

1 **Phylogeny of *Rhaponticum* (Asteraceae, Cardueae-Centaureinae) and related**
2 **genera inferred from nuclear and chloroplast DNA sequence data: taxonomic and**
3 **biogeographic implications.**

4

5 Author for correspondence: Oriane Hidalgo. Institut Botànic de Barcelona (CSIC-
6 Ajuntament de Barcelona). *Passeig del Migdia s. n., Parc de Montjuïc, 08038*
7 *Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain.* Tel. 34 932890611. Fax 34 932890614. E-mail:
8 orianehidalgo@ibb.csic.es

9

10 Number of figures: 1

11 Number of tables: 2

12 Number of words in the abstract: 216

13 Number of words in the remaining text (excluding tables): 6034

1 **Phylogeny of *Rhaponticum* (Asteraceae, Cardueae-Centaureinae) and related**
2 **genera inferred from nuclear and chloroplast DNA sequence data: taxonomic and**
3 **biogeographic implications.**

4

5 ORIANE HIDALGO*, NÚRIA GARCIA-JACAS, TERESA GARNATJE and
6 ALFONSO SUSANNA

7

8 *Institut Botànic de Barcelona (CSIC-Ajuntament de Barcelona), Passeig del Migdia s.*
9 *n., Parc de Montjuïc, 08038 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain.*

10

11 Running title: Combined DNA phylogeny of *Rhaponticum* and related genera.

12

13 e-mail address of the corresponding author: oranehidalgo@ibb.csic.es

14

1 ● Background and Aims. The precise generic delimitation of the *Rhaponticum* group is
2 not totally resolved. The lack of knowledge of the relationships between the basal
3 genera of Centaureinae could imply that genera whose position is as yet unresolved
4 could belong to the *Rhaponticum* group. On the other hand, the affinities among the
5 genera that are considered as members of this group are not well-known. The aim of our
6 study is to contribute to the phylogenetic and generic delineation of the *Rhaponticum*
7 group on the basis of molecular data.

8 ● Methods. Parsimony and Bayesian analyses of the combined sequences of one plastid
9 (*trnL-trnF*) and two nuclear (ITS region and ETS) molecular markers were carried out.
10 The results of these analyses are discussed in the light of the biogeographic history.

11 ● Key Results. The *Rhaponticum* group appears as monophyletic, and closely related to
12 the genus *Klasea*. Our results confirm the preliminary generic delimitation of the
13 *Rhaponticum* group, with the new incorporation of the genus *Centaurothamnus*.
14 *Ochrocephala* is supported as a separate genus from *Rhaponticum* and, contrary to this,
15 *Acroptilon* and *Leuzea* appear as merged into the genus *Rhaponticum*.

16 ● Conclusions. The new molecular evidence is consistent with the morphological and
17 karyological data, and suggests particularly coherent biogeographic routes of migration
18 and speciation processes for the genus *Rhaponticum*.

19

20 **Keywords:** *Acroptilon*, *Callicephalus*, *Centaurothamnus*, Compositae, ETS, ITS,
21 molecular phylogeny, *Myopordon*, *Ochrocephala*, *Oligochaeta*, *Rhaponticum*, *trnL-*
22 *trnF*

INTRODUCTION

2

3 One of the main problems which persists in the subtribe Centaureinae (Asteraceae,
4 Cardueae) is that the phylogenetic relationships between the basal genera are
5 unresolved. Monographers (Dittrich, 1977; Wagenitz and Hellwig, 1996; Garcia-Jacas
6 *et al.*, 2001; Hellwig, 2004; Susanna and Garcia-Jacas, in press) have described
7 informal groups of genera. One of these is the *Rhaponticum* group which comprises
8 about 7 genera and approximately 40 species. Apart from the genus *Rhaponticum* Vaill.
9 (~25 sp.), it includes *Acroptilon* Cass. (2 sp.), *Callicephalus* C. A. Mey. (1 sp.), *Leuzea*
10 DC. (1 sp.), *Myopordon* Boiss. (5 sp.), *Ochrocephala* Dittrich (1 sp.) and *Oligochaeta*
11 (DC.) K. Koch. (4 sp.).

12 The classic morphological approach limited itself to associate *Rhaponticum* and
13 *Acroptilon* (Dittrich, 1977), and pointed out generic delimitation problems: Holub
14 (1973) concluded that *Leuzea* and *Rhaponticum* should be merged, and Dittrich (1983)
15 that *Rhaponticum imatongensis* (Phillipson) Soják should be segregated to constitute a
16 new monotypic genus: *Ochrocephala*. Later, the molecular approach allowed the
17 addition of *Callicephalus*, *Oligochaeta* (Garcia-Jacas *et al.*, 2001) and *Myopordon*
18 (Susanna *et al.*, submitted).

19 These genera show the symplesiomorphic characters common to the basal genera of the
20 Centaureinae (homogamous capitula, lack of crystals in the phyllaries, basal hilum, no
21 bolster cells, absence of hairs on the achene and pollen of the *Serratula* type), and some
22 morphological traits which characterize the group:

- 1 - a peculiar type of involucre bract with a big, soft scarious, entire or lacerate and
- 2 usually silvery-white appendage (an exclusive character of the group which,
- 3 unfortunately, not all the species show);
- 4 - dimorphic achenes (the outer dorsiventrally compressed and the inner laterally
- 5 compressed);
- 6 - and finally the double pappus typical of all the Centaureinae, but with the
- 7 peculiarity that the inner bristles are wider and longer than the outer.

8 The geographical distributions, environmental conditions and life cycles are very

9 diverse in *Rhaponticum* and related genera. They are naturally distributed in North

10 Africa (including Canary Islands), temperate Eurasia, Siberia and the Far East,

11 Caucasus, Central and Eastern Asia, and Eastern Australia. They grow in deserts or

12 mountains, and are either widely distributed or narrow endemics. They can be perennial

13 or annual, and their habit is shrubby, or hemicryptophyte from 10 cm to more than 1 m

14 in height, or acaulescent. Several species are endangered to the verge of extinction, but

15 one taxon, *Acroptilon*, is considered to be an invasive weed in America and Australia.

16 The *Rhaponticum* group includes the only species of Centaureinae indigenous to

17 Australia: *Rhaponticum australe* (Gaudich.) Soskov (Wagenitz and Hellwig, 1996).

18 Some representatives of the group show medicinal properties which were already

19 known in Roman culture (Plinius, 77), and various species are being marketed due to

20 their anabolic and adaptogenic properties.

21 The main goals of our study in establishing a combined molecular phylogeny were to:

22 (1) elucidate the relationships between the basal groups of Centaureinae, with the

23 purpose of determining the taxa most closely related to the *Rhaponticum* group; (2)

1 verify the generic delimitation of the *Rhaponticum* group and the relationships between
2 its genera; (3) link our findings to the group's biogeographic history.

3

4

MATERIAL AND METHODS

5

6 *Plant Material*

7 The sampling includes representatives of all the genera of the *Rhaponticum* group, and
8 all the species of the genus *Rhaponticum* (except *R. namanganicum* Iljin). The
9 outgroups have been selected according to previous works by Garcia-Jacas *et al.* (2001)
10 and Susanna *et al.* (submitted) to represent most of the basal Centaureinae which could
11 have phylogenetic affinities with our focus of study: *Centaurothamnus* Wagenitz &
12 Dittrich, *Cheirolophus* Cass., *Klasea* Cass., *Plagiobasis* Schrenk, *Psephellus* Cass.,
13 *Rhaponticoides* Vaill., *Serratula* L. and *Stizolophus* Cass. The purpose in representing
14 numerous outgroups is to permit us, without forcing the topology, to test the good
15 assignation of a taxon as outgroup or as ingroup, and to define the more closely related
16 taxa to the *Rhaponticum* group. Both previously published and the 111 new sequences
17 (31 ITS, 47 ETS, 33 *trnL-trnF*) were used in the analyses. The origin of the samples and
18 GenBank sequence accession numbers are given in Table 1.

19

20 *DNA Extraction, Amplification, and Sequencing*

21 Total genomic DNA was extracted following the miniprep procedure of Doyle and
22 Doyle (1987) as modified by Soltis *et al.* (1991) and Cullings (1992) from herbarium
23 material, silica-gel-dried leaves collected in the field, or fresh leaves of plants cultivated

1 in the Botanic Institute of Barcelona. DNA of old herbarium material was extracted
2 using the DNeasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA).

3 *nrDNA ITS region strategies.* ITS1, 5.8S gene and ITS2 (the ITS region) were amplified
4 and sequenced together with 1406F (Nickrent *et al.*, 1994), ITS1 (White *et al.*, 1990)
5 and 17SE (Sun *et al.*, 1994) as forward primers, and ITS4 (White *et al.*, 1990), 26SE
6 (Sun *et al.*, 1994) as reverse primers, referring to the protocol described in Soltis and
7 Kuzoff (1993). PCR products were purified using the QIAquick PCR Purification Kit
8 (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA). Direct sequencing of the amplified DNA segments was
9 performed using the BigDye Terminator Cycle Sequencing v3.1 (PE Biosystems, Foster
10 City, CA). Nucleotide sequencing was carried out at the Serveis Científicotècnics of the
11 University of Barcelona on an ABI PRISM 3700 DNA analyzer (PE Biosystems, Foster
12 City, CA).

13 *nrDNA ETS region strategies.* The ETS region was amplified and sequenced with
14 ETS1f as forward primer and 18S-2L as reverse primer (Linder *et al.*, 2000), referring
15 to the PCR procedure described in the same publication. Purification and direct
16 sequencing of the amplified DNA segments were performed as for the ITS region.

17 *cpDNA trnL-trnF region strategies.* The *trnL-trnF* region includes the *trnL* intron, the 3'
18 *trnL* (UAA) exon, and the intergenic spacer between *trnL* (UAA) and *trnF* (GAA),
19 which were amplified and sequenced together. The universal primers *trnL-c*, forward,
20 and *trnL-f*, reverse (Taberlet *et al.*, 1991) were used to amplify and sequence the *trnL-F*
21 region. For old material we have amplified and sequenced the region in two parts using
22 the two precedent primers and the *trnL-e*, forward, and *trnL-d*, reverse, of the same
23 author. The PCR procedure includes a warm start at 95°C for 1 min 35 s, followed by
24 80°C during which the polymerase (Ecotaq, Ecogen S.R.L., Barcelona, Spain) is added,

1 and 34 cycles of 1 min denaturation at 93°C, 1 min annealing at 58°C, 1 min extension
2 at 72°C, and a final 10 min extension at 72°C. Purification and direct sequencing of the
3 amplified DNA segments was performed as for the ITS region.

4

5 *Phylogenetic Analyses*

6 Nucleotide sequences were edited with Chromas 1.56 (Technelysium Pty., Tewantin,
7 Australia). DNA sequences were aligned visually by sequential pairwise comparison
8 (Swofford and Olsen, 1990).

9 *Parsimony analysis* involved heuristic searches conducted with PAUP version 4.0b4a
10 (Swofford, 1999) using Tree Bisection Recognition (TBR) branch swapping with
11 character states specified as unordered and unweighted. All most-parsimonious trees
12 (MPT) were saved. To locate islands of most-parsimonious trees (Maddison, 1991), we
13 performed 100 replicates with random taxon addition, also with TBR branch swapping.
14 Trees lengths, consistency index (CI) and retention index (RI) are always given
15 excluding uninformative characters. Bootstrap (BS; Felsenstein, 1985) was carried out
16 to obtain support estimates of the nodes of the trees selected. Bootstrap analysis was
17 performed using 1000 replicates of heuristic search with the default options.
18 ACCTRAN (accelerated transformation) character-state optimization was used for all
19 illustrated trees. In order to conserve the phylogenetic information of insertions-
20 deletions and at the same time avoiding over-estimation of lengthy indels, we have used
21 “missing data” and coded the indels as presence-absence characters added to the end of
22 the matrix.

23 *Bayesian analysis:* data sets were analysed using Modeltest 3.04 (Posada and Crandall,
24 1998) to determine the sequence evolution model that best described our data. This

1 model was used to perform a Bayesian analysis using the program Mr. Bayes 3.0
2 (<http://morphbank.ebc.uu.se/mrbayes/>; Huelsenbeck *et. al.*, 2001). Four Markov chains
3 were run simultaneously for 1.000.000 generations, and these were sampled every 100
4 generations. Data from the first 1000 generations were discarded as the “burn-in”
5 period, after confirming that likelihood values had stabilized prior to the 1000th
6 generation. The 50% majority rules consensus phylogeny and posterior probability of
7 nodes (PP) were calculated from the remaining sample.

8 Biogeographic distributions: the distributions were mapped on the tree using the Farris
9 double pass method (Farris, 1970) which provides the hypothesized distributions of the
10 deep branches and nodes. Each taxon branch and internode was colored as to its
11 distribution using Adobe illustrator.

12 13 RESULTS

14
15 Some of our ETS sequences have repeats in the 5' end of the region, as found in other
16 groups (Baldwin and Marcos, 1998; Linder *et al.*, 2000). In most cases, these repetitions
17 constitute autapomorphic events or characterize a group without alignment or homology
18 problems. Conversely, the majority of *Klasea* species present a region with a different
19 number of repetitions. Because of these repetitions, we have not obtained the entire
20 sequence for some species; and for the others their alignment was impeded by the
21 difficulty of establishing the homology of the repetitions. For these reasons, this
22 repeated zone of *Klasea* was removed from the matrix.

23 Parsimony analysis: the results from the combined ITS, ETS and *trnL-trnF* parsimony
24 analysis are given in Table 2.

1 Bayesian analysis: the GTR+G+I model was found to be the most efficient model for
2 optimizing sequence evolution of our data set.
3 The two methods of phylogeny reconstruction lead to congruent results (there is no
4 discordance for strong supported branches) that lead us to present only the tree obtained
5 with the Bayesian inference, shown in Fig. 1. This tree indicates both the bootstrap
6 values (calculated by the parsimony analysis), the posterior probability (calculated by
7 the Bayesian inference), and the biogeography mapping.

8

9

DISCUSSION

10

11 This new molecular phylogeny allows us to draw some hypotheses regarding the
12 evolutive history of the *Rhaponticum* group. Among all the genera selected to constitute
13 the outgroup, the genus *Klasea* appears as the most closely related to the *Rhaponticum*
14 group (PP=97 %, BS=81 %, Fig. 1). Furthermore, our results contradict the election of
15 *Centaurothamnus* as outgroup, and suggest that it should be included in the
16 *Rhaponticum* group. On the other hand, all the taxa previously considered as members
17 of the *Rhaponticum* group appear in the ingroup (PP=98 %, Fig. 1).

18

19 *Klasea*, sister of *Rhaponticum* group?

20 *Klasea* (\equiv *Serratula* section *Klasea*) comprises ca. 65 species distributed from the
21 Western Mediterranean to China and the Western part of the Himalayas. The
22 phylogenetic distance within the genus *Serratula* between the *Serratula* sensus stricto
23 (*S. coronata* L. and *S. tinctoria*) and the *Klasea* section, has been demonstrated by
24 different authors, on morphological (Wagenitz and Hellwig, 1996) and on molecular

1 bases (Martins and Hellwig, 2003). Therein, those authors were in accordance with
2 Cassini (1825) who placed *Klasea* as a distinct genus from *Serratula*. Our results
3 confirm these findings and, furthermore, clearly define *Klasea* as closely related to the
4 *Rhaponticum* group (PP=97 %, BS=81 %, Fig. 1). This proximity was previously
5 suggested by Lessing (1832), who considered *Klasea* Cass. as a subgenus of
6 *Rhaponticum*. Moreover, the observation of the achene morphology has brought to light
7 for the first time the fact that *Klasea* shows the same achene polymorphism as the
8 *Rhaponticum* group. The *Klasea* species constitute a monophyletic group (PP=99 %,
9 BS=100 %, Fig. 1). Among them, *Serratula algida* Iljin, *S. chartacea* C. Winkl., *S.*
10 *biebersteiniana* (Iljin ex Grossh.) Takht. and *S. kuzhistanica* (Mozaffarian) Mozaffarian
11 have not been recombined as *Klasea* until now; this has lead us to establish new
12 nomenclatural combinations detailed in the appendix.

13

14 The monophyly of the *Rhaponticum* group is supported by the Bayesian inference
15 (PP=98 %, Fig. 1), but the parsimony analysis shows an irresolution between *Klasea*,
16 the *Centaurothamnus* plus *Ochrocephala* clade, and the rest of the genera. Even though
17 the parsimony advices us to hesitate before placing *Klasea* as sister to the *Rhaponticum*
18 group, this hypothesis is, nonetheless, supported both by karyological and
19 morphological data. Representatives of the genus *Klasea* have a base chromosome
20 number of $x=15$ (Löve and Löve, 1961; Cantó, 1982 and 1984; Garcia-Jacas *et al.*,
21 1998a and 1998b), while *Centaurothamnus* and *Callicephalus* have $x=14$ (Wagenitz *et*
22 *al.*, 1982 for the former; Chouksanova *et al.*, 1968; Hellwig, 1994; Garcia-Jacas *et al.*,
23 1998a, for the second one), and *Acroptilon*, *Leuzea* and most of the *Rhaponticum*
24 species present $x=13$ (Hidalgo, unpubl. res.). Descending dysploidy being one of the

1 main evolutionary mechanisms in plants, and in particular in the Centaureinae
2 (Fernández Casas and Susanna, 1986; Garcia-Jacas *et al.*, 1996; Vilatersana *et al.*,
3 2000), this could suggest that $x=15$ is more primitive than $x=14$. Then, in the case of our
4 focus of study, this could suggest that *Klasea* should be sister to the *Rhaponticum*
5 group. Furthermore, although *Klasea* shows achene polymorphism as the *Rhaponticum*
6 group, it does not exhibit the two other morphological apomorphies which define it,
7 namely the typical involucre bracts (present in *Ochrocephala*) and the characteristic
8 pappus (present in *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala*).

9

10 *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala*:

11 Our results confirm that *Ochrocephala* is more appropriately treated as a monotypic
12 genus (Dittrich 1983), rather than considered as *Rhaponticum imatongensis*.
13 Furthermore, this study allows us to define for the first time the systematic position of
14 the genus *Centaurothamnus*. This genus was placed with the genera of «uncertain
15 position» by Wagenitz & Hellwig (1996), Garcia-Jacas *et al.* (2001) and Hellwig
16 (2004). With the new molecular evidence, *Centaurothamnus* appears as closely related
17 to the genus *Ochrocephala* (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1). This result is unexpected but
18 not surprising, because these two monotypic genera are geographically very close:
19 *Centaurothamnus maximus* Wagenitz & Dittrich grows in Southwestern Arabia, in
20 Yemen, and *Ochrocephala imatongensis* (Phillipson) Dittrich in Eastern Africa
21 (Ethiopia, Sudan and Congo). Morphologically, these two taxa share the same shrubby
22 habit, an exclusive trait of the group. The shrubby port is uncommon within the
23 Centaureinae, and outside *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala* it is only known from
24 *Centaurodendron* Johow, *Centaurea ptosimopappa* Hayek and *Cheirolophus*. It

1 corresponds, probably, to a secondary adaptation, this phenomenon being particularly
2 evident for the insular taxa such as *Centaurodendron* and *Cheirolophus* (Böhle *et al.*,
3 1996; Garnatje *et al.* unpubl. res.). In the case of *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala* it
4 could be a secondary adaptation of hemicryptophytes colonizing extremely dry habitats,
5 where they suffer from physiologic constraints and lack of pollinators.
6 *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala* are genetically and morphologically distinguished:
7 their molecular divergence for the three markers considered is 13.8 %; *Ochrocephala*
8 shows the typical involucral bract appendages of the *Rhaponticum* group, while these
9 are not present in *Centaurothamnus*. A new question induced by these results could be
10 to determine whether *Centaurothamnus* and *Ochrocephala* should be more
11 appropriately maintained as distinct genera or whether they should be merged to
12 constitute a single genus.

13

14 *Callicephalus nitens*:

15 The genus *Callicephalus* includes a single species, *Callicephalus nitens* (M. Bieb. ex
16 Willd.) C. A. Mey., from the middle and low mountains of the Caucasus, Central Asia,
17 and the Near East. It appeared within the *Rhaponticum* group in the molecular analysis
18 of Garcia-Jacas *et al.* (2001), but with a weak statistical support. Our results strongly
19 support the fact that *Callicephalus* belongs to the *Rhaponticum* related genera (PP=99
20 %, BS=86 %, Fig. 1). Because of its annual nature, this species shows a high rate of
21 mutation, which could have induced distortions in the parsimony analysis. However, the
22 Bayesian inference method, less affected by the long branch attraction, leads to an
23 identical result. Furthermore, this hypothesis is reinforced by morphological features
24 such as the structure of the inner pappus or the tuberculate pericarp (Garcia-Jacas *et al.*

1 2001). *Callicephalus* has no closely related taxa and appears as isolated in the
2 phylogeny. Thus, this genus should be one of the numerous «relict» taxa which grow in
3 the Caucasus. The abundance of relict and endemic plant species in this area seems
4 largely due to the fact that it was spared glaciation during the most recent Iceages.

5
6 The rest of the ingroup belongs to a strongly supported clade (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1)
7 which includes the genera *Acroptilon*, *Leuzea*, *Myopordon*, *Oligochaeta*, and
8 *Rhaponticum*, placed in three different groups. The relationships between these three
9 groups are not resolved either in the parsimony or the Bayesian inference.

10
11 *Oligochaeta* and *Myopordon*:

12 *Myopordon*, a small genus with 5 perennial species from the Near East which had been
13 placed in the Carduinae, and *Oligochaeta*, another genus composed of 4 annual species
14 from the Near East, Caucasus, Afghanistan and India, and related to *Rhaponticum*, have
15 apparently nothing in common. However their close relationship was put in evidence in
16 the molecular study of Susanna *et al.* (submitted), and is also confirmed in this analysis
17 (PP=99 %, BS=96 %, Fig. 1), whose sampling of the *Rhaponticum* group species is
18 much more complete. In spite of the morphological review of *Myopordon* by Wagenitz
19 (1958), several questions remain open. One consists of the generic delimitation of
20 *Myopordon* and *Oligochaeta*: our analyses support the monophyly of *Oligochaeta*
21 (PP=100 %, BS=100 %, Fig.1) but not that of *Myopordon*. More studies are necessary
22 to verify whether *Myopordon* and *Oligochaeta* are independent taxa or whether they
23 should be merged. Another question could be the morphological traits of this clade,
24 focusing especially on their palynological characteristics, which are baffling. While all

1 the species of the *Rhaponticum* group show a *Serratula*-type pollen, *Oligochaeta*
2 presents a reduced form of *Serratula*-type pollen grain (Villodre and Garcia-Jacas,
3 2000), and *Myopordon* exhibits 3 different pollen types: *Jacea*, *Centaurea scabiosa* and
4 *Serratula* (Wagenitz, 1958). An additional question would be to understand how these
5 two specialized and divergent taxa can be so narrowly related to *Rhaponticum* up to the
6 point that our three molecular markers are not able to segregate them.

7

8 The genus *Rhaponticum*:

9 The genus *Rhaponticum* does not appear as monophyletic in the phylogeny established
10 for the following two reasons. Firstly, its segregation from the clade of *Myopordon* plus
11 *Oligochaeta* is not statistically supported (Fig. 1). Fortunately, the resolution within the
12 genus *Rhaponticum* is better, and shows two strongly supported clades, one oriental
13 (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1) and the other occidental (PP=99 %, BS=92 %, Fig. 1).
14 The second reason lead us to the paraphyly of *Rhaponticum* in its present
15 circumscription: this is, that the genera *Acroptilon* and *Leuzea* are firmly nested in the
16 genus *Rhaponticum*, the first in the oriental clade, and the second in the occidental clade
17 (Fig. 1). This implies some nomenclatural changes to reconcile the delimitation of the
18 genus with this new evidence. Another evidence for the placement of *Acroptilon* and
19 *Leuzea* in the genus *Rhaponticum* is that the three taxa share the same chromosome
20 number $x=13$ (Hidalgo, unpubl. res.), which is uncommon within the Centaureinae.
21 The comparison between the more comprehensive infrageneric classification of
22 *Rhaponticum* (Holub, 1973) and the molecular phylogeny shows numerous
23 incongruences (Fig. 1). Only two of the seven subgenera described are natural groups:
24 the subgenus *Rhaponticella* (Soskov) Holub (PP=99 %, Fig. 1) and the subgenus *Leuzea*

1 DC. (PP=99 %, BS=99 %, Fig. 1). Our results suggest that the genus *Rhaponticum*
2 should be more appropriately divided into only two subgenera, these corresponding to
3 the oriental and the occidental clades. Nevertheless, we have been unable to detect any
4 character for defining either group on morphological grounds.

5

6 The *Rhaponticum* oriental clade:

7 The first clade (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1) consists mostly of Central Asian species,
8 but includes species from Middle and Eastern Asia, Australia and the Eastern Europe.
9 These species have relatively restricted areas of distribution, except two groups of taxa
10 which have wider areas.

11 (1) One group extends from the Western to Eastern Europe, and is constituted by
12 *Rhaponticum serratuloides* (Georgi) Bobrov and *Acroptilon* (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig.
13 1). The incorporation of *Acroptilon* in *Rhaponticum* had never been mentioned before,
14 and this implies new nomenclatural combinations detailed in the appendix. The most
15 recent classifications do not recognize *Acroptilon australe* Iljin as a separate species
16 from *A. repens* (L.) DC (Hellwig, 2004; Susanna and Garcia-Jacas, in press), while on
17 the contrary Soskov (2001) considers them as two well-defined species. Our results do
18 not allow us to pronounce a verdict, and more studies are necessary to clarify the status
19 of *A. repens*. This is the reason why we have preferred to abstain from making a new
20 combination for this taxon. *Acroptilon* is considered as an invasive weed in America
21 and Australia, where it adversely affects agronomic harvests. It is aggressively
22 competitive and exhibits allelopathic effects. It differs from the other species of the
23 group, most of them endemics restricted to unfavorable environments where the
24 competition with other species is less notable, as for example the mountain screes. The

1 structure of capitula, achenes and the type of ramification are basically the same as
2 *Rhaponticum*, but *Acroptilon* shows secondary adaptations due to its colonizing
3 strategy: it is a hemicryptophyte like *Rhaponticum* but, instead of presenting few stems
4 weakly or not ramified, this species generates numerous strongly-branched stems in
5 spring, due to its extensive root and rhizome system. Therefore, vegetative
6 multiplication is favoured, although it also produces numerous capitula and achenes.

7 (2) The other group expands from Central to Eastern Asia and Australia and is
8 composed of *Rhaponticum australe* and *R. uniflorum* (L.) DC. The close relationship
9 between these two species (PP=100 %, BS=97 %, Fig. 1) is a logical result, considering
10 that *R. uniflorum* is the only species of the genus which has reached Eastern Asia. From
11 a geographic point of view, this was the better candidate as sister to the Australian
12 species. The fact that *R. australe* is the only species of Centaureinae indigenous to
13 Australia is surprising because nothing explains such a long dissemination distance of
14 the achenes of a *Rhaponticum* species. This lead Susanna and Garcia-Jacas (in press) to
15 hypothesize that the species was doubtfully native in Australia. There is a considerable
16 genetic divergence between *R. uniflorum* and *R. australe* for the three studied regions
17 (8.7 %), and this allows us to rule out the possibility of a recent introduction from *R.*
18 *uniflorum*. The colonizing event would have taken place during the period of lowermost
19 sea level (between 50,000 and 84,000 years ago), from the coasts of South Asia. Was it
20 the Aborigines that introduced the plant, and were they motivated by its medicinal
21 properties ? Had the species, on the other hand, reached Australia without human
22 intervention, we would need to ask ourselves how ?

23

24 The *Rhaponticum* occidental clade:

1 This second clade within *Rhaponticum* (PP=99 %, BS=92 %, Fig. 1) embraces species
2 distributed in North Africa, Canary Islands, Europe and the Near East. *Rhaponticum*
3 *pulchrum* Fisch. & C. A. Meyer, from Iran-Afganistan and the Caucasus, is situated as
4 sister of the remainder of this group (Fig. 1), which suggests that it originated in the
5 Near East. One characteristic of the occidental clade is that we do not see a grouping of
6 the North-African species in one subclade, and the European species in another
7 subclade, but, on the contrary, various subclades combining species from North Africa,
8 Europe, and/or a mixed distribution (Fig. 1). This suggests several independent passages
9 from one continent to the other during the evolutionary history of the group:

10 (1) the association *Rhaponticum heleniifolium* Godr. & Gren. plus *R. cynaroides* Less.
11 (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1) is the exception because the former one is endemic of the
12 Alps and the latter of the Pyrenees. The two species present the particularity of
13 exhibiting ramified inflorescential stems. Few species of *Rhaponticum* show this
14 character, and those are always less than 50 cm in height, while *R. heleniifolium* and *R.*
15 *cynaroides* reach 1 m.

16 (2) one of these passages could be the case for the group including the *Leuzea* species
17 (PP=99 %, BS=99 %, Fig. 1). Our study confirms, for the first time on a molecular
18 basis, that *Leuzea* and *Rhaponticum* should be fused, as previously suggested by
19 Holub (1973) on morphological bases. *Leuzea berardioides* Batt., endemic to the High
20 Atlas (Morocco), appears as clearly segregated from *L. conifera* (L.) DC. (the molecular
21 divergence for the studied regions between the two species is 7 %). This fact contradicts
22 its consideration as a synonym or as a subspecies of *L. conifera* by Susanna (2002), and
23 Greuter (2003), respectively, and implies a new nomenclatural combination of *L.*
24 *berardioides* as *Rhaponticum*, as detailed in the appendix. Another taxon, *L. fontqueri*,

1 had been described by Sauvage (1968) as closely related to *L. berardioides*. Our results
2 suggest that *L. fontqueri* is more closely related to *L. conifera* (PP=100 %, BS=100 %,
3 Fig. 1), the only molecular divergences observed between these two taxa concerning
4 polymorphic positions. *Leuzea conifera* presents a wide distribution area (W
5 Mediterranean and Portugal) and a high morphological variability. In this sense, more
6 studies are necessary to determine whether the observed differences with *L. fontqueri*
7 are included in the natural variability of *L. conifera*, or if this endemic of the
8 Chefchaouène Mountains (Morocco) merits the status of species. Meanwhile, the new
9 nomenclatural combination for *L. fontqueri* as *Rhaponticum* is proposed in the
10 appendix. *Leuzea conifera* had been previously combined as *Rhaponticum* by Greuter
11 (2003). *Rhaponticum acaule* (L.) DC., is positioned at the base of the *Leuzea* group, but
12 without statistical support.

13 (3) *Rhaponticum canariense* DC., the only representative of *Rhaponticum* from the
14 Canary Islands and seriously threatened with extinction, appears closely related to *R.*
15 *exaltatum* (Willk.) Greuter, a species from the Central Spain and North-East Portugal
16 (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1). Although floras usually do not indicate it, *R. exaltatum*
17 could also be present in Morocco, in the Rif Atlas, according to a voucher from the
18 Herbarium of Montpellier [“montagnes de Ketama”, Sennen & Mauricio, VI-1934
19 (MPU) ; the determination of the herbarium sample was established and confirmed
20 respectively by Maire in 1936 and Dittrich in 1976].

21 (4) There is another subclade which associates *R. scariosum* Lam. and *R. longifolium*
22 (Hoffmanns. & Link) Dittrich (PP=99 %, BS=100 %, Fig. 1). *Rhaponticum*
23 *cossonianum* (Ball) Greuter is positioned as sister of these two species, but with a weak
24 statistical support (Fig. 1).

1 An important outcome of this study is that the two representatives of *Rhaponticum*
2 growing in the Alps, *R. scariosum* and *R. heleniifolium*, considered by several authors
3 as subspecies of *R. scariosum* (Briquet 1902; Rouy 1905; Burnat 1931; Holub 1973;
4 Dostál 1976), do not appear as sisters in the phylogeny (Fig. 1). This implies *inter alia*
5 that the colonization of the Alps took place in, at least, two independent events. In the
6 same order of things, the biogeographic inference suggests that the two species of
7 *Rhaponticum* indigenous to the East of Europe (*R. serratuloides* and *R. scariosum*),
8 could have reached this region in two different ways: one expansion across Central Asia
9 to Eastern Europe generating *R. serratuloides*; the other expansion through the Near
10 East, North Africa and then to the Iberian Peninsula, thence on to the Alps, generating
11 *R. scariosum*.

12 In view of this interesting hypothesis suggested by our analysis, it is regrettable that
13 some nodes of the *Rhaponticum* occidental clade are weakly supported, and it would be
14 interesting to perform more studies towards a better understanding of its biogeographic
15 history.

16
17 To conclude, this study fulfills our main expectations. It defines the genus *Klasea* as
18 being probably the most closely related group of taxa to the *Rhaponticum* group. The
19 generic delimitation of the *Rhaponticum* group would include the genera *Callicephalus*,
20 *Centaurothamnus*, *Myopordon*, *Ochrocephala*, *Oligochaeta*, and *Rhaponticum*
21 (including *Acroptilon* and *Leuzea*). The new molecular evidence is consistent with the
22 karyological and morphological data, and suggests particularly coherent biogeographic
23 routes of migration and speciation processes for the genus *Rhaponticum*.

24

1

2 APPENDIX

3

4 *Klasea* Cass., in Cuvier, Dict. Sci. Nat. 35: 173 (1825).

5 *K. algida* (Iljin) Hidalgo comb. nov. ≡ *Serratula algida* Iljin, *Repertorium Specierum*
6 *Novarum Regni Vegetabilis* 35: 928-935 (1934).

7 *K. chartacea* (C. Winkl.) Hidalgo comb. nov. ≡ *Serratula chartacea* C. Winkl., in Tr.
8 Peterb. Bot. Sada 9,2: 524 (1886).

9 *K. biebersteiniana* (Iljin ex Grossh.) Hidalgo comb. nov. ≡ *Serratula radiata* ssp.
10 *biebersteiniana* Iljin ex Grossh., Fl. Kavk. 4 (1934) ≡ *Serratula biebersteiniana* (Iljin ex
11 Grossh.) Takht., in Takht. et Fed., Fl. Erevana : 323 (1945).

12 *K. kuzhistanica* (Mozaffarian) Mozaffarian comb. nov. ≡ *Centaurea khuzistanica*
13 Mozaffarian, *Iranian Journal of Botany* 5(2): 84 (1992) ≡ *Serratula khuzistanica*
14 (Mozaffarian) Mozaffarian in Garcia-Jacas *et al.*, *Botanical Journal of the Linnean*
15 *Society* 128: 420 (1998).

16

17 *Rhaponticum* Adans.

18 *R. berardioides* (Battand.) Hidalgo, comb. nov. ≡ *Leuzea berardioides* Batt., Contr. Fl.
19 Alt., 55 (1919) ≡ *Rhaponticum coniferum* (L.) Greuter subsp. *berardioides* (Battand.)
20 Greuter, *Willdenowia* 33:61 (2003).

21 *R. fontqueri* (Sauvage) Hidalgo, comb. nov. ≡ *Leuzea Fontqueri* Sauvage, *Collectanea*
22 *Botanica* 59, 7(2) : 1100-1104 (1968).

23 *R. repens* (L.) Hidalgo, comb. nov. ≡ *Centaurea repens* L., Species Plantarum ed. 2,
24 1293 (1763) ≡ *Acroptilon repens* (L.) DC., Prodrumus 6: 663 (1838).

1

2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

3

4 We thank E. Carqué Alamo, V. Funck, F. Gómiz, G Lazkov, K. Romaschenko, A.
5 Romo and J. Vallès for their assistance with collections. We also thank Miquel Veny for
6 keeping the collections of living plants, C. Roquet for their technical support, and R.
7 Vilatersana for helpful comments. In addition, we thank S. Garcia and S. Pyke for their
8 considerable amelioration of the English of this text. The collaboration of the botanical
9 gardens and herbaria listed in Table 2 is also acknowledged. This work was subsidized
10 by the Dirección General de Enseñanza Superior, Spain (Project PB 97/1134),
11 Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Spain (Projects PB BOS2001-3041-C02-02 and PB
12 BOS2002-11856-E) and Generalitat de Catalunya ("Ajuts a grups de recerca consolidats"
13 1999SGR00332 and 2001SGR00125). T. Garnatje and O. Hidalgo benefited from a
14 postdoctoral and a pre-doctoral grant, respectively, from the Ministerio de Educación y
15 Ciencia (Spanish government).

16

17 LITERATURE CITED

18

- 19 **Baldwin BG, Markos S. 1998.** Phylogenetic utility of the external transcribed spacer
20 (ETS) of 18S-26S rDNA: congruence of ETS and ITS trees of *Calycadenia*
21 (Compositae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **10**: 449-463.
- 22 **Böhle UR, Hilger HH, Martin WF. 1996.** Island colonization and evolution of the
23 insular woody habit in *Echium* L. (Boraginaceae). *Proceedings of the National Academy*
24 *of Sciences USA* **93**: 11740-11745.

- 1 **Briquet J. 1902.** Monographie des Centaurées des Alpes Maritimes. In: Burnat E,
2 *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la flore des Alpes maritimes*, 196 pp.
- 3 **Burnat E. 1931.** *Centaurea Rhapontica* L. (Composées Cynaroïdées). In: *Flore des*
4 *Alpes maritimes* 7: 97-100, Genève.
- 5 **Cantó P. 1982.** Números cromosómicos en algunos taxones del género *Serratula* L.
6 (Asteraceae). *Lazaroa* 3: 189-195.
- 7 **Cantó P. 1984.** Revisión del género *Serratula* L. (Asteraceae) en la Península Ibérica.
8 *Lazaroa* 6: 7-80.
- 9 **Cassini AHG 1825.** In: King RM, Janaske PC, Lellinger DB. 1995. Cassini on
10 Compositae II. *Monographs in Systematic Botany from the Missouri Botanical Garden*
11 54: [i]-xii, 1-190.
- 12 **Chouksanova NA, Sveshnikova LI, Alexandrova TV. 1968.** Data on karyology of the
13 family Compositae Giseke. *Citologija* 10: 198-206.
- 14 **Cullings KW. 1992.** Design and testing of a plant-specific PCR primer for ecological
15 and evolutionary studies. *Molecular Ecology* 1: 233-240.
- 16 **Dittrich M. 1977.** Cynareae-systematic review. In: Heywood VH, Harborne JB, Turner
17 BL, eds. *The Biology and Chemistry of the Compositae*. Academic Press, London: 999-
18 1015.
- 19 **Dittrich M. 1983.** *Ochrocephala*, eine neue afrikanische Compositengattung der
20 Subtribus Centaureinae. *Botanischer Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte*
21 *und Pflanzengeographie* 103 (4): 467-480.
- 22 **Dostál J. 1976.** *Leuzea* DC. In: Tutin TG, Heywood VH, Burges NA, Moore DM,
23 Valentine DH, Walters SM, and Webb DA, eds. *Flora Europaea* 5: 252-253.
24 Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.

- 1 **Doyle JJ, Doyle JL. 1987.** A rapid DNA isolation procedure for small quantities of
2 fresh leaf tissue. *Phytochemical Bulletin* **19**: 11-15.
- 3 **Farris JS. 1970.** Methods of computing Wagner trees. *Systematic Zoology* **19**: 83-92.
- 4 **Felsenstein J. 1985.** Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the
5 bootstrap. *Evolution* **39**: 783-791.
- 6 **Fernández Casas J, Susanna A. 1986.** Monografía de la sección *Chamaecyanus* Willk.
7 del género *Centaurea* L. *Treballs de l'Institut Botànic de Barcelona* **10**: 5-174.
- 8 **Garcia-Jacas N, Susanna A, Ilarslan R. 1996.** Aneuploidy in Centaureinae
9 (Compositae): is n=7 the end of the series ? *Taxon* **45**: 39-42.
- 10 **Garcia-Jacas N, Susanna A, Vilatersana R, Guara M. 1998a.** New chromosome
11 counts in the subtribe Centaureinae (Asteraceae, Cardueae) from West Asia, II.
12 *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **128**: 403-412.
- 13 **Garcia-Jacas N, Susanna A, Mozaffarian V. 1998b.** New chromosome counts in the
14 subtribe Centaureinae (Asteraceae, Cardueae) from West Asia, III. *Botanical Journal of*
15 *the Linnean Society* **128**: 413-422.
- 16 **Garcia-Jacas N, Susanna A, Garnatje T, Vilatersana R. 2001.** Generic delimitation
17 and phylogeny of the subtribe Centaureinae (Asteraceae): a combined nuclear and
18 chloroplast DNA analysis. *Annals of Botany* **87**: 503-515.
- 19 **Greuter W. 2003.** The Euro+Med treatment of *Cardueae* (Compositae) - generic
20 concepts and required new names. - *Willdenowia* **33**: 49-61.
- 21 **Hellwig FH. 1994.** Chromosomenzahlen aus der Tribus *Cardueae* (Compositae).
22 *Willdenowia* **24**: 219-248.
- 23 **Hellwig FH. 2004.** Centaureinae (Asteraceae) in the Mediterranean - history of
24 ecogeographical radiation. - *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **246**: 137-162.

- 1 **Holub J. 1973.** Contribution to the Taxonomy and Nomenclature of *Leuzea* DC. and
2 *Rhaponticum* auct. *Folia Geobotanica et Phytotaxonomica, Praha* **8**: 377-395.
- 3 **Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F, Nielsen R, Bollback JP. 2001.** Evolution-Bayesian
4 inference of phylogeny and its impact on evolution biology. *Science* **294**, 2310-2314.
- 5 **Lessing CF. 1832.** *Synopsis generum Compositarum*. Berlin: Dunker and Humblot.
- 6 **Linder CR, Goertzen LR, Vanden Heuvel B, Francisco-Ortega J, Jansen RK. 2000.**
7 The external transcribed spacer of the rDNA repeat: a new nuclear region for low-level
8 taxonomic analysis of the Asteraceae and closely allied families. *Molecular*
9 *Phylogenetics and Evolution* **14**: 285-303.
- 10 **Löve Á, Löve D. 1961.** Chromosome numbers of Central and Northwest European
11 plant species. *Opera Botanica* **5**: 1 -581.
- 12 **Maddison DR. 1991.** The discovery and importance of multiple islands of most-
13 parsimonious trees. *Systematic Zoology* **40**: 315-328.
- 14 **Martins L, Hellwig FH. 2003.** Polyphyly of the genus *Serratula* L. (Asteraceae-
15 Cardueae): evidence from nrDNA external and internal transcribed spacers. (Abstract)
16 *Palmarum Hortus Francofurtensis* **7**: 195.
- 17 **Nickrent DL, Schuette KP, Starr EM. 1994.** A molecular phylogeny of *Arceuthobium*
18 (Viscaceae) based on nuclear ribosomal DNA internal transcribed spacer sequences.
19 *American Journal of Botany* **81**: 1149-1160.
- 20 **Plinius G. 77.** *Naturalis Historia* **27**: 574.
- 21 **Posada D, Crandall KA. 1998.** Modeltest: testing the model of DNA substitution.
22 *Bioinformatics* **14**: 817-818.

- 1 **Rouy G. 1905.** *Centaurea* sous-genre *Eu-Rhaponticum*. In: *Flore de France ou*
2 *Description des plantes qui croissent spontanément en France, en Corse et en Alsace-*
3 *Lorraine*. Société des sciences naturelles de la Charente-Inférieure, Tours. 4: 114-115.
- 4 **Sauvage 1968.** Notes de floristique rifaine. *Collectanea Botanica* 59: 1100-1104.
- 5 **Soltis DE, Soltis PS, Collier TG, Edgerton ML. 1991.** The *Heuchera* group
6 (Saxifragaceae): evidence for chloroplast transfer and paraphyly. *American Journal of*
7 *Botany* 78: 1091-1112.
- 8 **Soltis DE, Kuzoff RK. 1993.** ITS sequence homogeneity within and among
9 populations of *Lomatium grayi* and *L. laevigatum* (Umbelliferae). *Molecular*
10 *Phylogenetics and Evolution* 2: 166-170.
- 11 **Soskov JD. 2001.** *Rhaponticum* Adans. (Compositae Tribes Cynareae and Mutisieae).
12 In: Bobrov EG, Čerepanov SK, eds. *Flora of URSS* 28. Leningrad: Academiae
13 Scientiarum URSS, 305-319.
- 14 **Sun Y, Skinner DZ, Liang GH, Hulbert SH. 1994.** Phylogenetic analysis of *Sorghum*
15 and related taxa using internal transcribed specers of nuclear ribosomal DNA.
16 *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 89: 26-32.
- 17 **Susanna A. 2002.** *Leuzea* DC. In: Valdés B, Redjali M, Achhal El Kadmiri A, Jury SL,
18 Montserrat JM, eds. *Catalogue des plantes vasculaires du Nord du Maroc, incluant des*
19 *clés d'identification*. 2: 715.
- 20 **Susanna A, Garcia-Jacas, N. In press.** Tribe Cardueae (Compositae). In: Kadereit J,
21 Kubitzki K, eds. *The Families and Genera of Vascular Plants*. Springer-Verlag,
22 Heidelberg (in press).

- 1 **Susanna A, Garcia-Jacas N, Hidalgo O, Vilatersana R, Garnatje T. Submitted.** The
2 Cardueae (Compositae) revisited: insights from a combined ITS, *trnL-trnF* and *matK*
3 nuclear and chloroplast DNA analysis.
- 4 **Swofford DL, Olsen GJ. 1990.** Phylogeny reconstruction. In: Hillis DM, Moritz C,
5 eds. *Molecular Systematics*. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates, 411-501.
- 6 **Swofford DL. 1999.** *PAUP*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and other*
7 *methods)*. Version 4. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates.
- 8 **Taberlet P, Gielly L, Pautou G, Bouvet J. 1991.** Universal primers for amplification
9 of three non-coding regions of chloroplast DNA. *Plant Molecular Biology* 17: 1105-
10 1109.
- 11 **Vilatersana R, Susanna A, Garcia-Jacas N, Garnatje T. 2000.** Karyology, generic
12 delineation and dysploidy in the genera *Carduncellus*, *Carthamus* and *Phonus*
13 (Asteraceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 134: 425-438.
- 14 **Villodre JM, Garcia-Jacas N. 2000.** Pollen studies in subtribe Centaureinae
15 (Asteraceae): the *Jacea* group analysed with electron microscopy. *Botanical Journal of*
16 *the Linnean Society* 133: 473-484.
- 17 **Wagenitz G. 1958.** Die Gattung *Myopordon* Boiss. (Compositae-Cynareae). *Berichte*
18 *der Deutschen Botanischen Gesellschaft (Stuttgart)* 71: 271-277.
- 19 **Wagenitz G, Dittrich M, Damboldt J. 1982.** *Centaurothamnus*, eine neue Gattung der
20 Compositae-Cardueae in Arabien. *Candollea* 37: 101-115.
- 21 **Wagenitz G, Hellwig FH. 1996.** Evolution of characters and phylogeny of the
22 Centaureinae. In: Hind DJN, Beentje HG, eds. *Compositae: Systematics. Proceedings of*
23 *the International Compositae Conference, Kew, 1994*. Kew: Royal Botanic Gardens,
24 491-510.

- 1 **White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S, Taylor J. 1990.** Amplification and direct sequencing of
- 2 fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. In: Innis M, Gelfand D, Sninsky J,
- 3 White T, eds. *PCR protocols: a guide to methods and applications*. San Diego:
- 4 Academic Press, 315-322.

1 TABLE 1. Origin of the materials, herbaria where the vouchers are deposited and
 2 GenBank accession numbers.

| SPECIES | VOUCHER | ITS ACCESSION | ETS ACCESSION | trnL-F ACCESSION |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Acroptilon australe</i> Iljin | MONGOLIA: <i>V. Grubov 301 et al.</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Acroptilon repens</i> (L.) DC. | UZBEKISTAN: <i>Susanna 2046 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826223 | xxxxxxx | AY772268 |
| <i>Callicephalus nitens</i> (M. Bieb. ex Willd.) C. A. Mey. | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1578 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826237 | xxxxxxx | AY772281 |
| <i>Centauranthus maximus</i> Wagenitz & Dittrich | YEMEN: <i>Molero s. n.</i> (BC) | AY826259 | xxxxxxx | AY772301 |
| <i>Cheirolophus mauritanicus</i> (Font Quer) Susanna | MOROCCO: <i>Romo 4617 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826261 | xxxxxxx | AY772303 |
| <i>Cheirolophus teydis</i> (C. Sm.) G. López | SPAIN: <i>Susanna 1429 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826262 | xxxxxxx | AY772304 |
| <i>Klasea algida</i> (Iljin) Hidalgo | TAJIKISTAN: <i>Susanna 2558 & Romaschenko</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea biebersteiniana</i> (Iljin ex Grossh.) Hidalgo | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1493 et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea cernitifolia</i> (Sm.) Greuter & Wagenitz | IRAN: <i>Susanna 1700 et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea chartacea</i> (C. Winkl.) Hidalgo | TAJIKISTAN: <i>Susanna 2467 & Romaschenko</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea coriacea</i> (Fisch. & Mey. ex DC.) Holub | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1558 et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea grandifolia</i> (P. H. Davis) Greuter & Wagenitz | IRAN: <i>Susanna 1709 et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea kuzhistanica</i> (Mozaffarian) Mozaffarian | IRAN: <i>Mozaffarian 70181</i> (TARI) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Klasea serratuloides</i> (DC.) Greuter & Wagenitz | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1569 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826295 | xxxxxxx | AY772334 |
| <i>Leuzea berardioides</i> Batt. | MOROCCO: <i>Hidalgo & Romo 12749</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Leuzea conifera</i> (L.) DC. | SPAIN: <i>Font s. n.</i> (BC) | AY826298 | xxxxxxx | AY772337 |
| <i>Leuzea Font-Quer</i> Sauvage | MOROCCO: <i>Hidalgo & Romo 12621</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Myopordon aucheri</i> Boiss. | IRAN: <i>Carls s. n.</i> (W) | AY826299 | xxxxxxx | AY772338 |
| <i>Myopordon hyrcanum</i> (Bornm.) Wagenitz | IRAN: <i>Koelz 16395</i> (W) | AY826300 | xxxxxxx | AY772339 |
| <i>Myopordon persicum</i> Boiss. | IRAN: <i>Remandieri s. n.</i> (W) | AY826301 | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Ochrocephala imatongensis</i> (Phillipson) Dittrich | ETHIOPIA: <i>Fantahun Simon 9163 et al.</i> (K) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Oligochaeta divaricata</i> (Fisch. & C. A. Mey.) K. Koch | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1583 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826306 | xxxxxxx | AY772344 |
| <i>Oligochaeta minima</i> (Boiss.) Briq. | UZBEKISTAN: <i>Botanical Garden of Tashrent</i> (BC) | AY826307 | xxxxxxx | AY772345 |
| <i>Plagiobasis centauroides</i> Schrenk | KAZAKHSTAN: <i>Susanna 2130 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826312 | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Psephellus persicus</i> (DC.) Wagenitz | IRAN: <i>Susanna 1716 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826316 | xxxxxxx | AY772352 |
| <i>Psephellus pulcherrimus</i> (Willd.) Wagenitz | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1492 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826317 | xxxxxxx | AY772353 |
| <i>Rhaponticoides hajastana</i> (Tzvelev) M. V. Agab. & Greuter | ARMENIA: <i>Susanna 1587 et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticoides iconiensis</i> (Hub.-Mor.) M. V. Agab. & Greuter | TURKEY: <i>Ertugrul 1761</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum acaule</i> (L.) DC. | ALGERIA: <i>Montserrat 2331 et al.</i> (BC) | AY826334 | xxxxxxx | AY772369 |
| <i>Rhaponticum aulicetense</i> Iljin | KYRGYZSTAN: <i>Sheremetova & Lazkov</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum australe</i> (Gaudich.) Soskov | AUSTRALIA: <i>Funck 12203</i> (BC) | AY826335 | xxxxxxx | AY772370 |
| <i>Rhaponticum canariense</i> DC. | SPAIN: <i>Carqué Alamo s. n.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum carthamoides</i> (Willd.) Iljin | RUSSIA: <i>Botanical Garden of Sibiricus Centralis, Novosibirsk 2003/2004-1062</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum cossonianum</i> (Ball) Greuter | MOROCCO: <i>Gómiz 17-IV-2003</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum cynaroides</i> Less. | SPAIN: <i>Hidalgo 504, et al.</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------|---------|----------|
| <i>Rhaponticum exaltatum</i> (Willk.) Greuter | SPAIN: <i>Garcia-Jacas & Susanna 2434</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum helenifolium</i> Godr. & Gren. | Botanical Garden of Minsk, Bielorusia 1/303-2000 (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum insigne</i> (Boiss.) Wagenitz | IRAN: <i>Archibald 2034</i> (K) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum integrifolium</i> C. Winkl. | TAJIKISTAN: <i>Makhmetov & R. Kamelin 344</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum karatavicum</i> Iljin | KAZAKHSTAN: <i>Kamelin</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum longifolium</i> (Hoffmanns. & Link) Dittrich | PORTUGAL: <i>Garcia-Jacas & Susanna 2436</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum lyratum</i> C. Winkl. ex Iljin | TAJIKISTAN: <i>Kossov</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum nanum</i> Lipsky | TAJIKISTAN: <i>Kochkariova 5834</i> (DUSH) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum nanum</i> Lipsky ssp. <i>pellucidum</i> (Rech. f.) Dittrich | AFGHANISTAN: <i>Renz 120</i> (W) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum nitidum</i> Fisch. | RUSSIA: <i>Kalibernova 5676, et al.</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum pulchrum</i> Fisch. & C. A. Meyer | RUSSIA: <i>326 et al.</i> (LE) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum scariosum</i> Lam. | SLOVENIA: <i>Botanical Garden of Universitatis Labacensis Slovenia 1994-180</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| | <i>Botanical Garden of Minsk, Bielorusia 1/304-2000</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum serratuloides</i> (Georgi) Bobrov | <i>Botanical Garden of Cluj-Napoca, Romania 636-2001</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Rhaponticum uniflorum</i> (L.) DC. | MONGOLIA: <i>Vallès 13-2003</i> (BC) | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx | xxxxxxx |
| <i>Serratula coronata</i> L. | <i>Botanical Garden of Vienna, Austria</i> (BC) | AY826327 | xxxxxxx | AY772362 |
| <i>Stizolophus coronopifolius</i> Cass. | TURKEY: <i>Ilarslan 4303</i> (ANK) | AY826337 | xxxxxxx | AY013516 |

- 1 TABLE 2. Results from the combined ITS, ETS and *trnL-trnF* parsimony analysis. The
 2 consistency and homoplasy indexes are calculated excluding uninformative characters.

| Data set | Combined analyses |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Total characters | 2950 [ITS: 669, ETS: 1354, <i>trnL-trnF</i> : 927] |
| Informative substitutions | 549 [ITS: 149, ETS: 375, <i>trnL-trnF</i> : 25] |
| Number of MTPs | 558 |
| Number of steps | 1582 |
| Consistency index (CI) | 0.48 |
| Retention index (RI) | 0.72 |
| Mean pairwise distances, ingroup (%) | from 0 [<i>Acroptilon australe</i> / <i>A. repens</i> ; <i>Leuzea conifera</i> / <i>L. fontqueri</i>] to 37 [<i>Acroptilon australe</i> , <i>A. repens</i> / <i>Callicephalus nitens</i>] |

1 FIG1. Majority-rule consensus tree based on Bayesian analyse. Numbers above branches
2 indicate Bayesian clade-credibility values (Posterior probability); Numbers below
3 branches indicate parsimony bootstrap percentages. Subgenus of *Rhaponticum*:
4 CES=*Cestrinus*; ELE=*Eleutherochaetum*; FOR=*Fornicium*; LEU=*Leuzea*;
5 RHA=*Rhaponticina*; RHL=*Rhaponticella*; STE=*Stemmacantha*.
6

