

Socioecology and Phylogeography of the Yellow-bellied Glider (*Petaurus australis*)

Meredeth Brown (B.Soc.Sci., Hons)

Environmental Biology
School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
The University of Adelaide
South Australia

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at The University of Adelaide

October 2006



Table of contents

| | |
|------------------|------|
| List of Tables | v |
| List of Figures | vi |
| Abstract | viii |
| Declaration | ix |
| Acknowledgements | xii |
| Dedication | xv |

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Introduction and definitions 1

1.2 Social and mating systems 1

1.2.1 Monogamous social and mating systems 1

1.2.2 Inter- and intraspecific variation in social and mating systems 3

1.2.3 Use of DNA technologies in studies on behaviour 4

1.3 Reproductive ecology 4

1.3.1 Life history strategies in a seasonal environment 4

1.3.2 Seasonal conditions and forest phenology 6

1.4 Phylogeography and conservation units 7

1.4.1 Conservation units 7

1.5 The study species: the yellow-bellied glider (*Petaurus australis*) 9

1.5.1 Description of the study species 9

1.5.2 Distribution and conservation status 9

1.5.3 Social behaviour 10

1.5.4 Diet and reproductive behaviour 11

1.5.5 Variation between populations of yellow-bellied gliders 12

1.5.6 Management considerations of isolated populations 12

1.6 Aims of the thesis 13

CHAPTER 2. CHARACTERISATION AND OPTIMISATION OF MICROSATELLITE LOCI IN *PETAURUS AUSTRALIS*, *P. BREVICEPS* AND *P. NORFOLCENSIS* 14

2.1 Preamble 14

2.2 Introduction 14

2.3 Methods 15

2.4 Results and Conclusion 16

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER 3. MONOGAMY IN THE YELLOW-BELLIED GLIDER | 18 |
| 3.1 Preamble | 18 |
| 3.2 Introduction | 18 |
| 3.3 Methods | 20 |
| 3.3.1 Study area and sampling times | 20 |
| 3.3.2 Trapping and processing techniques | 20 |
| 3.3.3 Collection and analysis of radio-tracking data | 21 |
| 3.3.4 Observations of associations between paired adult males and females | 23 |
| 3.3.5 Spatial distribution of den trees | 23 |
| 3.3.6 Paternity analysis | 24 |
| 3.4 Results | 26 |
| 3.4.1 Home range overlap between individuals | 26 |
| 3.4.2 Associations within adult male and female pairs | 29 |
| 3.4.3 Distribution of den trees within the home range | 30 |
| 3.4.4 Genetic analyses of parentage | 31 |
| 3.5 Discussion | 38 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 4. FOREST PHENOLOGY AND THE TIMING OF REPRODUCTION IN THE YELLOW-BELLIED GLIDER | 44 |
| 4.1 Preamble | 44 |
| 4.2 Introduction | 44 |
| 4.3 Materials and Methods | 47 |
| 4.3.1 The study area | 47 |
| 4.3.2 Trapping and processing techniques | 48 |
| 4.3.3 Forest phenology | 50 |
| 4.4 Results | 52 |
| 4.4.1 Flowering phenology | 52 |
| 4.4.2 Bark shed phenology | 55 |
| 4.4.3 Timing of reproduction | 57 |
| 4.5 Discussion | 59 |
| | |
| CHAPTER 5. PHYLOGEOGRAPHY OF THE YELLOW-BELLIED GLIDER | 63 |
| 5.1 Preamble | 63 |
| 5.2 Introduction | 63 |
| 5.3 Materials and Methods | 66 |
| 5.3.1 Tissue samples | 66 |
| 5.3.2 mtDNA sequencing | 67 |
| 5.3.3 mtDNA analyses | 68 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 5.3.4 Morphological measurements and analyses | 69 |
| 5.4 Results | 71 |
| 5.4.1 Variation and distribution of mtDNA haplotypes | 71 |
| 5.4.2 Phylogeographic relationships of mtDNA haplotypes | 73 |
| 5.4.3 Morphological data: sexual dimorphism and geographic variation | 76 |
| 5.5 Discussion | 77 |
| 5.5.1 Taxonomy | 77 |
| 5.5.2 Conservation units and management | 78 |
| 5.5.3 Levels of genetic variation | 81 |
| 5.5.4 Phylogeography | 82 |
| 5.5.5 Conclusions | 82 |
| CHAPTER 6. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION | 83 |
| 6.1 Summary of aims | 83 |
| 6.2 Mating system of yellow-bellied gliders | 83 |
| 6.2.1 Evidence for a monogamous mating system | 83 |
| 6.2.2 Factors contributing to monogamy in yellow-bellied gliders | 84 |
| 6.2.3 Mate guarding or group sap feeding in yellow-bellied gliders? | 85 |
| 6.3 Reproductive ecology of yellow-bellied gliders | 86 |
| 6.3.1 Seasonality of food resources and aseasonality of births | 86 |
| 6.3.2 Cues that may be important for initiating breeding in yellow-bellied gliders | 86 |
| 6.3.3 Opportunism in the timing of breeding? | 88 |
| 6.3.4 Aseasonality of births and a monogamous mating system | 88 |
| 6.4 Conservation units in yellow-bellied gliders | 89 |
| 6.4.1 ESU status of yellow-bellied gliders | 89 |
| 6.5 Limitations to the study | 89 |
| 6.6 Overall conclusion | 90 |
| <i>List of appendices</i> | |
| Appendix 1 | 92 |
| Appendix 2 | 93 |
| Appendix 3 | 97 |
| Appendix 4(a)(b) | 100 |
| Appendix 5 | 103 |
| Appendix 6 | 105 |
| Appendix 7 | 107 |
| Appendix 8 | 110 |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Appendix 9 | 111 |
| Appendix 10 | 112 |
| <i>References</i> | 115 |
| <i>Publications</i> | 132 |



List of tables

- Table 2.1 Polymorphic microsatellite loci isolated from *Petaurus breviceps* (Petb1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9) and *P. australis* (Peta13, 16 and 18), including the primer sequence (F, forward; R, reverse), core repeat motif, size of alleles (bp), number of alleles at each locus, observed (H_o) and expected (H_e) heterozygosities* (information on allele size, no. of alleles and heterozygosity for Petb1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 is for *P. breviceps*; Peta13, 16 and 18 is for *P. australis*) and GenBank Accession numbers. Petb6(a) primers were designed for specific amplification of the Petb6 locus in *P. australis*. 17
- Table 3.1 Amount of overlap (%) for cohabiting males and females, and between adjacent territories. Overlap is calculated from MCP 100% home ranges of each individual. Mean \pm SE and range, in parentheses, is presented. n = number of overlaps observed. Monogamous pairs = one male cohabiting with one female. Polygynous/ polyterritorial group = one male overlapped his home range with those of two females. 29
- Table 3.3 Likelihood analysis for putative mothers based on 10,000 simulations where no adults were assigned as known parents. LOD scores and Delta statistics for the female putative parent for each juvenile are provided. Putative mothers are in order of most likely candidate as defined by CERVUS. Delta statistics are between the most likely candidate mother and the next most likely candidate mother. ID numbers are the DNA in alcohol numbers assigned by the Evolutionary Biology Unit, SA Museum. #=juveniles/subadults where the social mother was not known, ^=true mother did not return a positive LOD score. *=95% and +=80% confidence interval, NS=not significant. 32
- Table 3.4 Likelihood analysis for putative fathers based on 10,000 simulations where no parent was assumed and where the social mother was assigned the known parent. LOD scores and Delta statistics of each putative father are provided. Putative fathers are in order of most likely candidate as defined by CERVUS. Delta statistics are between the most likely candidate father and the next most likely father. *=95% and +=80% confidence interval, NS=not significant. # =subadults that were assigned by Cervus the most likely female candidate. 35
- Table 5.1 Numbers of samples (n), haplotypes and diversity indices \pm standard deviation (gene and nucleotide diversity estimated using ARLEQUIN v.3.01) in populations of yellow-bellied gliders. 72
- Table 5.2 Within and between regions pairwise distance (HKY85 model) comparisons. Mean \pm standard deviation and range (in parentheses) are shown as percentages. Within regions comparisons are on the diagonal, between regions comparisons are above the diagonal. 72

List of figures

- Fig. 3.1 (a) Yellow-bellied gliders' home ranges using MCP 100% (female home ranges are in bold outline, whilst male home ranges are in fine outline); and (b) home ranges using Kernel 50% (all core home ranges are in black) and 90%; female home ranges are in white, males are in grey (the darker grey showing the adult male in C group). Group names are indicated on MCP 100% home ranges but are also applicable to Kernel home ranges. Kernel home ranges are circled to make group identification easier. The location of a home range for the adult male and female in group B is indicated by the dashed arrow (prior to the disappearance of both the adult male and female after August 2002). The adult male and one adult female from C group resided in this area from August/September 2002 until the end of the study in August 2003. The forest is bordered by *Pinus radiata* plantations on the west, but continuous native habitat exists to the north, south and east. 28
- Fig. 3.2 Interindividual distances of monogamous pairs (cohabiting adult male and adult female) and a polygynous group (one adult male and two adult females). Monogamous pairs ($n = 4$ pairs) are compared with polygynous group ($n = 1$ group). Distance classes contain 25m ranges. Total number of observations = 117. 30
- Fig. 4.1 Monthly mean daily maximum and minimum temperatures and average monthly rainfall for Rennick. Temperature data from 1948 to 2001 from the Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_090092.shtml. Rainfall data from 1953 to 2003 from Hancock Victorian Timber Plantations. 48
- Fig. 4.2 Circular distributions of the number of (a) manna gum and (b) brown stringybark monitored trees in flower for both years combined. Number of trees in flower is indicated on the N-S, E-W axes. The length of each wedge is representative of the number of trees in flower for that month. The bold line emerging from the centre to the edge is the mean, whilst the arcs on the outside of the circle are the 95% confidence limits of the mean. 53
- Fig. 4.3 Number of monitored (a) manna gum and (b) brown stringybark trees in various phases of flowering. Trees were categorised as having <1,000 flowers (light), between 1,001 and 10,000 (medium) flowers, and $\geq 10,001$ (heavy) flowers. Data were collected between August 2001 and August 2003. $n = 44$ monitored manna gum trees, $n = 124$ monitored brown stringybark trees. 54
- Fig. 4.4 Circular distributions of the number of trees in each of the high, medium and low categories of bark shed, where (a) = trunk, (b) = main branches, (c) = outer branches. High = $> 60\%$, medium = $40-60\%$, low = $< 40\%$ bark shed. Number of monitored trees are on the N-S, E-W axes. Year 1 = August 2001-August 2002 (data not collected in September 2001), year 2 = September 2002-August 2003. 56

- Fig. 4.5 Circular distributions of estimated dates of (a) births, (b) pouch exit and (c) independence. Number of births are on the N-S, E-W axes. The length of each wedge is representative of the number of births, pouch exit and independent young for that month. The line emerging from the centre to the edge is the mean, whilst the arcs on the outside of the circle are the 95% confidence limits of the mean. 58
- Fig. 5.1 Distribution map of the yellow-bellied glider (*P. australis*) showing both subspecies as they are recognised in the literature (e.g. Russell 1983). The location of the type specimen, *P. a. reginae* (Thomas 1923), is indicated. 64
- Fig. 5.2 Diagrams of cranial characters 1) zygomatic width, 2) zygomatic length, 3) brain width, 4) skull length, 5) nasal length, 6) nasal width, 7) lacrimal, 8) nasal angle, 9) brain height, 10) coronoid height, 11) mandible length, and 12) length of occipital. Measurements, not shown in the diagrams, were also taken of molar (M1) length and width. N = 34 skulls. 70
- Fig. 5.3 Maximum Parsimony (MP) tree of length 380 showing evolutionary relationships among *ND4* haplotypes from yellow-bellied gliders. *Petauroides volans* and *Petaurus breviceps* were used as an outgroup for the analyses. Numbers adjacent to branches represent % bootstrap values for MP (left) and % MRBAYES posterior probabilities (right). Sample numbers refer to ABTC numbers (no prefix) or museum voucher numbers, given in Appendix 4. 74
- Fig. 5.4 Minimum spanning haplotype network, assuming statistical parsimony, constructed in TCS v.1.21 (Clement *et al.* 2000). A total of 50 steps were required to link all *P. australis* haplotypes. Size of the circles is proportional to sample size. Each black node represents a haplotype change (missing haplotype). The stippled circle on the haplotype network corresponds with the locations of specimens obtained from Vic./SA as indicated on the map. The heavily outlined circles on the haplotype network correspond with the locations of specimens obtained from NQ. All empty circles are from NSW. The grey filled-in circles are specimens from southern Queensland. Localities from which specimens from NSW/SQ were obtained are also indicated on the map. 75
- Fig. 5.5 Relationship between the first (PC1) and second (PC2) components of the Principle Components Analysis (PCA). Fourteen characters from 34 skulls of both sexes are included. NQ = north Queensland, SQ = south Queensland, NSW = New South Wales, VIC = Victoria. 77

Abstract

Marsupials have complex and interesting socioecology and life history strategies that differ quite markedly to much-studied eutherian mammals. However, the socioecology and life history strategies of a number of Australian marsupials are most often observed only within the context of a much larger study on their ecology. My aim was to study, using a combination of behavioural observations and molecular DNA techniques, aspects of the socioecology of a population of yellow-bellied gliders (*Petaurus australis*) in Rennick State Forest, south-western Victoria. Petaurid gliders feed on plant and insect exudates, pollen/nectar and arthropods. Yellow-bellied gliders are arboreal, rare, nocturnal and cryptic, have persistent pair bonds, are territorial and exist in low population densities. In particular, I sought to confirm that the Rennick population of yellow-bellied gliders maintained a predominantly monogamous mating system. I also sought to confirm that the timing of reproduction in this population of yellow-bellied gliders would be seasonal, and timed to coincide with peaks in the abundances of two indices of protein food resources (i.e. flowering and bark shed). In a more broadscale study, I sought to examine the geographic distribution of mitochondrial haplotypes and morphological variation of the yellow-bellied glider throughout its range.

Polymorphic microsatellite loci are the choice of genetic marker for fine-scale studies, such as relatedness and paternity. Microsatellite loci had previously only been characterised and optimised for *Petaurus norfolcensis* (squirrel gliders). However, close inspection of the GenBank sequences revealed the presence of replicates differing only by sequencing errors. A panel of seven polymorphic tetranucleotide loci in *Petaurus breviceps* (sugar gliders) and three polymorphic trinucleotide loci in *P. australis* were isolated and optimised. Five *P. breviceps* loci were polymorphic in *P. norfolcensis* and two were polymorphic in *P. australis*. Only one *P. australis* locus was variable in *P. breviceps* and *P. norfolcensis*. No locus showed a deficit in heterozygotes according to Hardy-Weinberg expectations, and the large number of alleles for some of the loci confirmed their usefulness for studies in relatedness and paternity.

A number of Australian arboreal marsupials have been reported to show monogamous and polygynous mating systems in different populations, but previous studies have not included genetic analyses to confirm the observations. My aim was to test the hypothesis that monogamy was the predominant mating system in a population of yellow-bellied gliders (*Petaurus australis*) in south-western Victoria. Home range overlap, cohesiveness of pairs, rates of den site co-occupancy and location of den trees within the home ranges of 13 gliders were determined via radio-tracking. A monogamous social system predominated, demonstrated by extensive home range overlap between cohabiting adult males and females (40-100%) and little home range overlap between adjacent territories (< 7%). Males spent approximately 55% of their active time within 25m of their female partners and 55-85% of their sleeping time in dens with their female partner. The paternity of all juveniles within the population was analysed using five microsatellite DNA markers. Of 37 individuals genotyped, 12 of 13 juveniles could be attributed to the resident adult male. My results suggest that social monogamy equates with genetic monogamy in this population of yellow-bellied gliders.

Mammalian taxa living in seasonal environments usually coincide energy-demanding reproductive activities with the seasonal availability of food resources. However, few studies on arboreal marsupial taxa in Australia have focussed upon the interplay of forest phenology and the timing of breeding. This study examined forest phenology in a temperate environment, and the timing of reproduction the yellow-bellied glider. I captured adult females once per month between August 2001 and August 2003 to determine reproductive condition, and monitored indicators for two key food resources over the same period. Flowering phenology (as an index of pollen availability) was assessed in 170 manna gum (*Eucalyptus viminalis*) and brown stringybark (*E. baxteri*) trees, while bark shed (as an index of arthropod availability) was assessed in 45 manna gum, the only eucalypt species at this site that sheds its bark. Aseasonal reproduction was indicated within this population of gliders, as distributions of births were not statistically different from random. However, yellow-bellied gliders did exhibit distinct birth peaks in spring, summer and winter, when data were combined for both years. The temporal distributions of flowering for both eucalypt species were statistically different from random, indicating seasonal availability of nectar and pollen. Peak flowering occurred in summer for brown

stringybark, and autumn for manna gum in both years, although for manna gum peak abundance of flowers was one month earlier in the second year. While the temporal distribution of bark shed on the trunks of trees did not differ from random, it did show seasonality on the main and outer branches, peaking in summer and declining thereafter. Thus, it appears that yellow-bellied gliders breed aseasonally in a predictable, seasonal environment. However, yellow-bellied gliders have a reliance on the complex temporal interplay of different seasonal food resources.

Subspecific status has often been used as a surrogate for conservation unit, but does not always reflect intra-specific lineages with different evolutionary histories. One contentious case of subspecific classification occurs in the yellow-bellied glider, a marsupial species showing considerable decline in population size and requiring conservation management. Our aim was to assess the current subspecific status of populations and define units of conservation using a combination of phylogeographical analyses of mitochondrial DNA and morphological analyses. Analyses of the mitochondrial ND4 gene provided evidence for significant phylogeographic structure within yellow-bellied gliders. Isolated populations in north Queensland (NQ) and Victoria/ South Australia were genetically distinct from populations in New South Wales and southern Queensland. Morphological analyses provided little evidence for discrimination of populations, although NQ specimens were generally smaller in size compared to southern forms. My analyses do not support the classification of subspecies, *P. a. reginae*, for the original type specimen from southern Queensland. Taking into account other behavioural and ecological data, and the disjunct distribution of NQ populations from southern populations, I propose that the NQ population represents a distinct Evolutionarily Significant Unit, a lineage showing highly restricted gene flow with the rest of the species.

Declaration

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text.

The author consents to this thesis being made available for photocopying and loan when deposited in the University Library.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copyright holder/s of those works.

.....

Meredeth Brown

26 June 2007

Acknowledgements

To my supervisors, Dr Sue Carthew and Dr Steve Cooper, I thank you for your guidance and eternal patience in reading and re-reading chapters of this thesis, and for just being really nice. I feel very fortunate to have had both of you as supervisors, particularly as you got along together so well, and had different, but complementary, strengths when it came to different aspects of my research.

I acknowledge and thank the work that various colleagues have put into the production of papers that have arisen from this research. Firstly, thanks must go to my supervisors who put an enormous amount of work into reviewing manuscripts and advising on analyses. I thank Huw Cooksley who isolated and characterised microsatellite loci in *Petaurus breviceps*, Kathy Saint, who isolated and characterised microsatellite loci in *Petaurus australis*. Thanks to Trish Kendal and her supervisor, Dr Andrea Taylor, who tested the microsatellite loci developed in our laboratory in *P. breviceps* and *Petaurus norfolcensis*. Thanks to Huw Cooksley who also sequenced a number of *P. australis* specimens (further details are provided in the text) and Mansooreh Malekian who sequenced the *P. breviceps*, *P. norfolcensis* and *Petauroides volans* specimens that were used as outgroups in the phylogenetic analysis.

I am indebted to my volunteers. Without volunteers, my fieldwork would have been impossible. I thank the following people for taking the time to come out into the field with me, and particularly to those of you who made it out there multiple times: Darryl Funnell, Huw Cooksley, Georgina Haynes, Sean McKernan, Kris Krock, Grant Williamson, Doreen Marchesan, James and Rose Juniper, Evan Dunn, Adrian Hedley, Kelly Robinson, Joh Gulpers, Kay Richardson, Exo, Emma Wauchope, Sam Mason, Anne-Elisabeth Fauchaux, Glenn Sorrensen, Allen McIlwee, Tim Playford, Vera Weisbecker, Aga Rapacz, Michelle LeDuff, Josh Griffiths, Ross Goble, Sharon Gillam, Leah Kemp and Greg Rouse. To those volunteers who didn't have gliders named after them, I'm sorry, there just weren't enough gliders to go round!!

Funding for my research came from a small University Research Grant, Sir Mark Mitchell Foundation, Wildlife Conservation Fund, Nature Conservation SA, Australian Geographic, RZSSA/Rotary Robin Fund and Hancock Victorian Timber Plantations. I'd like to thank all these funding sources for their assistance. In particular, I'd like to thank Hancocks for the provision of radiotransmitters, accommodation and a car whilst I worked at Rennick. I was able to work so much harder and for longer hours, in cold and wet conditions, because I knew I could go back to a warm, dry house. To Dean, Bronwyn and Helen - thanks for your friendship and for making my fieldwork about a million times easier.

I'd like to express my appreciation to Justin Cook, Department of Sustainability & Environment for providing permits whilst I carried out my fieldwork. Field and laboratory work was carried out under Animal Ethics W-13-2002 and W-10-99, DSE permit numbers 10001364, 10001803 and 10002392.

I'd like to thank past and present staff from the Department of Animal Science at Roseworthy for providing me with a very funky office, and for helping me in the early stages of my thesis. In particular, I'd like to thank Keith Cowley who took care of the equipment and cars. I'd also like to thank staff from the Discipline of Environmental Biology, School of Earth & Environmental Sciences for providing space and assisting me in the latter stages of my thesis; the data analysis and writing up.

Thanks also to past and present staff and students of the Evolutionary Biology Unit (EBU) at the SA Museum for helping me in the lab, with the analysis and valuable comments on my research. Most of all, Jan Armstrong, Kathy Saint, Terry Bertozzi and Leanne Wheaton - thank you for your help with the molecular work. Also, I'd like to thank past and present members of the Carthew/Stott and Carthew/Johnston discussion groups for commenting on my research, listening and commenting on countless practice talks, helping me in the field and generally for being such a great support network.

I am also indebted to the people who generously supplied me with samples from yellow-bellied gliders. Larry Vogelnest and staff from Taronga Zoo in Sydney provided blood from their captive colony and Ross Goldingay from Southern Cross

University sent across skin biopsies. Thanks to Sandy Ingleby for allowing me to measure yellow-bellied glider skulls in her lab from the Australian museum collection, and also to Heather Janetzki from the Queensland museum, Cath Kemper from the SA museum, Robert Palmer from CSIRO, Australian National Wildlife Collection and Wayne Longmore from the Victorian Museum for sending skulls for me to measure.

There were a number of people to whom I am indebted for making fieldwork in north Queensland possible. Firstly, I must say a big thank you to Peter Latch and staff from the Threatened Species Unit, Parks North Queensland, Michelle Nissen and Claudia Morris for assistance with permits (ATH04/018, ATH04/019 & WISP01808404) and Kerry Hanrahan and Alastair Freeman for equipment. Thanks especially to Rupert Russell and Jane Blackwood who came out into the field and were so very supportive of my work, and to Jane and Sam who allowed us to use their home whilst we were in Ravenshoe. Thanks to Duane and Terry for allowing us to share their beautiful home for a while. I would also like to thank my two field assistants, Darryl Funnell and Mike Lee – thanks for making me laugh and for making the trip wonderful and memorable.

Finally to family and friends - it's been a pretty long ride! Thank you to my friends who stayed with me throughout this long and rocky haul. Thanks to my mum who never seemed to doubt for a second that her daughter was capable of doing a PhD, even if it was in some strange subject on an animal she'd never heard of. Lastly, I could not have completed this thesis without my wonderful partner, Mike, who made me laugh, and gave me support when I needed it most.

This thesis is dedicated to my mum and dad

