## Epigenetic variation within Phragmites australis among lineages, genotypes, and ramets

Amy E. Spens. Vladimir Douhovnikoff

Received: 3 November .

to microhabitat conditions where multiple genotypes exist across a heterogeneous environment.

Methylation-sensitive ampliÞed fragment length polymorphisms (MS-AFLPs)

We screened 96 individuals for epigenetic variation

*Author's personal copy*

of the total variance could be explained by the 2010; Herrera and Bazag $\mathfrak{A}011$ ). However, the segregation of individuals according to subspecies limited variation due to genotype we observed (Table1). In addition to demonstrating distinct epi-suggests that epigenotype may be more closely genetic signatures, our results support the theory thataligned with environmental factors among ramets. conspeciÞcs exhibit consistent variation from large-While a hierarchical AMOVA did Þnd that genotype scale morphological characteristics to smaller-scale contributed signiÞcantly to epigenetic variance (OObephysiological and epigenetic responses. tween genotypes $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}$ , 0.022, Table1), it was not the

Plasticity has been proposed as one characteristic highest source of variance among samples. Genotype that promotes invasion (Pa998 Richards et al.2006) Davidson et al.2011; Richards et al.2012. Being more plastic allows a species to act as a generalist, Libby site (hierarchical AMOVA, Table1). By comexploiting a broad niche in its environment. The parison, the same hierarchical AMOVA revealed generalist approach permits the establishment of statistically signiÞcant variation OOamong genotypesOO invasive populations in heterogeneous, unstable or (p =  $\,$  0.001 at both sites) that could account for 71  $\%$ rapidly changing environments (Pa 998). This appears to be consistent within australispopulations. The native stands are often restricted to growing support for the General-Purpose Genotype (GPG) in low-salinity tidal wetlands, whereas clones of the model inP. australis. The GPG model suggests that introduced subspecies can span diverse microhabitatspopulations with restricted genetic variation might from mesohaline marshes to tidal wetlands to fresh-Þnd other mechanisms to extend the plasticity of a water river systems (Chambers et  $1999$ . The broad introduced distribution could be facilitated by high levels of variation in epigenotype. Our results show within genotypes relative to between them might that the invasive introduced subspecies is more suggest the use of a GPG strategy by invas Re epigenetically plastic than the native, however, at this australisclones. stage we do not know if this lack of epigenetic accounted for only 4 % of epigenetic variance at the Webhannet site and 7 % of epigenetic variance at the of variation at Webhannet and 57 % of variation at Libby (Table 1; Fig. 1b). These results show tentative single genotype in order to take advantage of a wider ecological niche. The enriched epigenetic diversity An earlier study ofP. australis from multiple

plasticity within the native is limiting its expansion. In both subspecies we observed a higher degree of growth is important in both native and introduced epigenetic variation within rather than between-geno- stands (Douhovnikoff and Hazelto 2014). Because types. While environmental variation was not directly naturally-occurring clones ofP. australis are very measured here, there is considerable evidence in thelarge, they are likely to encounter environmental literature that epigenotype is largely inßuenced by heterogeneity. As a clone adjusts to optimize its genotype and environmental factors (Bossdorf et al. resource extraction and growth, it may prove watersheds in midcoast Maine showed that clonal

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean of squares	<b>Estimated Variance</b>	%	p value
Webhannet Marsh ( $n = 46$ invasive, $n = 47$ native)						
Among subspecies		284.932	284.932	5.174	25	0.001
Among genotypes	1	28.908	28.908	0.794	4	0.022
Within genotypes	90	1344.741	14.942	14.942	71	0.001
Total	92	1658.581		20.909	100	
Libby Marsh ( $n = 15$ invasive, $n = 15$ native)						
Among subspecies		86,800	86.800	4.805	37	0.001
Among genotypes	4	41.030	10.258	0.859	7	0.066
Within genotypes	24	178.837	7.452	7.452	57	0.001
Total	29	306.667		13.116	100	

Table 1 AMOVA derived from Webhannet and Libby sites, separately, showing percentage variation explained by subspecies, genotypes, and ramets

advantageous to differentiate ramets within the genet. Such local specialization would require a mechanism more nimble (fast, reversible, and sensitive to environmental variation) than the presence or absence of a gene, particularly within genetically uniform clones. Variability in epigenetic markers is a means of acclimation, potentially more rapid and responsive than adaptation, and thus practical over short to moderate amounts of time and space (Douhovnikoff and Dodd2014).

Natural selection acts to increase or decrease plasticity depending on environmental conditions, the rate at which conditions change, and the character of the species (Alpert and Simma<sup>902</sup> Davidson et al. 2011; Herman et al2013. The limited distribution of native P. australis, large clone sizes, and relatively lower plasticity may indicate a life history strategy more dependent on stability, where it could be more advantageous to specialize in a narrow niche (Alpert and Simms2002, Douhovnikoff and Dodd2014). However, this does not minimize the importance of

phenotypic plasticity of ecologically relevant traits in Arabidopsis thalianaEvol Ecol 24:541Đ553

- Chambers RM, Meyerson LA, Saltonstall K (1999) Expansion of Phragmites australisinto tidal wetlands of North America. Aquat Bot 64:261Ð273
- Davidson AM, Jennions M, Nicotra AB (2011) Do invasive species show higher phenotypic plasticity than native species and if so, is it adaptive? A meta-analysis. Ecol Lett 14:419Ð431
- Donohue K (2014) The epigenetics of adaptation: focusing on epigenetic stability as an evolving trait. Evolution 68Ð3: 617Ð619
- Douhovnikoff V, Dodd RS (2014) Epigenetics: a potential mechanism for clonal plant success. Plant Ecol 216(2): 227Ð233
- Douhovnikoff V, Hazelton ELG (2014) Clonal growth: invasion or stability? A comparative study of clonal architecture and diversity in native and introduced lineages Pothragmites australis(Poaceae). Am J Bot 101(9):1Ð8
- Douhovnikoff V, Taylor SH, Hazelton ELG, Smith CM, OÕBrien J (2016) Maximal stomatal conductance to water