deltamys sp. $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ was recently found in the highlands of southeastern Brazil. In the present study, we perform a phylogeographic reassessment of Deltamys and describe a third form of the genus, endemic to the Brazilian Araucaria Forest. We describe this new species based on an integrative analysis, using complete cytochrome b DNA sequences, karyology and morphology. Bayesian tree recovered two allopatric clades (lowlands vs. highlands) and three lineages: (i) the lowland D. kempi, (ii) the highland Deltamys sp. 2n=40, and (iii) Deltamys araucaria $\mathbf{s p}$. n. Deltamys araucaria $\mathbf{s p}$. $\mathbf{n}$. is karyotypically ( $2 \mathrm{n}=34$ ) and morphologically distinguishable from $D$. kempi ( $2 \mathrm{n}=37-38$ ), showing a tawnier dorsum/flank pelage, presence of a protostyle, M1 alveolus positioned anteriorly to the posterior margin of the zygomatic plate, and several other distinguishing characteristics. A phylogeographic assessment of $D$. kempi recovered two haplogroups with significant differences in skull measurements. This phylogeographic break seems to have been shaped by the Patos Lagoon estuarine channel. The diversification in Deltamys might have been triggered by dispersal of older lineages over different altitudinal ranges in the Paraná geological basin.
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## Introduction

Deltamys Thomas, 1917 is a monotypic rodent genus, which for almost a century was thought to be associated only with grasslands in the Pampas biome (lowlands) (González \& Pardiñas 2002; González \& Martínez-Lanfranco 2010). Recently, a new allopatric lineage, referred to as Deltamys sp. $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ (Ventura et al. 2011), was found on the Meridional Plateau (hereafter highlands; Fig. 1), a region originally covered over most of its area by Atlantic Forest vegetation, specifically, the Araucaria Forest (i.e. Mixed Ombrophilous Forest). The genus was thought to exhibit a particular karyotype system, due to the distinctive sex-chromosome system of D. kempi, in which males ( $2 \mathrm{n}=37 /$ $\mathrm{FN}=38)$ are determined by $\mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{Y}_{1}$ and females $(2 \mathrm{n}=38 / \mathrm{FN}=38)$ by $\mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{2}$ (Sbalqueiro et al. 1984; Castro et al.

1991; González \& Pardiñas 2002; Ventura et al. 2011). Deltamys sp. 2n=40, in contrast, shows the common mammalian sex-determination system XY/XX (Ventura et al. 2011). In addition to the karyological differences, these two Deltamys lineages are highly divergent based on DNA sequences of the cytochrome $b$ (cyt b) gene, showing ca. $12 \%$ genetic distance. They form a well-supported sister clade to Akodon (Ventura et al. 2011).

Deltamys kempi is the only formally recognized species in the genus, described by Thomas (1917) based on specimens from "Isla Ella", an uncertain locality in the Paraná River estuary. Similarities between D. kempi and small Akodon forms have led some authors to consider Deltamys a subgenus or even a synonym of Akodon (e.g. Ellerman 1941; Cabrera 1961; Massoia 1964; Reig 1987; Barrantes et al. 1993; Musser \& Carleton 1993). Morphological (González \& Massoia 1995), cytogenetic (Gentile de Fronza et al. 1981; Sbalqueiro et al. 1984; Castro et al. 1991) and later molecular data (D’Elía et al. 2003; Montes et al. 2008), however, supported the generic status of Deltamys.

The intraspecific genetic diversity in $D$. kempi was assessed through analysis of the cytochrome $b$ (cyt $b$ ) and nuclear recombination activating gene 2 sequences (Montes et al. 2008), and in Deltamys sp. $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ based only on cyt $b$ data (Ventura et al. 2011). Deltamys kempi shows high haplotypic diversity, considering the number of localities surveyed in these studies. The first phylogeographic analysis, using 30 specimens from eight localities along the species distribution (10 haplotypes recovered) (Montes et al. 2008), showed an internal division of $D$. kempi into two groups: (i) restricted to the coastal plain of northern Rio Grande do Sul state (RS) plus one locality on the northeastern shore of the Patos Lagoon; and (ii) extending to inland RS, southern RS coastal plain, Uruguay and Argentina. These groups also show significant differences in a craniometric analysis (Montes et al. 2008). Based on these molecular and morphological divergences, Montes et al. (2008) suggested that D. kempi could encompass two taxa. In spite of these important findings, Montes et al. (2008) did not evaluate the genetic diversity on the central RS coastal plain (Restinga of São José do Norte), and sampled only one Uruguayan locality. Furthermore, the craniometric analysis in their study did not include samples from Uruguayan populations.

In this study we expanded this scenario, including a number of localities in Uruguay and also within Rio Grande do Sul state. More importantly, we explored a continuation of the distribution beyond the northern limit of the distribution range defined by Montes et al. (2008), considered as Torres municipality ( $29^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \mathrm{S} ; 049^{\circ} 43^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ ). This limit is a narrow region of the coastal plain, delimited eastward by the Atlantic Ocean and westward (ca. 2 Km ) by a forested mountain range. The mountain range lies within the Atlantic Forest domain and is characterized by a mosaic of grassland patches within an Araucaria Forest. Accordingly, we sampled in this region (São Francisco de Paula municipality; Fig. 1) specimens that externally resemble D. kempi (small size, relatively large head, short limbs and tail, soft pelage, small eyes, delicate skull; González \& Pardiñas 2002), except for a tawnier pelage. Given the existence of Deltamys sp. $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ in the Araucaria Forest (Ventura et al. 2011), we investigated the phylogenetic status of the SFP morphotype, and describe it here as a new species. We also re-examined the genetic structure and skull morphological differentiation in $D$. kempi, using a larger and broader sample.

## Material and methods

Sample collection. We sampled 18 individuals from the São Francisco de Paula (hereafter SFP) highlands (eight were collected and 10 were released after their ear tips were clipped, as requested by the local managers) and 69 of D. kempi (all collected) from lowland localities in eastern and southern RS (Fig. 1; Table 1). Skin, skull and tissue samples were prepared and housed at the Genetics Department of the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (DG-UFRGS), Museu de Ciências Naturais da Universidade Luterana do Brasil (MCNU) and Zoology Department of the Universidade Regional de Blumenau (DZ-FURB). For the morphometrics approach, we also included 55 specimens from Uruguay, housed at the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) and the Museo Nacional de Historia Natural (EMG and PCE). All material used is listed in Appendix I. The collecting was approved by the Brazilian governmental authority ICMBio-SISBIO 29358-1.

Cytogenetic methods. Chromosome preparations were obtained from femoral marrow of one male and one female from SFP, following Ford and Hamerton (1956). Individuals were euthanized 35 minutes after a subcutaneous adminstration of $0.1 \%$ colchicine solution ( $1 \mathrm{ml} / 100 \mathrm{~g}$ of body weight) and marrow cells were extracted and treated with hypotonic citrate. Diploid number was established after analyzing at least 10 metaphases/individual. Suspensions of bone-marrow in Carnoy's fixative were deposited at DG-UFRGS.
TABLE 1. Localities identified on the map (\#; Figure 1), indicating the number of specimens sampled (N) and haplotypes characterized in Deltamys based on sequences of the cytochrome $b$ gene.

| Species | \# | Locality | N | Haplotype | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deltamys kempi |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | UR: Canelones, Rincón del Colorado | 2 | H8, H9 | This study |
|  | 2 | UR: Flores, Rio San José | 1 | H3 | This study |
|  | 3 | UR: San José, Arroio Cufré | 2 | H2 | This study |
|  |  | UR: San José* |  | H2 | This study |
|  | 4 | UR: Rocha, Refugio de Fauna Laguna de Castillos | 5 | H1, H2, H5, H6 | This study |
|  | 5 | UR: Rocha, Parque Santa Teresa | 6 | H7, H28 | This study |
|  | 6 | UR: Rivera, Cofusa | 1 | H4 | This study |
|  | 7 | AR: Buenos Aires* | - | H18 | Montes et al. 2008; D’Elía et al. 2003 |
|  | 8 | BR: Rio Grande, Reserva Ecológica do Taim | 4 | H33, H34, H35, H36 | This study |
|  |  | BR: Rio Grande, Reserva Ecológica do Taim* | - | H17, H19, H20 | Montes et al. 2008 |
|  | 9 | BR: RS, Rio Grande, APA Lagoa Verde | 4 | H10, H11, H12 | This study |
|  | 10 | BR: RS, Bujuru | 1 | H13 | This study |
|  | 11 | BR: RS, São José do Norte | 12 | H13, H31, H32 | This study |
|  | 12 | BR: RS, Palmares do Sul | 19 | H25, H26,H27 | This study |
|  | 13 | BR: RS, Pedro Osório | 3 | H22 | This study |
|  | 14 | BR: RS, Pelotas | 5 | H29, H30 | This study |
|  | 15 | BR: RS, Cristal | 1 | H15 | This study |
|  | 16 | BR: RS, Charqueadas* | - | H21 | Montes et al. 2008 |
|  | 17 | BR: RS. Viamão, Banhado Grande | 1 | H37 | This study |
|  | 18 | BR: RS, Tapes* | - | H24 | Montes et al. 2008 |
|  | 19 | BR: RS, Tramandaí* | - | H14 | Montes et al. 2008 |
|  | 20 | BR: RS, Osório | 1 | H14 | This study |
|  |  | BR: RS, Osório* | - | H23 | Montes et al. 2008 |
|  | 21 | BR: RS, Torres, Parque Estadual de Itapeva | 1 | H16 | This study |
|  |  | BR: RS, Torres* | - | H22 | Montes et al. 2008 |
| Deltamys araucaria sp. n . |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22 | BR: RS, São Francisco de Paula | 18 | H38, H39, H40, H41, H42 | This study |
| Deltamys sp. $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ | 23 | BR: RS, Esmeralda* | 3 | H43, H44 | Ventura et al. 2011 |
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FIGURE 1. Distributional range of Deltamys in South America, showing the allopatry of lowland and highland populations. Collecting localities of Deltamys kempi are marked in yellow circles, Deltamys araucaria sp. n.. is indicated by the red triangle, and Deltamys sp. $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ is indicated by the light-blue square. Numbers correspond to localities presented in Table 1.

Molecular methods. The majority of the DNA sequences analyzed were generated for this study, obtained according to the following protocol. Genomic DNA was isolated from 87 specimens (Table 1) using approximately 0.2 g of liver or muscle tissue, with the Cetyl Trimethyl Ammonium Bromide method (Doyle \& Doyle 1984). The complete cyt $b$ gene ( $1,143 \mathrm{bp}$ ) was amplified using a polymerase chain reaction (PCR) with primers MVZ05 and MVZ14 (Smith \& Patton 1993). Reaction concentration included: $25 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ total volume, including $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $10 \times$ PCR buffer, $1.0 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $\mathrm{MgCl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{mM}), 0.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of dNTP mixture ( 10 mM for each nucleotide), $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of Platinum® Taq DNA polymerase (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of each primer ( $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ), and $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of DNA template ( 100 $\mathrm{ng} / \mu \mathrm{L})$. PCR thermal profiles included an initial denaturation at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(5 \mathrm{~min})$, followed by 39 cycles with denaturation at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(20 \mathrm{~s})$, annealing at $48^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{~s})$, polymerization at $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(45 \mathrm{~s})$, and a final extension at 72 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ( 7 min ). PCR products were purified using ExoSap-IT® (USB Corporation) and sequenced using an ABI 3730XL automatic sequencer (Perkin Elmer, Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA), with the above-listed primers. Electropherograms were manually checked to locate any discrepancy, and edited in MEGA 6 (Tamura et al. 2013). Nucleotide sequences generated from this study were deposited in GenBank under the accession numbers KM275437- KM275467.

Sequence analysis. We reconstructed a maximum likelihood (ML) tree to infer phylogenetic relationships in Deltamys. We used original data generated for 18 specimens from SPF and 75 specimens of D. kempi ( 32 novel haplotypes). Haplotypes of D. kempi (Montes et al. 2008) and three sequences of Deltamys sp . $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ (Ventura et al. 2011) were incorporated from GenBank (Table 1). Representative akodontine species (e.g., Oxymcterus paramensis and Brucepattersonius soricinus), some of them sympatric do Deltamys (e.g., Akodon paranaensis, A. reigi, A. azarae and A. serrensis; Necromys lasiurus), were used to root the tree downloaded from Genbank database. The ML analysis was conducted using the HKY (Hasegawa et al. 1985) nucleotide substitution model that was selected by jModeltest 2 (Darriba et al. 2012). Searches were conducted in PHYML 3.0 (Guindon et al. 2010) through 1000 replicates of heuristic search with random addition of sequences and TBR. Monophylyconfidence limits were assessed with the bootstrap method (Felsenstein 1985) at a $50 \%$ cutoff after 1000 bootstrap iterations.Pairwise genetic distances (p-distances) among clades were estimated in MEGA 6.

We characterized mtDNA diversity for all lineages, including variable sites, definitions of haplotypes, haplotype and nucleotide diversity, and Neutrality tests (Tajima's $D$, Fu and Li's $D$ and $F$, Fu's $F S$ ), using the program DNASP 5.0 (Librado \& Rozas 2009). A median-joining haplotype network (Bandelt et al. 1999) was constructed in NETWORK 4.6 (http://www.fluxus-engineering.com/sharenet.htm). Levels of genetic structure among subpopulations of $D$. kempi were characterized using $\phi_{\mathrm{ST}}$, which is analogous to Wright's $F$-statistics but takes into account the genetic distance among haplotypes, using ARLEQUIN 3.5 (Excoffier \& Lischer 2010).

Morphological analysis. We directly examined the skull and skin for diagnostic characters to distinguish between Deltamys sp. n. and D. kempi from RS and Uruguay lowlands. The skull of the D. kempi holotype was examined through high-definition photographs. The descriptive terminology for general external morphology follows Hershkovitz (1966) and Voss (1988). We transcribed the external measurements of total length (TL), headbody length (HB), length of tail (LT), height of ear (Ear), and hindfoot length from specimen tags and field notes. When TL was available instead of HB, we calculated HB by subtracting LT from TL. External measurements are given to the nearest millimeter (mm). Cranial terminology follows Hershkovitz (1962) and Voss (1988), and molar terminology follows Reig (1977). Postcranial terminology follows Voss (1988), Carrizo and Diaz (2011) and Machado et al. (2011).

Twenty-one craniodental measurements (breadth of incisors [BI], length of molar row [LMR], length of nasal [LN], length of rostrum [LR], length of tympanic bulla [LTB], breadth of braincase [BB], breadth of zygomatic plate [BZB], least interorbital length [LIB], length of rostrum [LR], distance between first molars [DFM], breadth of first molar [BFM], condylo-incisive length [CIL], greatest length [GL], palatal length [PL], length of diastema [LD], orbital length [OL], height of braincase [HB], breadth of zygomatic [BZ], length of incisive foramina [LIF], breadth of incisive foramina [BIF], breadth of occipital condyles [BOC]) were taken with a digital caliper accurate to the nearest 0.01 mm . Measurements were taken as illustrated by Hershkovitz (1962) and Voss (1988) and converted to decimal logarithms. Missing values (3.2\%) were estimated by the method of linear regression (Gauthier et al.) 2003. All measurements were positively correlated to GL, which was treated as independent variable. The other measurements were treated as dependent variables and missing values estimated by the model generated for each variable (expected values). We performed two craniometric analyses. First, we examined craniometric differences between specimens of Deltamys sp. n. ( $\mathrm{n}=7$ ) and D. kempi $(\mathrm{n}=121)$ through a principal components analysis (PCA) using the first three principal components from the variance-covariance matrix generated from logarithm-converted measurements. We then tested the hypothesis of significant differences in the skull measurements between samples from D. kempi mitochondrial clades A $(\mathrm{n}=34)$ and $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n}=38)$ previously identified in the Bayesian analysis (see Results). For this, we performed a PCA using the first three principal components from the variance-covariance matrix generated from logarithm-converted measurements. We also performed a discriminant analysis aiming to evaluate the percentage of correct classification of the specimens between mitochondrial clades A and B.. Because sexual dimorphism in the sets of cranial measurements used here was not detected previously (Montes et al. 2008), we pooled the sets from females and males for analysis.

## Results

We identified high levels of variation in cyt $b$ sequences, including 37 haplotypes in $D$. kempi $(2 \mathrm{n}=37-38)$ from the lowlands and seven in the highlands; five in the SFP morphotype and two in Deltamys sp. ( $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ ) (Tables 1, 2). Haplotypes found in individuals from SFP were exclusive to this lineage (Figs. 2, 3). Neutrality tests did not indicate a pattern of population expansion, except for the SFP morphotype, which showed significant negative values for most of parameters, but FS Fu's test (Table 2). The genetic divergence between D. kempi and either SPF or Deltamys sp. ( $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ ) were $12 \%$ (Table 3). .Specimens from SFP formed a strongly supported bootstrap $>0.95$ ) clade, reciprocally monophyletic to the Deltamys sp. $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ from Esmeralda (Fig. 2). The genetic distance between them was $8 \%$ (Table 3).

Deltamys from SFP showed $2 \mathrm{n}=34$ and $\mathrm{FNa}=34$ (Fig. 4), and therefore is karyotypically distinct from $D$. kempi $(2 n=38)$ and the sister lineage from Esmeralda ( $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ ). Deltamys from SFP presented the commom mammalian sex chromosome system $\mathrm{XY} / \mathrm{XX}$, in contrast with the exclusive system $\mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{Y}_{1} / \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{2}$ observed in $D$. kempi. Deltamys from SFP showed clear qualitative craniodental and pelage characters that distinguished it from $D$. kempi, which includes: (1) dorsal and flank pelage markedly tawnier (dorsal and flank pelage of D. kempi is grayer)
(Fig.5), (2) presence of protostyle (protostyle absent in D. kempi) (Fig. 6), (3) M1 anterior alveolus parallel to or above the posterior border of the zygomatic plate, in ventral view (in D. kempi the M1 anterior alveolus is positioned below or parallel to the posterior border of the zygomatic plate) (Fig.6), (4) hamular process short, stocky and of similar width along its length (hamular process with a long ramus and a posteriorly divergent section in $D$. kempi), (5) interparietal comparatively wider (interparietal reduced but present as a distinct losangular bony plate in D. kempi) (Fig.6), (6) region of the suture between the frontal and the maxillary at the border of the orbit rounded (in $D$. kempi this region is shelflike, almost forming a plate), (7) presence of enteroloph (enteroloph is present in only two of 62 D . kempi specimens), (8) ectolophid conspicuous (ectolophid is absent in most $D$. kempi specimens, and when present, it is vestigial, conspicuous in only a single specimen). However, in the PCA analysis the scores of this new lineage were displayed within the convex hull formed by $D$. kempi individual scores (Fig. 7). External and craniometric measurements of Deltamys sp. 2n=34 and D. kempi specimens overlapped (Table 4). The genetic divergence at specific level, the distinct karyotype and the marked morphological differences support the recognition of the SFP form as a new Deltamys species, therefore described.
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FIGURE 2. Maximum likelihood tree of Deltamys constructed based on cytochrome $b$ complete sequences. Boostrap branch support is indicated by gradient of colors, accordingly to the legend. Numbers above branches represent the percentage of genetic divergence ( $p$-distance) between clades. Bold indicate specimens of the new taxa described in this study.


FIGURE 3. Haplotype network for Deltamys kempi obtained under the median-joining method. Population labels are given according to Table 1 (bold indicates haplotypes [H1-H10] found by Montes et al. [2008] in the same localities sampled in this study). The size of each circle is proportional to the haplotype frequency. Median vectors are represented by small black circles. All lines represent one mutational step. Clades represent major haplogroups (A and B) of D. kempi identified in the phylogenetic analysis.


FIGURE 4. Karyotype (conventional Giemsa staining) of Deltamys araucaria sp. n. showing $2 \mathrm{n}=34$ and $\mathrm{FNa}=34$. The small metacentric pair corresponds to pair 16.

TABLE 2. Number of sequences ( N ), haplotypes ( Ha ), polymorphic sites ( S ), haplotype diversity ( $\mathrm{Hd} \pm$ standard
 Li's $D$ and $F$ and Fu's $F S$ estimated using DnaSP v5 are also given.

| Species | N | H | S | Hd $( \pm$ SD $)$ | $\mathrm{Pi}( \pm$ SD $)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Deltamys kempi | 75 | 37 | $52(6.4 \%)$ | $0.946 \pm 0.017$ | $0.01178 \pm 0.0004$ |
| Deltamys araucaria $\mathbf{\text { sp. n. }}$ | 18 | 5 | $15(1.3 \%)$ | $0.662 \pm 0.094$ | $0.00271 \pm 0.0012$ |
| Deltamys sp. $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ | 3 | 3 | $12(1.0 \%)$ | $1.000 \pm 0.272$ | $0.00702 \pm 0.0021$ |

continued.

| Species | Neutrality tests |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tajima's $D$ | Fu and Li's |  | Fu's FS |
|  |  | D | F |  |
| Deltamys kempi | -0.34326 | -0.82542 | -0.76295 | -10.870 |
| Deltamys araucaria sp. n. | -1.97476* | -2.97581** | -3.11006** | 0.625 |
| Deltamys sp. (2n=40) | - | - | - | 0.901 |

* $\mathrm{P}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{P}<0.05$.

TABLE 3. Evolutionary divergence estimates based on cytochrome $b$ sequences between pairwise groups of Deltamys (and a sister species, Akodon boliviensis; see material and methods). The number of base substitutions per site from averaging over all sequence pairs between groups, $\pm$ standard error (after 1000 bootstrap replications), is shown. Analyses were conducted using uncorrected $p$-distance.

|  | Deltamys kempi <br> $($ clade A) | Deltamys kempi <br> $($ clade B) | Deltamys sp. <br> $(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ | Deltamys araucaria <br> $\mathbf{s p . ~} \mathbf{n}$. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Deltamys kempi (clade A) | - |  |  |  |
| Deltamys kempi (clade B) | $0.01 \pm 0.00$ | - |  |  |
| Deltamys $\mathrm{sp} .(2 \mathrm{n}=40)$ | $0.11 \pm 0.02$ | $0.12 \pm 0.02$ | - | - |
| Deltamys araucaria sp. $\mathbf{n}$. | $0.12 \pm 0.02$ | $0.12 \pm 0.02$ | $0.08 \pm 0.01$ | $0.17 \pm 0.02$ |
| Akodon boliviensis | $0.17 \pm 0.02$ | $0.17 \pm 0.02$ | $0.15 \pm 0.02$ | 0 |

## Deltamys araucaria sp. n.

Araucaria Grass Mouse
Figures 5,8, Table 4

Holotype. FURB 20296 (field number PRM 137), adult female with skull (left zygomatic arch and incisors damaged), skin, post-cranial skeleton, ethanol-preserved forefoot and hind foot, collected by F. M. Quintela on 17 August 2012. Frozen tissue sample (PRM 137) and suspension of bone-marrow in Carnoy's fixative (PRM 137) were deposited in the Department of Genetics at UFRGS (DG-UFRGS).

Type locality. São Francisco de Paula municipality ( $29^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 73^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{S}, 050^{\circ} 13^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} ; 913 \mathrm{~m}$ above sea level), Rio Grande do Sul State, Brazil.

Paratypes. Seven topotypes (FURB 20220, 20240, 20244, 20297, 20330, 20954 and 20955) were collected between 1 April and 12 October 2012. A frozen tissue sample (FQ 84-86; PRM 10, 103, 104, 106, 124, 138) and a suspension of bone marrow in Carnoy's fixative (FQ 85 and 86) were deposited in the Department of Genetics at DG-UFRGS.

Distribution. Known only from shrub and herbaceous palustrine systems in São Francisco de Paula municipality (altitude ca. 913 m above sea level), Serra Geral highlands, Rio Grande do Sul state, southern Brazil. This region is within the biogeographic domains of Araucaria Forest, Atlantic Forest biome.

Diagnosis. A markedly tawny furred Deltamys species; $2 \mathrm{n}=34, \mathrm{FNa}=34$; protostyle present; M1 anterior alveolus parallel to or above posterior border of zygomatic plate in ventral view.

TABLE 4. External and cranial measurements (in millimeters) of Deltamys kempi and Deltamys araucaria (mean [X] $\pm$ one standard deviation [SD], the observed range [in parentheses], and the sample size [ N ]).

|  | Deltamys kempi |  |  | Deltamys araucaria sp. n. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{X} \pm$ SD | Range | N | $\mathrm{X} \pm$ SD | Range | N |
| HBL | $79.77 \pm 8.31$ | (71.7-98.03) | 44 | $79.76 \pm 11.67$ | (68.41-91.53) | 7 |
| LT | $74.11 \pm 6.82$ | (62.26-86.33) | 44 | $65.92 \pm 5.76$ | (61.85-70.11) | 7 |
| Ear | $13.06 \pm 1.10$ | (10.11-15.96) | 44 | $14.15 \pm 2.61$ | (12.37-16.08) | 7 |
| HF | $21.65 \pm 2.14$ | (20.17-23.22) | 44 | $21.86 \pm 2.54$ | (20.04-23.63) | 7 |
| IB | $1.79 \pm 0.47$ | (1.46-2.12) | 114 | $1.65 \pm 0.08$ | (1.59-1.71) | 7 |
| LMR | $3.83 \pm 0.70$ | (3.34-4.33) | 118 | $4.00 \pm 0.14$ | (3.91-4.01) | 7 |
| NL | $9.26 \pm 1.93$ | (7.89-10.63) | 112 | $9.47 \pm 1.20$ | (8.62-10.33) | 7 |
| BR | $4.07 \pm 0.98$ | (3.37-4.77) | 119 | $3.83 \pm 0.34$ | (3.59-4.08) | 7 |
| TBL | $3.97 \pm 0.82$ | (3.38-4.55) | 108 | $4.08 \pm 0.35$ | (3.84-4.33) | 7 |
| BB | $10.46 \pm 1.59$ | (9.33-11.58) | 112 | $10.65 \pm 0.32$ | (10.42-10.88) | 7 |
| BZB | $2.00 \pm 0.58$ | (1.59-2.41) | 117 | $1.87 \pm 0.21$ | (1.72-2.03) | 7 |
| LIB | $4.27 \pm 0.61$ | (3.84-4.70) | 119 | $4.37 \pm 0.11$ | (4.29-4.44) | 7 |
| LR | $8.20 \pm 1.44$ | (6.47-9.93) | 113 | $8.96 \pm 0.42$ | (8.06-9.26) | 7 |
| DFM | $4.55 \pm 0.39$ | (3.92-5.19) | 118 | $4.73 \pm 0.17$ | (4.61-4.86) | 7 |
| BFM | $1.05 \pm 0.39$ | (0.77-1.32) | 118 | $1.13 \pm 0.11$ | (1.05-1.21) | 7 |
| CIL | $23.19 \pm 3.92$ | (20.42-25.96) | 108 | $22.82 \pm 1.13$ | (22.02-23.63) | 7 |
| TL | $24.36 \pm 3.63$ | (21.80-26.93) | 101 | $24.38 \pm 1.01$ | (23.67-25.09) | 7 |
| PL | $3.56 \pm 0.75$ | (3.03-4.09) | 119 | $3.60 \pm 0.23$ | (3.44-3.76) | 7 |
| LD | $6.15 \pm 1.65$ | (4.98-7.32) | 118 | $6.54 \pm 0.56$ | (6.14-6.94) | 7 |
| OL | $8.11 \pm 1.33$ | (7.16-9.04) | 114 | $8.04 \pm 0.29$ | (7.83-8.25) | 7 |
| HB | $9.04 \pm 1.87$ | (7.72-10.36) | 99 | $9.27 \pm 0.44$ | (8.96-9.59) | 7 |
| BZ | $11.67 \pm 1.56$ | (10.56-12.77) | 100 | $11.25 \pm 0.48$ | (10.91-11.60) | 7 |
| IFL | $5.06 \pm 0.42$ | (4.17-5.96) | 118 | $5.48 \pm 0.56$ | (5.08-5.88) | 6 |
| IFW | $1.61 \pm 0.61$ | (1.18-2.04) | 118 | $1.74 \pm 0.24$ | (1.57-1.91) | 6 |
| DFO | $6.09 \pm 0.59$ | (5.67-6.51) | 106 | $6.16 \pm 0.24$ | (5.99-6.33) | 7 |
| Weight | $27 \pm 9$ | (14-41) | 37 | $16 \pm 8$ | (10-22) | 7 |

Description. Pelage dense and soft, uniformly tawny brown on dorsum (Fig. 5), slightly lighter on face and cheeks; guard-hairs about 9 mm over back, all eumelanic; overhair about 7 mm on back, three-banded, eumelanic on distal tip and most of length, and pheomelanic in distal section; under-hair about 5 mm on back, all eumelanic. Ventral pelage (Fig. 5) grayish-brown, clearly demarcated from browner flanks; dichromatic overhair about 6 mm in middle chest, pheomelanic in distal segment and eumelanic in central and proximal segments; dichromatic under-hair about 3.7 mm in middle chest, with same banding pattern as ventral overhair. Presence of superciliary and inconspicuous mystacial and submental vibrissae; measurements of largest vibrissae from holotype FURB 20330: mystacial 16.3 mm , superciliary 9.8 mm , submental 6.5 mm ; longest mystacial not reaching bases of pinnae when laid back along head. Ears rounded, not reaching eyes when laid forward, densely covered with 2.4 mm eumelanic thick hairs. Tail about $75 \%$ of head-body length; unicolor and dark; hair coverage barely visible; hair arranged in triplets on each scale, subequal in size, with central hair reaching two and half scales; 4-5 mm terminal pencil. Mammae eight, in pectoral, axial, abdominal and inguinal pairs.

Hind foot about $26 \%$ of head-body length; plantar surface dark; densely covered with short melanic hair; digits II, III and IV subequal in size; digit I conspicuously longer than digit V; claws grooved, about 2.5 mm long in digit III; ungueal hair most melanic, not reaching tip of claws; thenar pad about 2.5 x interdigital pad; interdigital pads subequal in size; hypothenar pad slightly shorter than interdigital pads. Forefoot sparsely covered with melanic and
bicolor hair on metapodial and digits; digits III and IV subequal in size; digits II and V subequal in size; welldeveloped claws, extending about 1.7 mm past extremity of digits III and IV; ungueal hair not covering claws; dark palmar surface; hypothenar pad slightly longer than thenar pad; interdigital pad 3 conspicuously longer than interdigital pads 1 and 2.


FIGURE 5. Dorsal (upper), ventral (middle) and flank (bottom) views of skins of Deltamys araucaria sp. n. (holotype, FURB 20296; above) and Deltamys kempi (FURB 20308). Bar $=20 \mathrm{~mm}$.


FIGURE 6. Morphological distinctive traits in Deltamys. Above, first upper molar of Deltamys araucaria sp. n. (FURB 20330; left) and D. kempi (TR 2136; right), showing the presence of protostyle (A) and enteroloph (B) in D. araucaria (bar = $0.5 \mathrm{~mm} ; 30 \mathrm{x}$ ). Middle, position of M1 anterior border in relation to posterior border of zygomatic plate in D. auraucaria $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{p} . \mathbf{n}$. (left) and D. kempi (right) (bar=1 mm). Bottom, proportion of interparietal in D. araucaria (left) and D. kempi (right) (bar=2mm).

Skull (Fig. 8) delicate, with narrow elongated rostrum and narrow zygomatic arches; gnathic process little developed, not exceeding anteriormost extremity of incisor in lateral view; well-developed anterior process of premaxillary but not forming rostral tube (trumpet) with nasal extremity; slightly inflated incisive capsular projection; nasofrontal suture "V"-shaped; shallow zygomatic notches; rounded lacrimal; narrow nasolacrimal foramen, similar to M1 in size; broad zygomatic plate, directed backward, with posterior border positioned behind of anterior plane of M 1 ; elongate incisive foramina with their broadest point around premaxilla-maxillary suture,
posterior extremity reaching protoflexus or protocone; narrow antorbital bridge; posterior palatine foramina small and ovate, located in maxillopalatine suture at height of M2 hypoflexus; hourglass-shaped interorbital region, with rounded margins and posteriorly broader; conspicuous ethmoid foramen; sphenopalatine foramen horizontally elongated, reaching from M1 metacone to M2 posterior border; large optic foramen, vertically elongated and located behind M3; large anterior lacerated foramen, similar to optic foramen in size; zygomatic arches narrow, anteriorly convergent and posteriorly slightly divergent, surpassing border of braincase in dorsal view; frontal-parietal-squamosal suture at exact point of parietal anterior process extremity or slightly behind this process; conspicuous elongated jugal; shallow glenoid fossa; mesopterygoid fossa narrow, extending from slightly behind M3 alveoli to posterior border of zygomatic arches, straight along most of its length and divergent posteriorly; presphenoid posteriorly wider; sphenopalatine vacuities elongated, similar to M1 in size, and divided by narrow presphenoid strut; basisphenoid plane; basioccipital with prominent median crest; parapterygoid fossa shallow and narrow; hamular processes of pterygoid straight and divergent; coronal suture " $U$ "-shaped; carotid as circulatory pattern 1 of Voss (1988); large and oval stapedial foramen; large petrotympanic fissure, varying in width; littledeveloped stapedial spine; broad Eustachian tube; moderately inflated tympanic bulla, similar in size to superior molar row; punctual carotid canal; large jugular foramen; thin malleus; orbicular apophysis present; broad hamular process of squamosal; postglenoid foramen conspicuously larger than subsquamosal foramen; braincase moderately inflated; interparietal varying in length and width; mastoid slightly inflated, similar in size to external auditory meatus, bordered posteriorly by elongated foramen; exoccipital conspicuously trilobed, without prominent crests; occipital condyle slightly inflated; well-developed paraoccipital process; large foramen magnum.

Mandible (Fig. 8) gracile, length without incisors about $49 \%$ of greatest skull length; height about $41 \%$ of length without incisors; elongated ramus; short diastema, similar in size to molar row, anterior extremity located parallel to molar plane; conspicuous mental foramen, visible from lateral and occlusal views; little-developed masseteric ridge; conspicuous capsular projection; delicate coronoid process isolated from condyloid by shallow elongated sigmoid notch, strongly concave anteriorly; condyloid process robust, markedly thickened distally; shallow mandibular notch; little-developed angular process, distally thickened and perpendicularly projected.

Upper incisors orthodontt and orange; lower incisors much paler. Upper molars (Fig. 9) parallel, crested; lingual cusps higher than labial cusps. Main cusps (paracone, metacone, protocone, hypocone) parallel. M1 with well-developed anteromedian flexus in specimens with little-worn molars, dividing procingulum into anterolingual and anterolabial conules subequal in size; anteroloph and mesoloph present but reduced; little-developed but conspicuous protostyle and enteroloph (Fig. 6); protocone and paracone equal in size; hypocone and metacone equal in size; deep paraflexus and metaflexus, curved backward parallel to median mure; shallow protoflexus and hypoflexus; little-developed posteroloph, visible mainly in specimens with unworn dentition (e.g. FURB 20244). M2 lacking anteroconule; anteroloph visible in specimens with slight or moderate wear; protocone and paracone subequal in size; hypocone and metacone subequal in size; anteroloph and mesoloph present but reduced, visible in specimens with all degrees of wear; hypoflexus deep and straight; paraflexus deep and curved backward parallel to median mure; narrow median mure between hypoflexus and paraflexus. M3 with three visible cusps, protocone, paracone, and metacone; protocone conspicuously larger than paracone and metacone; presence of two or three fossetes in specimens with dentition little worn. Lower molars (Fig. 9) parallel and crested, with lingual cusps higher than labial ones. Main cusps slightly alternated; ml with well-developed procingulum; shallow anteromedian flexid visible only in specimens with unworn or slightly worn molars; anterolabial conulid larger than anterolingual conulid; well-developed protostylid; anterolophid conspicuous, parallel to protostylid; protoflexid deep and straight; anteroflexid and metaflexid shallow; protoconid larger than metaconid; mesoflexid deep and straight; hypoflexid deep and upward-curved; mesoflexid and hypoflexid separated by narrow median mure; well-developed ectolophid; mesolophid fused with entoconid; shallow and straight entoflexid; welldeveloped posterolophid, separated from entoconid by deep and upward-curved posteroflexid. m2 lacking anteroconulids; well-developed protostylid, separated from protoconid by deep protoflexid; protoconid larger than metaconid; hypoconid larger than entoconid; mesoflexid deep and curved upward; hypoflexid deep and diagonal; mesoflexid and hypoflexid separated by narrow median mure; ectolophid visible in specimens with dentition little worn; mesolophid fused with entoconid; well-developed posterolophid, separated from entoconid by deep and upward-curved posteroflexid; m3 with six visible cusps in specimens with little-worn dentition; inconspicuous protostylid, fused with protoconid; protoconid larger than metaconid; hypoconid larger than entoconid; mesoflexid deep and upward-curved; hypoflexid deep and straight; mesoflexid and hypoflexid separated by narrow median
mure; mesolophid fused with entoconid; well-developed posterolophid, separated from entoconid by deep and diagonal posteroflexid (or fossete in specimens with moderately worn dentition).

Axial skeleton composed of 13 ribs, 7 cervical vertebrae, 13 thoracic vertebrae, 4 sacral vertebrae, 26 caudal vertebrae; presence of conspicuous neural spine on second thoracic vertebrae. Scapula wide, thin and translucent except at borders; shallow supra- and infraspinous fossae; acromion delicate, with shallow concavity; deep notch, reaching about one-third of spine length. Humerus shorter than scapula; well-developed head; conspicuous greater and lesser tubercles; well-developed and thick deltoid tuberosity. Radius longer than humerus, fused with ulna except for small segment behind trochlear notch, which forms a slightly elongated foramen. Elongated ilium, showing conspicuous iliac crest. Robust ischium, translucent at center and internal border. Large obturator foramen. Femur thin and curved; well-developed head; conspicuous median tuberosity; medial and lateral condyles little developed; shallow patellar groove.


FIGURE 7. Convex hull for specimen scores of Deltamys kempi (crosses) and Deltamys araucaria sp. $\mathbf{n}$. (circles) on the principal components 1 and 2 (above) and 1 and 3 (below) extracted from the variance-covariance matrix of 21 cranial measurements.


FIGURE 8. Dorsal (left), ventral (middle) and lateral (right) views of skull and labial view of mandible (bottom right) of Deltamys araucaria sp. n. (holotype, FURB 20296; above) and Deltamys kempi $(\mathrm{AMNH} 206139)$. Bar $=5 \mathrm{~mm}$.

Karyotype. Diploid number (2n) of 34 chromosomes and an autosomal fundamental number (FNa) of 34 arms. Autosome complement characterized by 15 acrocentric pairs and 1 pair of small metacentric chromosomes. Sex determination system XY/XX; chromosomes X and Y acrocentric (Fig. 4).

Etymology. Refers to Araucaria angustifolia (Bertol) Kuntze (Pinopsida: Araucariaceae), the major arboreal element in the Araucaria Forest or Mixed Ombrophilous Forest, the vegetation domain where the type locality is inserted. Proposed as a noun in apposition.

Natural history. Specimens of D. araucaria were collected in palustrine savanna with a predominance of Eryngium pandanifolium (Apiaceae) and Baccharis sp. (Asteraceae) and unidentified treelets, in areas with soggy soil. The species was found in sympatry with the didelphid Monodelphis dimidiata Wagner and the sigmodontines Akodon montensis Thomas, Oligoryzomys flavescens Waterhouse, Oxymycterus nasutus Waterhouse and Scapteromys meridionalis Quintela et al. Parallel sampling in dense forest habitats of the region produced no additional individuals, which indicates that $D$. araucaria is associated with the open herbaceous/savannic palustrine systems.


FIGURE 9. Left maxillary molars (left) and right mandibular molars (right) of Deltamys araucaria sp. n. holotype (FURB 20296) (bar=1mm).

## Discussion

For a long time following its description, Deltamys was captured exclusively in lowland pampean zones (for details of habitats see Massoia 1964; Bianchini \& Delupi 1994; González \& Pardiñas 2002; Udrizar Sauthier et al. 2005; González 2006). The recent findings of Ventura et al. (2011), however, included the highlands of the Meridional Plateau of southern Brazil in the biogeography of the genus. Herein we provide evidence of a second form that is divergent at the species level in the Meridional Plateau highlands, revealing that, within the small radiation of the genus, we can observe a higher diversification in this geological formation compared to the lowlands of the northern Pampean domain, inhabited exclusively by D. kempi.

Tracing a historical biogeographic hypothesis on Deltamys speciation is a delicate task, partially due to the small sample and incipient data on Meridional Plateau forms. First, it is noticeable how populations from the highly divergent forms $D$. kempi and the new lineage herein reported are separated by only ca. 50 km between Torres, on the northern coastal plain, and São Francisco de Paula, at the plateau border. This stretch, however, has an altitudinal variation of more than 900 m , partially due to the presence of plateau slopes (Serra Geral). Thus, it is possible that the altitudinal gradient has shaped the differentiation in Deltamys, with one lineage dispersing across the volcanic highlands of the Meridional Plateau and differentiating into two forms, and the D. kempi lineage dispersing through the sedimentary lowlands of the Paraná basin and later spreading along the Cenozoic coastal plain. Mountain ranges and ridges have long been considered topographic elements associated with speciation processes in akodontine rodents (Reig 1984; Geise 2001; Gonçalves et al. 2007; Gonçalves \& Oliveira 2014; Quintela et al. 2014).


FIGURE 10. Scores for Deltamys kempi specimens from haplogroup A (crosses) and B (circles) on the principal components 1 and 2 (above) and 1 and 3 (below) extracted from the variance-covariance matrix of 21 cranial measurements.

The two Deltamys lineages from the Meridional Plateau are highly divergent ( $8 \%$ ) considering the range of cyt $b$ sequence divergence found among congeneric akodont species (D'Elía 2003). Both forms are known from single localities separated by about 160 km in the northeastern RS highlands. In view of the marked differentiation, it is expected that strong evolutionary processes have acted on the highlands Deltamys. The sparse data on these forms, however, do not permit any further inferences about these processes, but it should be noted that two major rivers of the northern Atlantic hydrographic basin (Caí and Antas rivers) (Vieira 1984) run between the localities of the so-far-known occurrence of D. araucaria (São Francisco de Paula) and Deltamys sp. ( $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ ) (Esmeralda). Rivers are suggested to be geographic elements that shaped the speciation in small mammals such as didelphid marsupials and echimyid rodents (Patton \& Da Silva 2000; Teta et al. 2009; Nascimento et al. 2013). The unstable forest coverage in southern Brazil during the Pleistocene climatic fluctuations (Valdez \& D'Elía 2013) and the possibility of isolation of lineages in suitable open areas during interglacial forest expansions should also be considered.

Deltamys araucaria is genetically and karyotypically divergent from D. kempi and Deltamys sp . ( $2 \mathrm{n}=40$ ) and is morphologically distinguishable from $D$. kempi by discrete diagnostic characters. Although an investigation of the chromosomal evolution in Deltamys is beyond the scope of the present study, we can observe that the highland forms $D$. araucaria and Deltamys sp. $(2 n=40)$, sister species according to our phylogenetic analysis, share the same sex-determination system ( $\mathrm{XY} / \mathrm{XX}$ ), while the $\mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{Y}_{1} / \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{2}$ system represents an autapomorphic condition in D. kempi. Therefore, for a better understanding of evolution in Deltamys, it is crucial to examine the morphology of $2 n=40$ specimens (not available for this study) as well to apply banding and FISH techniques for analysis of the chromosomal homology. It is also remarkable the presence of a small metacentric pair of autosomes in $D$. araucaria. The pair of small metacentric autosomes is considered a karyotypic marker of Akodon, which allows distinguishing forms from this genus from the closely related Deltamys (Fronza et al. 1981; Ventura et al. 2011). Our finding, however, does not corroborate this statement and suggests that the presence of a small autosome pair does not represent a reliable marker for genus Akodon.

Specific genealogical analysis of the D. kempi haplotype evidenced an internal structure of two subclades (A and B): haplogroup A and haplogroup B (Fig. 3). Haplogroup A was restricted to RS, occurring on the northern and central coastal plain and west of Patos Lagoon. Haplogroup B extended from Buenos Aires to Uruguay, and in RS to regions of the southern coastal plain and west of Patos Lagoon. The haplotype network showed a pattern characterized by local diversification (i.e., markedly structured), as only five of 37 haplotypes were shared by two or three nearby localities (Fig. 3). In Haplogroup A, four of the 13 recovered haplotypes were shared by pairs of localities, each within the same physiographic unit. Haplogroup B extends over the remaining distributional area. Analysis of the genetic differentiation among subpopulations based on haplotype-frequency ( $\phi_{\mathrm{ST}}$ ) revealed a population structure pattern (Table 5). In the PCA results, however, samples from the two clades did not segregate on the multivariate space, showing a high overlap in the convex hull on both PC1 x PC2 and PC1 x PC3 (Fig. 10). In the discriminant analysis, both clades showed a high percentage of correct classifications (Haplogroup A: 94.2\%; Haplogroup B: 92.2\%).

The analysis of the spatial distribution of $D$. kempi cyt $b$ sequences revealed a population structure that is characterized by marked local diversification. This pattern may reflect some presumably ecological-behavioral aspects of the species. Despite the lack of data on time-scaled movements or home-range, it is expected that $D$. kempi has a limited dispersal capacity, considering its small size and proportionally short forefeet and limbs (González \& Pardiñas 2002). Individuals observed in a large terrarium moved slowly and over short distances (during both day and night), generally limited to short movements beneath the litter. The other aspects that may contribute to the observed structure pattern are that $D$. kempi seems to be naturally rare in many parts of its distribution (Massoia 1964; González \& Pardiñas 2002; Montes et al. 2008; Quintela et al. 2012; 2013), and populations seem to occur generally associated with scrub vegetation composed of specific palustrine herbaceous species (Massoia 1964; present study), which probably impedes gene flow.

Our expanded data on the D. kempi phylogeographic structure supported the previous scenario of a subdivision into two major phylogroups that are markedly differentiated in both cyt $b$ and the craniometric characters, in which one group is restricted to northern areas and the other is widely spread in the species' distribution (Montes et al. 2008). However, the geographic coverage of the 'northern' group was substantially enlarged with the addition of newly sampled populations. The 'northern' group recovered by Montes et al. (2008) ('Tramandaí group') included populations from Torres, Tramandaí and Osório, on the northern RS coastal plain, and Tapes, northwest of the Patos Lagoon. In our analysis, these samples grouped in Clade A with haplotypes from four other localities on the
TABLE 5. Population pairwise $\Phi S T$ s for comparisons between populations of Deltamys kempi from the Pampas. Abbreviations for locations are defined in Fig. 1 and Table 1.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.88 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.55 | -0.15 | 0.44 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.60 | 0.91 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.78 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.19 | 0.31 | 0.24 | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.15 | -0.17 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.33 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0.59 | 0.57 | 0.33 | 0.11 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.76 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 6}$ | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 8}$ | 0.74 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.38 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.66 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.22 | 0.91 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1}$ | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.62 | 0.92 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 5}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| 17 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.39 | 0.76 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| 18 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.33 | 0.85 | 0.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 6}$ | -0.47 | -0.47 | -0.16 | 0.00 |  |
| 19 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 0.04 | 0.76 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | -0.47 | 0.00 |
| 20 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ | 0.36 | 0.73 | 0.72 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3}$ | 0.43 | 0.56 | -0.33 | 0.21 | 1.00 |
| 21 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | 0.42 | 0.70 | 0.92 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
|  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

northern and central coastal plain and two localities at the border of the Precambrian Sul-Riograndense Shield. The northern clade of $D$. kempi, however, is not restricted to the recent Cenozoic deposits as previously found by Montes et al. (2008), but also spreads over the Shield. Clade A also encompassed samples from the central RS coastal plain, a region not sampled in previous molecular surveys (D'Elía et al. 2003; Montes et al. 2008; Ventura et al. 2011). This region corresponds to a long narrow sedimentary deposit formed by the last two marine transgressions, which occurred at 120 and five kya (Tomazelli \& Villwock 2000). At these times, the sea covered a large area of the continental shelf, forming the Patos Lagoon, the largest lagoon system in South America (Vieira 1984). The phylogeographic break observed in $D$. kempi seems to be related to the evolution of this lagoon system, where the estuarine channel may constitute a geographical barrier to the historical gene flow. This pattern of internal differentiation was also observed for the sympatric akodont Scapteromys tumidus (Quintela et al. 2015).

Similarly to previous investigations using molecular markers (Montes et al. 2008; Ventura et al. 2011), our analysis showed an internal division in D. kempi. The question is whether this subdivision is consistent with a binomial or a subspecific trinomial classification. A first attempt at a D. kempi subspecific arrangement was proposed by González \& Massoia (1995), who assigned populations from Argentina to the nominal subspecies, and populations from Uruguay and Brazil to D. kempi langguthi. This classification, however, was based only on morphological features and was subsequently contested by Montes et al. (2008), who in turn found a genetic/ craniometric-based internal division, but with a spatial coverage of clades markedly different from the geographical context of the subspecific proposal of González \& Massoia (1995). The internal clades recovered herein and in the analyses of Montes et al. (2008) and Ventura et al. (2011) are geographically congruent, strongly indicating that $D$. kempi is passing through a process of differentiation. The significant craniometric differences found here and by Montes et al. (2008) support this supposition of an internal differentiation process. Nevertheless, the low level of genetic (distances between 1 and 2\%; Montes et al. 2008; Ventura et al. 2011; present study) and craniometric divergences (see the high degree of overlap of convex hulls in the PCA), in our view, is not consistent with a formal taxonomic division within D. kempi. The other fact is that "northern" and "southern" clades are apparently sympatric west of the Patos-Mirim complex, which disagrees with the formal concept of subspecies (see Mallet 2007 for further details). In this case, the most appropriate procedure could be to treat each clade as independent ESUs (Evolutionary Significant Unit; see Moritz 1994), considering the divergence in sequences of the nuclear recombination activating gene 2 between the clades previously found by Montes et al. (2008). Moreover, there is no clear objection for sympatry conditions in the definition of ESUs, which also does not consider the level of divergence an arbitrary criterion, since the monophyly of both the nuclear and mitochondrial markers was confirmed (Moritz 1994).
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## APPENDIX

Specimens used in molecular ${ }^{\left({ }^{a}\right)}$ and skull morphometric $\left({ }^{b}\right)$ analyses are housed in: American Museum of Natural History, New York, United States (AMNH); Museu de Ciências Naturais, Universidade Luterana do Brasil, Canoas, Brazil (MCNU); Departamento de Genética, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil (TR); Museo Nacional de Historia Natural, Montevideo, Uruguay (EMG and PCE). Sequences obtained from GenBank $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ are presented as voucher number (when available)/GenBank access number.

Deltamys araucaria (23) BRAZIL: Rio Grande do Sul: São Francisco de Paula (FURB 20220 ab $20240^{\mathrm{ab}}, 20244^{\mathrm{ab}}$, 20296 $^{\mathrm{ab}}$,

Deltamys sp. (2n=40) (3) BRAZIL: Rio Grande do Sul: Esmeralda (CIT 945/JN232108*, CIT 946/JN232109*, CIT 947/ JN232110*).
Deltamys kempi—BRAZIL (119): Rio Grande do Sul: Torres: Parque Estadual de Itapeva (TR 2159ª, EF206809*), Osório (TR 2137 ${ }^{\text {a }}$, MN42081/EF206811*), Tramandaí (EF206809*, EF206810*), Palmares do Sul (MCNU 2766 ${ }^{\text {ab }}, 2767^{\text {ab }}, 2768^{\text {ab }}$, $4007^{\mathrm{ab}}$, TR $2107^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2108^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2109^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2110^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2111^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2112^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2113^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2114^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2115^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2116^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2117^{\mathrm{b}}, 2118^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2119^{\mathrm{a}}, 2120^{\mathrm{a}}, 2121^{\mathrm{a}}$, $2122^{\mathrm{a}}, 2123^{\mathrm{a}}, 2124^{\mathrm{a}}, 2156^{\mathrm{a}}, 2157^{\mathrm{a}}$ ), Charqueadas (EF206808*), Tapes (MCNU 1813áa, EF206812*), Viamão (TR 2145a), Cristal (TR 2125 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ), Bujuru (TR $2126^{\text {ab }}$ ), 14 km N São José do Norte (MCNU 2937, $2939^{\text {b }}, 2940^{\text {b }}, 2941^{\text {b }}$; TR $2127^{\text {ab }}$, $2128^{\text {ab }}, 2129^{\text {ab }}, 2130^{\text {ab }}, 2131^{\text {ab }}, 2132^{\text {ab }}, 2133^{\text {ab }}, 2134^{\text {ab }}, 2135^{\text {ab }}, 2136^{\text {a }}$ ), Pedro Osório (MCNU 4002,$~ 4004^{\text {ab }}$; TR 2138 $)^{\text {a }}$, Pelotas (TR $2139^{\text {ab }}, 2144^{\text {ab }}, 2141^{\text {b }}, 2142^{\text {b }}, 2143^{\mathrm{a}}, 2144^{\mathrm{a}} ; 2158^{\mathrm{ab}}$ ), Lagoa Verde (MCNU $1487^{\mathrm{b}}, 1488^{\mathrm{b}}, 1494^{\mathrm{b}}, 1501^{\mathrm{b}}, 1733^{\mathrm{b}}$, $1734^{\mathrm{b}}, 1735^{\mathrm{b}}$; TR $2146^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2147^{\mathrm{ab}}, 2148^{\mathrm{b}}, 2149^{\mathrm{b}}, 2150^{\mathrm{b}}, 2151^{\mathrm{a}}, 2152^{\mathrm{b}}$ ), Mata da Estrada Velha (MCNU 948,$~ 949^{\mathrm{b}}$ ), Taim (MCNU $4003^{\mathrm{b}}, 4006^{\mathrm{ab}}, 4008^{\mathrm{ab}}, 4009^{\mathrm{b}}, 4022^{\mathrm{b}}$; TR 2153 ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$, 2154 ${ }^{\text {a }}$, EF206805*, EF206806*, EF206807*), Santa Vitória do Palmar-Lagoa Mangueira (FURB 20308). URUGUAY: Rivera, Cofusa (EMG 1099³), Rocha-Parque Santa Teresa (EMG 1808 ${ }^{\text {a }}$; PCE $05^{\text {ab }}, 06^{\text {a }}, 11^{\text {a }}, 12^{\text {a }}, 13^{\text {a }}$ ), Refúgio de Fauna Laguna de Castillos (EMG $1926^{\text {a }}, 1929^{\text {a }}, 1930^{\text {a }}, 1957^{\text {a }}, 2003^{\text {a }}$ ), Lascano (AMNH 206146-206149 ${ }^{\text {b }}$, 206134-206142 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ), Canelones-Rincón del Colorado (EMG 1440 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1495 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ), not specified (AMNH 206097), Flores—Rio San José (EMG 1762a), San José-Arroyo Cufré (EMG 999á, MNHN4151/ AY195862*). ARGENTINA: Buenos Aires-La Balandra (UP42/AY195861*).


[^0]:    UR: Uruguay, AR: Argentina, BR: Brazil. * Localities sampled by Montes et al. (2008) and Ventura et al. (2011), incorporated into this study from the GenBank database.

