

DNA barcoding of Arctic bryophytes: an example from the moss genus *Dicranum* (Dicranaceae, Bryophyta)

Annick S. Lang, J. D. Kruijer & Michael Stech

Downloaded from:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00300-014-1509-7>

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (DCA) - End User Rights

This publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act (Auteurswet) with consent from the author. Dutch law entitles the maker of a short scientific work funded either wholly or partially by Dutch public funds to make that work publicly available following a reasonable period after the work was first published, provided that reference is made to the source of the first publication of the work.

This publication is distributed under the Naturalis Biodiversity Center 'Taverne implementation' programme. In this programme, research output of Naturalis researchers and collection managers that complies with the legal requirements of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act is distributed online and free of barriers in the Naturalis institutional repository. Research output is distributed six months after its first online publication in the original published version and with proper attribution to the source of the original publication.

You are permitted to download and use the publication for personal purposes. All rights remain with the author(s) and copyrights owner(s) of this work. Any use of the publication other than authorized under this license or copyright law is prohibited.

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the department of Collection Information know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, Collection Information will make the material inaccessible. Please contact us through email: collectie.informatie@naturalis.nl. We will contact you as soon as possible.

DNA barcoding of Arctic bryophytes: an example from the moss genus *Dicranum* (Dicranaceae, Bryophyta)

Annick S. Lang · J. D. Kruijer · Michael Stech

Received: 8 November 2013 / Revised: 9 April 2014 / Accepted: 11 April 2014 / Published online: 22 April 2014
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2014

Abstract The identification of bryophytes from the Arctic is often difficult due to deviating morphologies under the extreme environmental conditions. This is especially true for species-rich and taxonomically complex genera, such as the moss genus *Dicranum*. DNA barcoding is expected to improve the identification of Arctic bryophyte species, but the optimal combination of barcoding markers for mosses in general, especially for delimiting closely related, is still under discussion. In this paper, we test the discrimination capacity of six potential barcode markers (*rps4-trnT*_{UGU}, *trnL*_{UAA}-*trnF*_{GAA}, *trnH*_{GUG}-*psbA*, *rps19-rpl2*, *rpoB*, and nrITS1-5.8S-ITS2) based on phylogenetic reconstructions of 30 *Dicranum* samples from Spitsbergen (Svalbard, Norway), and reference samples from all ten *Dicranum* species confirmed for the Svalbard archipelago and six additional Arctic *Dicranum* species. All 16 species (possibly except *D. fuscescens*) were distinguishable with bootstrap support >70 % based on the combined sequence data, but none of the individual markers could delimit all included species. All Svalbard collections could be readily assigned to five species, *D. acutifolium*, *D. elongatum*, *D. laevidens*, *D. majus*, and *D. spadiceum*, respectively. It is concluded that DNA barcoding improves species identification of Arctic *Dicranum*

plants, but that a combination of several markers is necessary in order to obtain reliable identification results, with the single loci ITS1, *trnL-F* and *rps4-trnT* being the most promising regions.

Keywords Svalbard · *rps4-trnT*_{UGU} · *trnL*_{UAA}-*trnF*_{GAA} · *trnH*_{GUG}-*psbA* · *rps19-rpl2* · *rpoB* · nrITS1-5.8S-ITS2 · Species identification

Introduction

Bryophytes comprise three different phylogenetic lineages of land plants, namely liverworts, hornworts, and mosses (e.g., Qiu et al. 2006). Of these, liverworts and mosses play an essential role in Arctic terrestrial ecosystems and constitute a major component of different types of tundra vegetation (e.g., Longton 1997; Callaghan et al. 2004; Lang et al. 2012). The Arctic bryoflora comprises a considerable diversity of approximately 700 species (Longton 1988; Afonina and Czernyadjeva 1995; Frisvoll and Elvebakk 1996; Konstantinova and Potemkin 1997).

Bryophytes, especially mosses, have been widely employed in studies of ecosystem processes and organismal interactions in (sub-)Arctic environments (e.g., Alsos et al. 1998; Gordon et al. 2001; van der Wal and Brooker 2004; Gornall et al. 2007; Jasmin et al. 2008; Krab et al. 2008). The Arctic has been divided into bioclimatic regions, where the High Arctic is characterized by an open herbaceous vegetation with some dwarf-shrubs on mineral soils, while the Low Arctic generally consists of a closer herbaceous vegetation, composed of dwarf and low shrubs on peat-rich soils (Walker et al. 2005). Biodiversity-based investigations of Arctic ecosystem processes, however, are still severely hampered by insufficient knowledge of

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s00300-014-1509-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

A. S. Lang (✉) · J. D. Kruijer · M. Stech
Naturalis Biodiversity Center, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden,
The Netherlands
e-mail: annick.lang@naturalis.nl

A. S. Lang · J. D. Kruijer · M. Stech
Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

bryophyte taxonomy and by the ability of species recognition based on morphological characters. In response to the extreme environmental conditions, bryophytes display unusual growth forms and deviant gametophytic characters in the (High) Arctic. This plasticity makes morphological identification to species level difficult or even impossible (e.g., Frisvoll and Elvebakk 1996; Buryová and Shaw 2005; Hesse et al. 2012). This is especially true for species-rich and taxonomically complex genera such as *Bryum* Hedw., *Dicranum* Hedw., and *Schistidium* Brid. (e.g., Steere 1978; Hesse et al. 2012). Consequently, ecological studies have largely been limited to a few easily distinguishable species or genus-level identifications (e.g., Oki-tsu et al. 1998), or treated bryophytes as a single category without distinction of species (e.g., van der Wal et al. 2001). Sometimes bryophytes are even grouped with lichens and fungi as the outdated group of “cryptogams” (e.g., Epstein et al. 2004; Wahren et al. 2005; Hudson and Henry 2010). The development of new identification tools to treat bryophytes in a more comprehensive way would surely increase the significance of ecological studies in the (High) Arctic, especially with respect to the potential of bryophytes for investigating the impact of global climate change (Tuba et al. 2011).

DNA barcoding is a molecular tool for species identification based on species-specific sequence differences in a short, standardized DNA region. In contrast to this original idea, however, barcoding in land plants (including bryophytes) is supposed to be based on one or two core markers plus additional information from other DNA regions where necessary (e.g., Hollingsworth et al. 2009, 2011). In bryophytes, especially mosses, the plastid markers recently proposed for barcoding of land plants (Kress et al. 2005; CBOL Plant Working Group 2009) either tend to be short (*psbA-trnH* spacer; Stech and Frey 2008; Stech and Quandt 2010), have different discrimination capacity at the species level (*rbcL*; Liu et al. 2010; Stech and Quandt 2010), or need more study concerning primer design and amplification strategy (*trnK/matK*, e.g., Bell et al. 2012). Although the optimal combination of barcoding markers for bryophytes is still under discussion (e.g., Liu et al. 2010, 2011; Bell et al. 2012; Hassel et al. 2013; Stech et al. 2013), several other molecular markers have already shown to be useful for inferring species delimitations and identifying species in bryophytes (e.g., Draper and Hedenäs 2009; von Cräutlein et al. 2011; Stech et al. 2011; Bell et al. 2012; Stech et al. 2013).

Dicranum (Dicranaceae) is a large genus belonging to the second largest subclass of mosses, Dicranidae. It comprises ca. 90 species essentially found in the Holarctic (Crosby et al. 1999; Ireland 2007), including about 30 species in the boreo-arctic region, of which ten species were accepted for Svalbard (Frisvoll and Elvebakk 1996). Several *Dicranum*

species show a high morphological variability (Hedenäs and Bisang 2004; Smith 2004; Hedenäs et al. 2006; Lang and Stech 2014), which renders their identification challenging, in particular in plants (Hedenäs et al. 2006; personal observation). Previous phylogenetic studies revealed low sequence divergence in commonly employed plastid markers (La Farge et al. 2002; Stech et al. 2006). The nuclear ribosomal ITS region allowed species identification in a study of Russian *Dicranum* species albeit with low support (Tubanov et al. 2010; Tubanov and Ignatova 2011). Most recently, however, Lang and Stech (2014) showed that closely related species of the *Dicranum scoparium* Hedw. species complex were best resolved by combining five plastid regions and the nuclear ribosomal ITS region.

In the present study, we aim to test how well *Dicranum* collections from the High Arctic archipelago of Svalbard can be identified to species level based on a DNA barcoding approach. Inferences are based on molecular phylogenetic reconstructions using chloroplast (*rpoB*, *trnH-psbA*, *trnL-trnF*, *rps4-trnT*, *rps19-rpl2*) and nuclear ribosomal ITS sequences from Svalbard and reference collections. The reference sequences were generated from well identified, morphologically typical specimens from temperate to boreal regions. Furthermore, we examine the species discrimination efficacy of the six markers individually based on phylogenetic inference and comparison of maximum intraspecific versus minimum interspecific genetic distances.

Materials and methods

Sampling

According to the most recent checklist of the bryophytes of Svalbard (Frisvoll and Elvebakk 1996), 17 *Dicranum* species have been reported for the archipelago, of which ten were accepted in the checklist (*Dicranum acutifolium* (Lindb. and Arn.) C. Jens., *D. angustum* Lindb., *D. elongatum* Schleich. ex Schwägr., *D. flexicaule* Brid., *D. fuscescens* Sm., *D. laevidens* R.S. Williams, *D. majus* Sm., *D. scoparium* Hedw., *D. spadiceum* J.E. Zetterst., and *D. tauricum* Sapjegin), and seven were excluded due to erroneous identification (*D. bonjeanii* De Not., *D. brevifolium* (Lindb.) Lindb., *D. fragilifolium* Lindb., *D. groenlandicum* Brid., *D. leioneuron* Kindb., *D. muehlenbeckii* Bruch and Schimp., and *D. scottianum* Turner ex Scott). DNA sequences of 52 reference specimens comprising 16 out of the 17 species were compiled from earlier studies (Stech 1999; Lang and Naciri 2010; Lang and Stech 2014) or newly generated for this study (Online Resource 1): *Dicranum acutifolium* (1 sample), *D. angustum* (5), *D. brevifolium* (2), *D. bonjeanii* (5), *D. elongatum* (1), *D.*

flexicaule (7), *D. fragilifolium* (1), *D. fuscescens* (3), *D. groenlandicum* (1), *D. laevidens* (1), *D. leioneuron* (3), *D. majus* (6), *D. scoparium* (6), *D. spadiceum* (4), *D. scottianum* (2), and *D. tauricum* (4). The reference specimens originated from temperate to boreal regions, generally displayed morphologies typical for the respective species, and were mostly identified, or their identifications checked, by the authors or L. Hedenäs (Stockholm). *Dicranum muhlenbeckii*, however, could not be included in the analysis because of unsuccessful DNA amplification. Thirty *Dicranum* specimens from Svalbard (including one specimen already included in Lang and Stech 2014) collected by the second and third author in Adventdalen (Longyearbyen area), Colesbukta, and Kongsfjorden (Ny-Ålesund area) in 2008–2010 were analyzed (DNA numbers Dic_1644–Dic_1646, Dic_1648–Dic_1655, Dic_1659–Dic_1673, Dic_1675–Dic_1677). The collection strategy was to collect as many morphotypes as possible from the sampled areas. Four samples of *Holomitrium* Brid., one of *H. crispulum* Mart. and three of *H. arboreum* Mitt., were chosen as outgroup representatives according to earlier molecular phylogenetic reconstructions (La Farge et al. 2002; Stech et al. 2006). Voucher information and GenBank accession numbers of the DNA sequences generated from the 30 specimens are listed in Online Resource 1. The nomenclature of *Dicranum* used in this study follows Hedenäs and Bisang (2004), which corresponds to the accepted species in Tropicos (Missouri Botanical Garden 2012) and The Plant List (2013), except three species considered as synonyms in the latter two databases (*D. angustum* and *D. laevidens* as synonyms of *D. spadiceum* and *D. flexicaule* as synonym of *D. fuscescens*).

Molecular marker selection

For this study, we sequenced five chloroplast regions, i.e., partial *rpoB* gene, *trnH_{GUG}-psbA* and *rps19-rpl2* intergenic spacers, and two parts of the *trnS-F* region, namely *rps4-trnT_{UGU}* spacer and *trnL-F* (*trnL_{UAA}* intron and *trnL_{UAA}-trnF_{GAA}* spacer), and the nuclear ribosomal nrITS1–5.8S–ITS2 region. Amplification and sequencing success as well as haplotype diversity of the chloroplast markers were inferred for 54 *Dicranum scoparium* specimens by Lang and Naciri (2010). Subsequently, these markers provided, together with nrITS sequences, valuable results in delimiting species of the *Dicranum scoparium* complex, based on a sampling of 111 *Dicranum* specimens (Lang and Stech 2014).

DNA extraction, amplification, and sequencing

DNA was extracted from the dried leaves of a single plant using the NucleoSpin® Extract II Kit (Macherey–Nagel,

Düren, Germany). Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was performed following Lang and Stech (2014). PCR products were purified and sequenced at Macrogen Inc. (www.macrogen.com). GenBank accession numbers of all sequences are listed in Online Resource 1.

Alignment and phylogenetic reconstruction

Sequences were aligned in Geneious v6.1.6 (Biomatters 2010) using 65 % similarity matrix costs, and manually adjusted. Gaps were treated as missing data or coded as informative by a simple indel coding strategy (SIC) (Simmons and Ochoterena 2000) as implemented in Seq-State (Müller 2004). Short hairpin-associated inversions in the *trnH-psbA* spacer were positionally separated in the alignment and not coded as indels. Numbers of constant, variable, and parsimony-informative sites were calculated for each locus using PAUP* v4.0b10 (Swofford 2002).

Phylogenetic analyses using maximum parsimony (MP) optimality criterion and maximum likelihood (ML) were performed on every marker separately (including separate analyses of ITS1 and ITS2) and the combined markers (total evidence trees sensu Kluge 1989), both with and without indels included. Before combining markers, we tested for incongruence by visual inspection of the separate trees and by applying an incongruence length difference test (ILD, Farris et al. 1994) as implemented in PAUP* with 100 replicates.

MP analyses were performed using PAUP*. Heuristic searches were performed with 100 replicates using random sequence addition, one tree held at each step and tree bisection–reconnection branch swapping, saving up to 10,000 trees. ML analyses were carried out with RAxML v. 7.3.0 (Stamatakis 2006) employing the raxmlGUI v.0.93 interface (Silvestro and Michalak 2012). The default GTR + Γ model was chosen for all markers. Bootstrap analyses under ML were done using the thorough bootstrap heuristics algorithm with 1,000 replicates.

Pairwise nucleotide distances between all sequences were calculated in PAUP* under the Kimura 2-parameter (K2P) model for the combined chloroplast dataset, ITS, and all partitions. Maximum intraspecific distances were plotted against minimum interspecific distances for all possible species pairs with more than one specimen sequenced to infer the presence of a barcoding gap (cf. Stech et al. 2013).

Results

Lengths of the sequenced chloroplast markers within *Dicranum* and *Holomitrium* ranged from 509 to 521 nucleotides for *rps4-trnT*, 449–471 nt for *trnL-F*, 136–140 nt for

Table 1 Alignment length (length), number of constant characters (constant), variable characters (variable), parsimony-informative characters (pars-info) and percentage of parsimony-informative characters (% pars-info) for nucleotide and indel matrices

	<i>trnT-rps4</i>		<i>trnL-trnF</i>		<i>psbA-trnH</i>		<i>rps19-rpl2</i>		<i>rpoB</i>		ITS 1		ITS 2		ITS	
	Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup		Ingroup	
Species	15		16		16		14		16		16		16		16	
Length	522	471	471	471	149	149	310	310	457	457	360	360	427	427	966	966
Constant	485	432	432	436	136	136	292	299	441	443	287	274	369	369	821	821
Variable	37	39	35	35	13	11	18	11	16	14	73	30	67	67	145	145
Parsi-info	33	35	29	29	9	7	11	9	12	1	49	20	42	42	96	96
% Parsi-info	6.32	7.43	6.16	6.16	6.04	4.70	3.55	2.90	2.63	2.19	13.61	6.58	9.84	9.84	9.94	9.94
# Indels	3	6	6	6	5	5	1	1	0	0	64	34	59	59	123	123
Parsi-info	3	4	5	5	3	3	1	1	0	0	49	28	37	37	87	87
Total pars-info	36	39	34	34	12	10	12	10	12	10	98	48	79	79	183	183


Values were calculated from alignments of each marker with outgroup and ingroup only (ingroup)

Fig. 1 Single optimal ML phylogenetic reconstruction inferred from combined chloroplast and nrITS sequence data of *Dicranum* species, including indels coded by SIC. Four specimens of *Holomitrium* were used as outgroup representatives, and names in *bold* represent the reference samples. Numbers above branches indicate MP BS and numbers below the branch indicate ML BS, with and without indels. Branch lengths are to scale except those indicated by the symbol “//” (shortened 2 times)

trnH-psbA, 309–310 nt for *rps19-rpl2* and 457 nt for *rpoB*. The total plastid alignment comprised 1909 positions, of which 123 were variable, and 100 of the variable positions were parsimony informative. SIC yielded a total of 15 additional characters, of which 11 were parsimony informative. Hence, a total of 111 parsimony-informative characters resulted from the plastid markers. Sequences length of nrITS1-5.8S-ITS2 ranged from 747–900 nt (747–839 within *Dicranum*). The alignment comprised 1,086 positions, of which 120 were removed from further calculations due to ambiguous alignment. Of the 966 remaining positions, 145 were variable and 96 of the variable positions were parsimony informative. SIC yielded 123 characters of which 87 were parsimony informative. In total, 183 parsimony-informative characters resulted from nrITS. Respective numbers of parsimony-informative characters per plastid marker and for ITS1 and ITS2 separately are summarized in Table 1. The partitions with the most parsimony-informative characters were ITS1 (13.61 %) and ITS2 (9.84 %), followed by the chloroplast markers *trnL-F* (7.43 %), *rps4-trnT* (6.32 %), *trnH-psbA* (6.04 %), *rps19-rpl2* (3.55 %), and partial *rpoB* gene (2.63 %).

Maximum parsimony analyses with or without indels included resulted in most parsimonious phylogenetic reconstructions with similar consistency indices (combined chloroplast: CI 0.7306 vs. 0.7159, ITS: CI 0.7939 vs. 0.8394), indicating only a slightly higher amount of homoplasy in the indel characters in ITS. Both visual inspections of plastid versus ITS tree topologies and the ILD test ($p = 0.29$) indicated that the two datasets were congruent and could be combined.

The single optimal ML tree of the combined analysis of all markers including indels is shown in Fig. 1 ($\ln L = -7,188.5806$). The optimal ML trees calculated from the combined chloroplast markers versus ITS ($\ln L = -3,728.5203$ and $\ln L = -3,159.2803$, respectively) are shown in Figs. 2 and 3, with bootstrap support values (BS) from MP and ML analyses. Separate clades of all 16 included *Dicranum* species were resolved in the combined tree (Fig. 1) and the plastid marker tree (Fig. 2) according to the positions of the reference specimens, except *Dicranum fuscescens* that was resolved as paraphyletic. The ITS tree (Fig. 3) was less resolved and most clades were weakly supported. The *D. leioneuron*, *D. majus*, *D.*






Fig. 2 Single optimal ML phylogenetic reconstruction inferred from chloroplast sequence data of *Dicranum* species, including indels coded by SIC. Four specimens of *Holomitrium* were used as outgroup representatives, and names in bold represent the reference samples. Numbers above branches indicate MP BS and numbers below the branch indicate ML BS, with and without indels

scottianum, and *D. spadiceum* clades received BS of $\geq 70\%$ in all three phylogenetic inferences. The *D. acutifolium*, *D. elongatum*, *D. scoparium*, and *D. tauricum* clades yielded high support in the chloroplast and combined analyses, whereas the *D. angustum*, *D. bonjeanii*, and *D. brevifolium* clades were supported ($\geq 80\%$ BS) in ITS and the combined tree. The *D. flexicaule* and *D. laevidens* clades received high bootstrap support ($\geq 78\%$) only in the combined analysis (Table 2). High support in the combined trees was furthermore obtained for the sister group relationships of *D. elongatum* + *D. fragilifolium*, *D. flexicaule* + *D. fuscescens* + *D. scottianum*, as well as *D. bonjeanii* + *D. scoparium* + *D. leioneuron* of the *D. scoparium* complex. The Svalbard specimens clustered in five clades, namely the *D. acutifolium* (5 specimens), *D. elongatum* (4), *D. laevidens* (7), *D. majus* (1), and *D. spadiceum* (13) clades (Figs. 1, 2, 3).

Clades with more than one sequence were generally weakly supported in each of the seven single partitions (Table 2). Moreover, only six clades were recovered in at least four partitions, namely the *D. leioneuron*, *D. majus*, *D. scoparium*, *D. scottianum*, *D. spadiceum*, and *D. tauricum* clades. ITS1 recovered the most clades with statistical support $\geq 70\%$ BS, whereas *trnH-psbA* recovered only the *D. elongatum* clade with strong BS (84/86 %).

Genetic distances were generally small in all markers. The ranges of intraspecific versus interspecific pairwise genetic distances overlapped for all markers, except in the combined chloroplast dataset (Table 3). Tables of all nucleotide distances measured are available on request. Furthermore, the comparison of maximum intraspecific versus minimum interspecific genetic distances (Fig. 4) showed greater intraspecific than interspecific distances for a number of pairwise comparisons in every partition (data points below the 1:1 line). Therefore, no clear barcode gap was obtained for all pairwise comparisons, i.e., none of the markers was powerful enough to discriminate all studied species.

Discussion

DNA barcoding in *Dicranum* and implications for mosses in general

All *Dicranum* species included in this study except *D. fuscescens* were distinguishable based on the combined sequence data of five chloroplast markers and nrITS, with

BS $> 70\%$ for all clades of species represented by more than one sample (Fig. 1; Table 2). However, an increased sampling of the species represented in this study by one or few specimens would be necessary to confirm their monophyly and infer intra-versus interspecific sequence variation with more confidence. The present results support our earlier study focusing on closely related species within the *D. scoparium* complex (Lang and Stech 2014), namely the close relationship between *D. bonjeanii* and *D. scoparium* and the separation of *D. majus* from the *D. scoparium* complex. In addition, *D. leioneuron*, which was not included in Lang and Stech (2014), is resolved as a member of the *D. scoparium* complex here. As the molecular clades of these species coincide with the morphological species circumscriptions, we conclude that the sequenced entities are in fact separate species. *Dicranum flexicaule* is morphologically very similar to *D. fuscescens* and frequently regarded as a variety or a form of the latter (Mönkemeyer 1927; Podpěra 1954; Savicz-Lyubitskaya and Smirnova 1970; Ireland 2007; The Plant List 2013). However, several other authors accept *D. flexicaule* as a separate yet doubtful species (Bellolio-Trucco and Ireland 1990; Hedenäs and Bisang 2004). The present molecular data support a close relationship of *D. flexicaule* with *D. fuscescens*, and in addition *D. scottianum*, but analyses of a larger number of specimens or additional markers are necessary to resolve their relationships with confidence and conclude about the taxonomic status of *D. flexicaule*.

Each individual locus provided insufficient variability to distinguish all sequenced species (Table 2; Fig. 4). The ITS region as well as the chloroplast markers *trnL-F* and *rps4-trnT* showed the highest species discrimination capacity in terms of statistical support, in accordance with previous studies (e.g., La Farge et al. 2002; Hernández-Maqueda et al. 2008; Hollingsworth et al. 2009). However, the *D. elongatum* clade was only supported by *psbA-trnH* and none of the markers delimited *D. laevidens* (Table 2). The *psbA-trnH* spacer possessed a relatively high proportion of parsimony-informative characters in *Dicranum*, as in other moss species (Liu et al. 2010; Hassel et al. 2013), although the resulting tree was still poorly resolved (cf. Table 2). Neither the combined chloroplast loci nor the generally variable ITS region could discriminate all included *Dicranum* species with confidence. A recent study of the *Racomitrium canescens* (Hedw.) Brid. complex (Stech et al. 2013), another representative of subclass Dicranidae, showed that nrITS performed better in terms of species discrimination capacity than chloroplast data. In *Dicranum*, the concatenated chloroplast markers provided clades with generally better support, which may be due to the larger number of chloroplast markers included here than in the study by Stech et al. (2013), which employed solely the *rps4-trnT-trnL* region. Few studies have so far



Fig. 3 Single optimal ML phylogenetic reconstruction inferred from ITS sequence data of *Dicranum* species, including indels coded by SIC. Four specimens of *Holomitrium* were used as outgroup representatives, and names in bold represent the reference samples. Numbers above branches indicate MP BS and numbers below the branch indicate ML BS, with and without indels. Branch lengths are to scale except those indicated by the symbol “//” (shortened 2 times)

compared the performance of ITS1 versus ITS2 alone as barcoding markers for bryophytes. ITS2 was considered as universal barcode marker for plants and animals because of conserved regions in the adjacent genes, suitable for primer design. Additionally, ITS2 had sufficient variability for identification of closely related species (Yao et al. 2010) and has proven to be conclusive for some bryophyte taxa, among them also Arctic species (Hassel et al. 2013). In contrast, other studies reported higher variation and species discrimination capacity of ITS1 in bryophytes (Liu et al. 2010; Stech et al. 2013), which was also the case in *Dicranum* (Table 2). As suggested by Stech et al. (2013), further analyses would be necessary in order to infer which part of the ITS region performs best as DNA barcode in bryophytes.

The present study is another example that a combination of several markers may be necessary to identify moss species with confidence based on molecular data. While one marker was sufficient to discriminate two closely related *Orthodontium* species (Rowntree et al. 2010), most complexes of closely related species needed several

markers to be discriminated at species level (e.g., Draper and Hedenäs 2009; Carter 2012; Medina et al. 2012). However, finding the optimal combination of barcoding markers capable of delimiting closely related species is still a major concern in bryophytes and no consensus has been reached yet (Liu et al. 2010; Stech and Quandt 2010; Hollingsworth et al. 2011). The combination of ITS1 and/or ITS2, *rps4-trnT-trnL*, and *psbA-trnH* seems to be suitable for moss genera with generally low sequence divergence such as *Dicranum* (compared, for example, with its southern Hemisphere sister genus *Dicranoloma* (Renauld) Renauld; Stech et al. 2006). Additional markers such as *rps19-rpl2* may be required for certain species. The *rpoB* gene, in contrast, does not provide any additional resolution.

Molecular versus morphological identification of *Dicranum* specimens from Svalbard

According to the molecular data, the 30 sequenced *Dicranum* specimens from Svalbard belong to five species, *D. acutifolium*, *D. elongatum*, *D. laevidens*, *D. majus*, and *D. spadiceum*. All of them are among the ten species accepted for the archipelago in the checklist by Frisvoll and Elvebakk (1996). The sequenced specimens represent most of the morphological variation in *Dicranum* in the respective sampled habitats and areas on Svalbard, and consequently, most, if not all, *Dicranum* species occurring there.

Table 2 Bootstrap values of MP and ML analysis including indels, for clades with more than one sequence

Species	<i>trnT-rps4</i>	<i>trnL-trnF</i>	<i>psbA-trnH</i>	<i>rps19-rpl2</i>	<i>rpoB</i>	ITS 1	ITS 2	CPall	ITS1	combined
<i>Dicranum acutifolium</i>	≤50	85/91						73/87	≤50	88/89
<i>Dicranum angustum</i>		83/85				72/82		67/75	81/88	96/97
<i>Dicranum bonjeanii</i>	66/66	≤50	≤50			87/94		52/53	89/90	85/79
<i>Dicranum brevifolium</i>		≤50		≤50		80/72	76/64	55/71	92/92	93/96
<i>Dicranum elongatum</i>	≤50		84/86			59/61		92/94	62/64	94/98
<i>Dicranum fragilifolium</i> + <i>D. elongatum</i>	52/49				62/71	71/65	≤50	77/76	60/62	92/89
<i>Dicranum fuscescens</i>	81/86									
<i>Dicranum flexicaule</i>	≤50	56/53				75/93	≤50	64/63		83/81
<i>Dicranum scottianum</i>	86/85	100/100	–/66		60/62	84/92	52/56	100/100	86/90	100/100
<i>D. fuscescens</i> + <i>D. flexicaule</i>	≤50		–/54		61/64		56/60			
<i>D. fuscescens</i> + <i>D. flexicaule</i> + <i>D. scottianum</i>	91/95	85/86					79/77	75/41	71/66	90/89
<i>Dicranum laevidens</i>		≤50		70/63	61/71	68/–		≤50		78/80
<i>Dicranum leioneuron</i>	57/77	53/74	–/53	≤50		55/73	62/62	100/100	83/90	100/100
<i>Dicranum majus</i>	59/87	89/94	51/65	≤50	≤50	77/60	72/67	100/99	77/81	100/100
<i>Dicranum scoparium</i>	62/70	91/88	≤50	82/85	65/63	60/70		100/100	≤50	96/99
<i>Dicranum spadiceum</i>	–/64	64/87	56/65	≤50	52/58	100/81	100/97	99/98	99/92	99/100
<i>Dicranum tauricum</i>	100/99	99/99	≤50	92/100		82/78		99/100	69/61	100/100

Values for each single markers as well as for the concatenated chloroplast markers (CPall), nrITS1–5.8S–ITS2 (ITS) and the combined sequence data (combined) are shown. Values ≥70 % BS are in bold. Dashes denote clades that were absent in the respective phylogenetic reconstruction

Table 3 Pairwise K2P distances for ITS, the combined chloroplast markers and different partitions

	<i>trnT-rps4</i>	<i>trnL-trnF</i>	<i>psbA-trnH</i>	<i>rps19-rpl2</i>	<i>rpoB</i>	ITS 1	ITS 2	ITS	CPall	Combined
Intraspecific	0–0.0091	0–0.0159	0–0.01444	0–0.0065	0–0.0045	0–0.0116	0–0.0121	0–0.0103	0–0.0118	0–0.0089
Interspecific	0–0.0279	0–0.0391	0–0.0467	0–0.0165	0–0.0177	0–0.0638	0–0.0316	0–0.0627	0.0005–0.0296	0.0015–0.0346
Overlap	0.0091	0.0159	0.0144	0.0065	0.0044	0.0116	0.0121	0.0103	0.0112	0.0073

The upper two rows indicate the ranges of intraspecific and interspecific distances for all *Dicranum* species. The last row indicates the overlap between the maximum intraspecific and minimum interspecific distances




Fig. 4 Comparison of maximum intraspecific versus minimum interspecific divergence distances for *Dicranum* species pairs with more than one specimen sequenced. Genetic distances have been

calculated using a K2P model of sequence evolution for *trnT-rps4*, *trnL-F*, *trnH-psbA*, *rps19-rpl2*, *rpoB*, all chloroplast markers combined (CPall), ITS and its partitions ITS1 and ITS2

Nonetheless, molecular analysis of an extended sampling across Svalbard would be necessary to assess whether the five other species accepted in the checklist are actually occurring on the archipelago or not, and to confirm the absence of the seven rejected species. Such an extended sampling would require extensive additional fieldwork or PCR amplification and sequencing of older herbarium material. The latter, however, seems to be difficult according to preliminary analyses (unpublished results) of collections from Edgeøya, eastern Svalbard, dating from the 1980s (cf. Hesse et al. 2012).

Dicranum species occurring in the Arctic are difficult to identify morphologically, especially in the field, but also microscopically. In few species, the diagnostic characters

seem to be stable, such as the strong costa and strongly incrassate, short and smooth upper lamina cells of *D. elongatum*, which could be recognized relatively easily. Most species present more variability in their diagnostic characters and are thus more often misidentified. For example, in temperate habitats, *Dicranum majus* is characterized by strongly falcate leaves, prosenchymatous and porose upper lamina cells, furrows on the costa and a double row of guide cells in the lower leaf. These typical characters are much less distinct in High Arctic specimens (Hedenäs et al. 2006). High Arctic specimens can therefore readily be mistaken for other species such as *D. scoparium* or *D. spadicum* (Hedenäs and Bisang 2004; personal observation). The most difficult group of species to identify

is comprised of *D. angustum*, *D. groenlandicum*, *D. laevidens*, and *D. spadiceum*. *Dicranum spadiceum* has long and narrow leaves ending in a tubular apex. Its leaf margins are slightly denticulate near the apex and the lamina cells are thin-walled and slightly porose. The basal cells are elongate, gradually becoming shorter and irregular, and lack pores, while the typical parenchymatous cells are sometimes restricted to the tip of the lamina. While *D. angustum* and *D. laevidens* are considered synonyms of *D. spadiceum* in The Plant List (2013), the former is distinguished by long, narrow, tubular and acuminate leaves as well as thin-walled and non-porose lamina cells. *Dicranum laevidens* is distinguished by an entire leaf margin as well as incrassate and porose, prosenchymatous lamina cells (Hedenäs and Bisang 2004). According to the molecular data, *D. angustum* and *D. laevidens* are clearly separated from *D. spadiceum* (Figs. 1, 2, 3), supporting their status as separate species. All respective Svalbard specimens belong to either *D. laevidens* or *D. spadiceum*, which corresponds well with the conclusions of Frisvoll and Elvebakk (1996) based on morphology that true *D. angustum* may be rare on Svalbard and further study is necessary to delimit *D. angustum* from *D. laevidens* or *D. spadiceum*. Again, additional fieldwork or molecular analysis of (old) herbarium specimens possibly representing *D. angustum* would be necessary. Species boundaries of *D. laevidens* and *D. groenlandicum* remained unclear because of their strong morphological similarities (Tuomikoski et al. 1973; Steere 1978; Nyholm 1987; Bellolio-Trucco and Ireland 1990; Hedenäs and Bisang 2004;). In the absence of sporophytes, the distinction between the two species is essentially based on the different growth form, as *D. groenlandicum* grows in very dense and *D. laevidens* in looser tufts. Both the reference specimen of *D. groenlandicum* and one Svalbard specimen (Dic_1651) formed dense cushions, but the latter belonged to *D. laevidens* according to the molecular data, whereas the reference specimen was clearly separated molecularly (Figs. 1, 2, 3). This is a first indication that the habit may not always be reliable for identifying *D. groenlandicum* and that in case no other gametophytic diagnostic characters can be found, sterile plants of *D. groenlandicum* can best be identified by DNA barcoding. Examination of supplementary material would be necessary to confirm this result.

Correct species identification is important in various fields of biodiversity assessments, ecology and conservation (Cornelissen et al. 2007; Steele and Pires 2011; Dinnage et al. 2012; Winter et al. 2012). Morphological identification of Arctic mosses requires taxonomic expertise and a combination of several stable characters. However, gametophytic characters often show deviating morphologies (Bellolio-Trucco and Ireland 1990; Hedenäs and Bisang 2004; Hesse et al. 2012). In *Dicranum* and

many other genera, sporophytic characters are useful to distinguish gametophytically similar species, e.g., *D. groenlandicum* versus *D. laevidens* and *D. fuscescens* versus *D. flexicaule*. Yet, sporophytes are rarely present in Arctic material. Therefore, species identification of Arctic plants of *Dicranum*, as well as of other complex moss species and genera, could greatly benefit from DNA barcoding. In *Dicranum*, identification can be best achieved using a combination of nuclear and plastid DNA sequences. Additional taxon sampling would, however, be necessary to better understand the relationships between morphological variability and genetic variation, solve taxonomic issues and build up a reference sequence database for molecular identification of unknown specimens by local BLAST searches in addition to molecular phylogenetic approaches.

Acknowledgments Sincere thanks are due to E. W. Kolvoort, C.B. Mennes (Naturalis Biodiversity Center/Leiden University), N. Cox and the late S. Herniman (NERC Station, Ny-Ålesund), and M. Loonen (Arctic Centre Groningen/Netherlands Arctic Station, Ny-Ålesund) for collaboration and support during fieldwork. We also thank R. Gama, N. Davin and A. Towns (Naturalis Biodiversity Center/Leiden University) for their helpful comments and English revision. Many thanks to L. Hedenäs (Stockholm) for the loans from S. Fieldwork was carried out with financial support by NWO (Grant No. ALW-NAP/851.30.027) and EU ARCFAC V (Grants No. ARCFAC-026129-2008-31 and ARCFAC-026129-2009-123).

References

- Afonina OM, Czernyadjeva IV (1995) Mosses of the Russian Arctic: check-list and bibliography. *Arctoa* 5:99–142
- Alsos IG, Elvebakk A, Gabrielsen GW (1998) Vegetation exploitation by barnacle geese *Branta leucopsis* during incubation on Svalbard. *Polar Res* 17:1–14. doi:10.1111/j.1751-8369.1998.tb00255.x
- Bell D, Long DG, Forrest AD, Hollingsworth ML, Blom HH, Hollingsworth PM (2012) DNA barcoding of European *Herbertus* (Marchantiopsida, Herbertaceae) and the discovery and description of a new species. *Mol Ecol Resour* 12:36–47. doi:10.1111/j.1755-0998.2011.03053.x
- Bellolio-Trucco G, Ireland RR (1990) A taxonomic study of the moss genus *Dicranum* (Dicranaceae) in Ontario and Quebec. *Can J Bot* 68:867–909. doi:10.1139/b90-115
- Biomatters (2010) Geneious v6.1.6. <http://www.geneious.com/>
- Buryová B, Shaw AJ (2005) Phenotypic plasticity in *Philonotis fontana* (Bryopsida: Bartramiaceae). *J Bryol* 27:13–22. doi:10.1179/174328205X40545
- Callaghan TV, Björn LO, Chernov Y, Chapin T, Christensen TR, Huntley B, Ims RA, Johansson M, Jolly D, Jonasson S, Matveyeva N, Panikov N, Oechel W, Shaver G, Elster J, Henttonen H, Laine K, Taulavuori K, Taulavuori E, Zöckler C (2004) Biodiversity, distributions and adaptations of Arctic species in the context of environmental change. *Ambio* 33:404–417. doi:10.1579/0044-7447-33.7.404
- Carter BE (2012) Species delimitation and cryptic diversity in the moss genus *Scleropodium* (Brachytheciaceae). *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 63:891–903. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2012.03.002

- CBOL Plant Working Group (2009) A DNA barcode for land plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 106:12794–12797. doi:[10.1016/j.ympev.2012.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2012.03.002)
- Cornelissen JHC, Lang SI, Soudzilovskaia NA, During HJ (2007) Comparative cryptogam ecology: a review of bryophyte and lichen traits that drive biogeochemistry. *Ann Bot* 99:987–1001. doi:[10.1093/aob/mcm030](https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcm030)
- Crosby MR, Magill RE, Allen B, He S (1999) A checklist of Mosses. Prospectus, Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis
- Dinnage R, Cadotte MW, Haddad NM, Crutsinger GM, Tilman D (2012) Diversity of plant evolutionary lineages promotes arthropod diversity. *Ecol Lett* 15:1308–1317. doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01854.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01854.x)
- Draper I, Hedenäs L (2009) Circumscription of European taxa within the *Sciuro-hypnum reflexum* complex (Brachytheciaceae, Bryophyta), based on molecular and morphological data. *Taxon* 58:572–584
- Epstein HE, Calef MP, Walker MD, Chapin FS III, Starfield AM (2004) Detecting changes in arctic tundra plant communities in response to warming over decadal time scales. *Glob Chang Biol* 10:1325–1334. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2486.2004.00810.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2004.00810.x)
- Farris JS, Källersjö M, Kluge AG, Bult C (1994) Testing significance of congruence. *Cladistics* 10:315–319
- Frisvoll A, Elvebakk A (1996) Bryophytes. In: Elvebakk A, Pestrud P (eds) A catalogue of Svalbard plants, fungi, algae and cyanobacteria. Norsk Polarinstitutt Skifter, Oslo, pp 57–172
- Gordon C, Wynn JM, Woodin SJ (2001) Impacts of increased nitrogen supply on high Arctic heath: the importance of bryophytes and phosphorus availability. *New Phytol* 149:461–471. doi:[10.1046/j.1469-8137.2001.00053.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-8137.2001.00053.x)
- Gornall JL, Jónsdóttir IS, Woodin SJ, van der Wal R (2007) Arctic mosses govern below-ground environment and ecosystem processes. *Oecologia* 153:931–941. doi:[10.1007/s00442-007-0785-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-007-0785-0)
- Hassel K, Segreto R, Ekrem T (2013) Restricted variation in plant barcoding markers limits identification in closely related bryophyte species. *Mol Ecol Resour* 13:1047–1057. doi:[10.1111/1755-0998.12074](https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12074)
- Hedenäs L, Bisang I (2004) Key to European *Dicranum* species. *Herzogia* 17:179–197
- Hedenäs L, Bisang I, Lüth M, Schnyder N (2006) Variation in *Dicranum majus* in central, western and northern Europe. *J Bryol* 28:293–298. doi:[10.1179/174328206X136296](https://doi.org/10.1179/174328206X136296)
- Hernández-Maqueda R, Quandt D, Werner O, Muñoz J (2008) Phylogeny and classification of the Grimmiaceae/Ptychomitriaceae complex (Bryophyta) inferred from cpDNA. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 46:863–877. doi:[10.1179/174328206X136296](https://doi.org/10.1179/174328206X136296)
- Hesse C, Jalink LM, Stech M, Kruijer JD (2012) Contributions to the moss flora of Edgeøya and Barentsøya, Svalbard (Norway). *Pol Bot J* 57:167–179
- Hollingsworth ML, Clark A, Forrest LL, Richardson J, Pennington RT, Long DG, Cowan R, Chase MW, Gaudeul M, Hollingsworth PM (2009) Selecting barcoding loci for plants: evaluation of seven candidate loci with species-level sampling in three divergent groups of land plants. *Mol Ecol Resour* 9:439–457. doi:[10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02439.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2008.02439.x)
- Hollingsworth PM, Graham SW, Little DP (2011) Choosing and using a plant DNA barcode. *PLoS One* 6:e19254. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0019254](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019254)
- Hudson JMG, Henry GHR (2010) High Arctic plant community resists 15 years of experimental warming. *J Ecol* 98:1035–1041. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01690.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01690.x)
- Ireland RR (2007) *Dicranum* (Family Dicranaceae). In: Zander RH (ed) Flora of North America. Oxford University Press, New York, pp 397–420
- Jasmin J-N, Rochefort L, Gauthier G (2008) Goose grazing influences the fine-scale structure of a bryophyte community in arctic wetlands. *Polar Biol* 31:1043–1049. doi:[10.1007/s00300-008-0443-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00300-008-0443-y)
- Kluge AG (1989) A concern for evidence and a phylogenetic hypothesis of relationships among *Epicrates* (Boidae, Serpentes). *Syst Zool* 38:7–25
- Konstantinova NA, Potemkin AD (1997) Liverworts of the Russian Arctic: an annotated check-list and bibliography. *Arctoa* 6:125–150
- Krab J, Cornelissen JHC, Lang SI, Logtestijn RSP (2008) Amino acid uptake among wide-ranging moss species may contribute to their strong position in higher-latitude ecosystems. *Plant Soil* 304:199–208. doi:[10.1007/s11104-008-9540-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9540-5)
- Kress WJ, Wurdack KJ, Zimmer EA, Weigt LA, Janzen DH (2005) Use of DNA barcodes to identify flowering plants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 102:8369–8374. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0503123102](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0503123102)
- La Farge C, Shaw AJ, Vitt DH (2002) The circumscription of the Dicranaceae (Bryopsida) based on the chloroplast regions *trnL* — *trnF* and *rps4*. *Syst Bot* 27:435–452. doi:[10.1043/0363-6445-27.3.435](https://doi.org/10.1043/0363-6445-27.3.435)
- Lang AS, Naciri Y (2010) New chloroplast primers for intraspecific variation in *Dicranum scoparium* Hedw. (Dicranaceae) and amplification success in other bryophyte species. *Mol Ecol Resour* 10:735–737. doi:[10.1111/j.1755-0998.2009.02821.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2009.02821.x)
- Lang AS, Stech M (2014) What's in a name? Disentangling the *Dicranum scoparium* species complex (Dicranaceae, Bryophyta). *Syst Bot* 39. doi:[10.1600/036364414X680735](https://doi.org/10.1600/036364414X680735)
- Lang SI, Cornelissen JHC, Shaver GR, Ahrens M, Callaghan TV, Molau U, Ter Braak CJF, Hölzer A, Aerts R (2012) Arctic warming on two continents has consistent negative effects on lichen diversity and mixed effects on bryophyte diversity. *Glob Chang Biol* 18:1096–1107. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02570.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02570.x)
- Liu Y, Yan H-F, Cao T, Ge X-J (2010) Evaluation of 10 plant barcodes in Bryophyta (Mosses). *J Syst Evol* 48:36–46. doi:[10.1111/j.1759-6831.2009.00063.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-6831.2009.00063.x)
- Liu Y, Cao T, Ge X-J (2011) A case study of DNA barcoding in Chinese *Grimmiaceae* and a moss recorded in China for the first time. *Taxon* 60:185–193
- Longton RE (1988) Adaptations and strategies of polar bryophytes. *Bot J Linn Soc* 98:253–268. doi:[10.1111/j.1095-8339.1988.tb02429.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8339.1988.tb02429.x)
- Longton RE (1997) The role of bryophytes and lichens in polar ecosystems. In: Woodin SJ, Marquiss M (eds) Ecology of Arctic Environments. Blackwell Science Ltd, Oxford, pp 69–96
- Medina R, Lara F, Goffinet B, Garilleti R, Mazimpaka V (2012) Integrative taxonomy successfully resolves the pseudo-cryptic complex of the disjunct epiphytic moss *Orthotrichum consimile* s. l. (Orthotrichaceae). *Taxon* 61:1180–1198
- Missouri Botanical Garden (2012) Tropicos. <http://www.tropicos.org>
- Mönkemeyer W (1927) Die Laubmoose Europas: Andreaeales-Bryales. In: Rabenhorsts DL (ed) Kryptogamen-Flora von Deutschland. Österreich und der Schweiz, Leipzig, pp 171–231
- Müller K (2004) SeqState—primer design and sequence statistics for phylogenetic DNA data sets. *Appl Bioinform* 4:65–69
- Nyholm E (1987) Fissidentaceae-Seligeriaceae. In: Nyholm E (ed) Illustrated flora of nordic mosses Fasc. 1 Nordic Bryological Society, Copenhagen and Lund, pp 47–58
- Okitsu S, Minami Y, Kanda H (1998) Relationship between plant occurrences and surface conditions on a recently deglaciated moraine at Ny-Alesund, Svalbard, Arctic Norway. *Proc NIPR Symp Polar Biol* 11:119–127
- Podpěra J (1954) *Dicranum*. In: Podpěra J (ed) Conspectus muscorum Europaeorum. Československé akademie věd, Praha, pp 141–153
- Qiu Y-L, Li L, Wang B, Chen Z, Knoop V, Groth-Malonek M, Dombrowska O, Lee J, Kent L, Rest J, Estabrook GF, Hendry

- TA, Taylor DW, Testa CM, Ambros M, Crandall-Stotler B, Duff J, Stech M, Frey W, Quandt D, Davis CC (2006) The deepest divergences in land plants inferred from phylogenomic evidence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 103:15511–15516. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0603351103](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0603351103)
- Rowntree JK, Cowan RS, Leggett M, Ramsay MM, Fay MF (2010) Which moss is which? Identification of the threatened moss *Orthodontium gracile* using molecular and morphological techniques. *Conserv Genet* 11:1033–1042. doi:[10.1007/s10592-009-9948-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10592-009-9948-3)
- Savicz-Lyubitskaya LI, Smirnova ZN (1970) The handbook of the mosses of the USSR. The Acrocarpous mosses, Academy of Science of the USSR, Leningrad
- Silvestro D, Michalak I (2012) raxmlGUI: a graphical front-end for RAxML. *Org Divers Evol* 12:335–337. doi:[10.1007/s13127-011-0056-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13127-011-0056-0)
- Simmons MP, Ochoterena H (2000) Gaps as characters in sequence-based phylogenetic analyses. *Syst Biol* 49:369–381
- Smith AJE (2004) In: Smith AJE (ed) The moss flora of Britain and Ireland, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Stamatakis (2006) RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 22:2688–2690. doi:[10.1093/bioinformatics/btl446](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl446)
- Stech M (1999) A reclassification of Dicranaceae (Bryopsida) based on non-coding cpDNA sequence data. *J Hattori Bot Lab* 86:137–159
- Stech M, Frey W (2008) A morpho-molecular classification of the mosses (Bryophyta). *Nova Hedwigia* 86:1–21. doi:[10.1127/0029-5035/2008/0086-0001](https://doi.org/10.1127/0029-5035/2008/0086-0001)
- Stech M, Quandt D (2010) 20,000 species and five key markers: the status of molecular bryophyte phylogenetics. *Phytotaxa* 9:196–228
- Stech M, Pfeiffer T, Frey W (2006) Molecular relationships and divergence of palaeoaustral *Dicranoloma* species (Dicranaceae, Bryopsida). *Studies in austral temperate rain forest bryophytes* 31. *J Hattori Bot Lab* 100:451–464
- Stech M, Kolvoort E, Loonen MJJE, Vrieling K, Kruijer JD (2011) Bryophyte DNA sequences from faeces of an arctic herbivore, barnacle goose (*Branta leucopsis*). *Mol Ecol Resour* 11:404–408. doi:[10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02938.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02938.x)
- Stech M, Veldman S, Larraín J, Muñoz J, Quandt D, Hassel K, Kruijer H (2013) Molecular species delimitation in the *Racomitrium canescens* complex (Grimmiaceae) and implications for DNA barcoding of species complexes in mosses. *PLoS One* 8:e53134. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0053134](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0053134)
- Steele PR, Pires JC (2011) Biodiversity assessment: state-of-the-art techniques in phylogenomics and species identification. *Am J Bot* 98:415–425. doi:[10.3732/ajb.1000296](https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.1000296)
- Steere WC (ed) (1978) The Mosses of Arctic Alaska. A. R. Gantner Verlag, Vaduz
- Swofford DL (2002) PAUP*: phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (*and other methods), version 4.0b10. Sinauer, Sunderland
- The Plant List (2013) Version 1.1. <http://www.theplantlist.org>
- Tuba Z, Slack NG, Stark LR (eds) (2011) Bryophyte ecology and climate change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Tubanova DY, Ignatova EA (2011) A new species of *Dicranum* (Dicranaceae, Bryophyta) from Asiatic Russia. *Arctoa* 20:183–190
- Tubanova DY, Goryunov DV, Ignatova EA, Ignatov MS (2010) On the taxonomy of *Dicranum acutifolium* and *D. fuscescens* complexes (Dicranaceae, Bryophyta) in Russia. *Arctoa* 19:151–164
- Tuomikoski R, Koponen T, Ahti T (1973) The mosses of the island of Newfoundland. *Ann Bot Fenn* 10:217–264
- van der Wal R, Brooker RW (2004) Mosses mediate grazer impacts on grass abundance in arctic ecosystems. *Funct Ecol* 18:77–86. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2435.2004.00820.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2004.00820.x)
- van der Wal R, van Lieshout SMJ, Loonen MJJE (2001) Herbivore impact on moss depth, soil temperature and arctic plant growth. *Polar Biol* 24:29–32
- von Cräutlein M, Korpelainen H, Pietiläinen M, Rikkinen J (2011) DNA barcoding: a tool for improved taxon identification and detection of species diversity. *Biodivers Conserv* 20:373–389. doi:[10.1007/s10531-010-9964-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-010-9964-0)
- Wahren C-H, Walker MD, Bret-Harte MS (2005) Vegetation responses in Alaskan arctic tundra after 8 years of a summer warming and winter snow manipulation experiment. *Glob Chang Biol* 11:537–552. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00927.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00927.x)
- Walker DA, Raynolds MK, Daniëls FJA, Einarsson E, Elvebakk A, Gould WA, Katenin AE, Kholod SS, Markon CJ, Melnikov ES, Moskalenko NG, Talbot SS, Yurtsev BA, The other members of the C.AVM Team (2005) The Circumpolar Arctic vegetation map. *J Veg Sci* 16:267. doi:[10.1111/j.1654-1103.2005.tb02365.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2005.tb02365.x)
- Winter M, Devictor V, Schweiger O (2012) Phylogenetic diversity and nature conservation: where are we? *Trends Ecol Evol* 1–6. doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.015)
- Yao H, Song J, Liu C, Luo K, Han J, Li Y, Pang X, Xu H, Zhu Y, Xiao P, Chen S (2010) Use of ITS2 region as the universal DNA barcode for plants and animals. *PLoS ONE* 5:e13102. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0013102](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013102)