



## **Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records, historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

*Original:*

Leone, A., Pucher, G.N., Ferretti, F., Sperone, E., Tripepi, S., Micarelli, P., et al. (2020). Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records, historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses. JOURNAL OF BIOGEOGRAPHY, 47(5), 1119-1129 [10.1111/jbi.13794].

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/11365/1227090> since 2023-02-27T11:22:56Z

*Published:*

DOI:10.1111/jbi.13794

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license.

For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*Publisher copyright*

Wiley (Post-print)

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article which has been published in final form at (see DOI above).

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

(Article begins on next page)

## Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records, historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses

Journal:	<i>Journal of Biogeography</i>
Manuscript ID	JB1-19-0030.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Leone, Agostino; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Laboratory of Genetics &amp; Genomics of Marine Resources and Environment (GenoDREAM); Dipartimento di Scienze Biologiche, Geologiche e Ambientali (BiGeA)</p> <p>Puncher, Gregory; University of New Brunswick, Department of Biological Sciences, Canadian Rivers Institute; Maurice-Lamontagne Institute, Fisheries and Oceans Canada</p> <p>Ferretti, Francesco; Stanford University, Hopkins Marine Station, Department of Biology</p> <p>Sperone, Emilio; Università degli Studi della Calabria, Dipartimento di Biologia, Ecologia e Scienze della Terra (DiBEST)</p> <p>Tripepi, Sandro; Università degli Studi della Calabria, Dipartimento di Biologia, Ecologia e Scienze della Terra (DiBEST)</p> <p>Micarelli, Primo; Aquarium Mondo Marino, Sharks Studies Center (C.S.S.)</p> <p>Gambarelli, Andrea; Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Museo di Zoologia e Anatomia Comparata</p> <p>Sarà, Maurizio; Università degli Studi di Palermo, Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Biologiche Chimiche e Farmaceutiche (STEBICEF)</p> <p>Arculeo, Marco; Università degli Studi di Palermo, Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Biologiche Chimiche e Farmaceutiche (STEBICEF)</p> <p>Doria, Giuliano; Museo civico di storia naturale Giacomo Doria, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale "Giacomo Doria"</p> <p>Garibaldi, Fulvio; Università degli Studi di Genova, Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, dell'Ambiente e della Vita (DISTAV)</p> <p>Bressi, Nicola; Museo Civico di storia naturale, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Trieste</p> <p>Dall'Asta, Andrea; Museo Civico di storia naturale, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Trieste</p> <p>Minelli, Daniela; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Museo di Anatomia Comparata</p> <p>Cilli, Elisabetta; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Dipartimento di Beni Culturali</p> <p>Vanni, Stefano; Università degli Studi di Firenze, Museo di Storia Naturale "La Specola" Sez. Zoologia</p> <p>Serena, Fabrizio; Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto per le Risorse e le Biotecnologie Marine (IRBIM)</p> <p>Díaz-Jaimes, Píndaro; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	<p>Laboratorio de Genética de Organismos Acuáticos Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y Limnología  Baele, Guy; Rega Institute, KU Leuven, Department of Microbiology and Immunology  Cariani, Alessia; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Laboratory of Genetics &amp; Genomics of Marine Resources and Environment (GenoDREAM);  Dipartimento di Scienze Biologiche, Geologiche e Ambientali (BiGeA)  Tinti, Fausto; Università degli Studi di Bologna, Laboratory of Genetics &amp; Genomics of Marine Resources and Environment (GenoDREAM);  Dipartimento di Scienze Biologiche, Geologiche e Ambientali (BiGeA)</p>
Key Words:	Great White Shark, Mediterranean, historical DNA, divergence time, phylogeography, <i>Carcharodon carcharias</i>



1  
2  
3 **Responses to Editor and Reviewers in Bold**  
4

5 Dear Dr. Leone,  
6

7 Reference Number: JBI-19-0030  
8

9  
10 Title: Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records,  
11 historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses  
12

13 We have designated this paper as requiring Full Revision, indicating that significant concerns have been  
14 raised about the paper in the review process but that we are keeping the paper centre open for the  
15 submission of a revised version. Resubmitted versions of papers classified under this heading are normally  
16 sent out for a second round of peer review prior to an editorial decision being made. There is no certainty  
17 of eventual acceptance.  
18  
19

20 This email provides: (1) specific comments from the chief editor and from the handling editor, (2) any  
21 referee reports.  
22

23  
24 To upload a revised manuscript: Go into your author centre and click on "Manuscripts with decisions". You  
25 will then see a link allowing you to upload your revision to the correct number.  
26

27  
28 A copy of this letter is also available in your Corresponding Author Centre  
29 at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jbi>  
30

31 Thank you again for submitting to the 'Journal of Biogeography'. We look forward to receiving the revised  
32 version of your paper, ideally within 60 days. You can contact the editorial office if you would like an  
33 extension.  
34

35  
36 With best wishes,  
37

38 Peter Linder  
39

40 Chief Editor, Journal of Biogeography  
41  
42 -----  
43

44  
45 FURTHER COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EDITOR  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 -----  
52

53 EDITOR'S COMMENTS TO AUTHOR  
54

55 Editor: Gaither, Michelle  
56

57 Comments to the Author:  
58

59 This is a well written and interesting paper and both reviewers agree that this is an interesting contribution  
60 to the field. However both also raised important questions about the fossil data used here. These  
independent reviewers raised similar concerns about the use of GWS records from the Paleobiology

1  
2  
3 Database....  
4

5 One reviewed said  
6 the authors need to be cautious "and use recent literature rather than data from PaleoDB that suffer from  
7 outdated taxonomic assignments"  
8  
9

10 We hope that authors will carefully consider the detailed comments by reviewers before resubmission.  
11

12  
13 Dr. Michelle Gaither  
14

15  
16 **Dear Dr. Gaither,**

17 **First of all, we would like to thank you for finding our study interesting and worth reviewing, and for**  
18 **granting us the extension of the re-submission. We really appreciated that.**  
19

20 **We are glad that our work was found very interesting by both reviewers, and we have improved the**  
21 **manuscript; which we hope you will find suitable for publication on the Journal of Biogeography. We**  
22 **have found the comments useful and have considered all of them in our revision. We have marked our**  
23 **modifications to the manuscript in word track changes mode and detail below our responses to each of**  
24 **the comments raised.**  
25

26 **Specifically, we have integrated more recent literature about fossil history of the species, and we've**  
27 **faced the problems with the PaleoDB database, further investigating the literature on fossil occurrences**  
28 **of the species. Furthermore, we have integrated some new divergence time analyses with alternative**  
29 **calibration priors (estimated divergence between the target species and an outgroup, inferred using**  
30 **molecular data and molecular clock calibration, rather than using fossil records only), trying to clarify any**  
31 **doubts about the reliability of our study, and showing that our work is solid.**  
32  
33

34 **Yours sincerely,**

35  
36 **Agostino Leone**

37 **On behalf of all the other authors**  
38

39 -----  
40 REVIEWER COMMENTS TO AUTHOR  
41

42  
43 Referee: 1  
44

45 Comments to the Author

46 In this paper, the authors propose that the Mediterranean (MED) population of great white sharks (GWS)  
47 originated in the Pacific Ocean based on multiple lines of evidence. I really enjoyed reading this well-  
48 written paper and found the results very interesting and though provoking. I applaud the great amount of  
49 data analysed and the fact the authors have considered different types of approaches (paleontological,  
50 historical, molecular). They also provide a very complete list of references which shows a good  
51 understanding of the literature on the different approaches used. The two main strengths of this paper, in  
52 my opinion, are the findings that the MED population originated in the Pacific, and not in the Atlantic and  
53 the interpretations on local extinctions. Nevertheless, I consider that this work, which I think has great  
54 potential, has a number of problems that should be addressed before its publication. Below I describe three  
55 main issues, and then I provide a line by line list.  
56  
57  
58

59 **We thank the reviewer for reviewing our manuscript and are glad of their overall interest and**  
60 **suggestions. We detail a point by point response below.**

1  
2  
3 Main issues:  
4

5 The fossil record of the GWS, and its origin: This paper needs a stronger support on the origin of the GWS,  
6 and therefore, it begs for a more detailed analyses of its fossil record. The authors use the Paleobiology  
7 Database (herein, PBDB) to assess the fossil record of this species, but they don't seem to have filtered the  
8 data using solid criteria (other than just the species name). It has been proposed that the earliest  
9 occurrence of this species is late Miocene (Ehret et al. 2012) and not middle Miocene as stated here.  
10 However, I don't think that the global fossil record of the GWS has ever been assessed. For instance, as  
11 shown in Table S4, there are records from as early as the early Miocene. Evaluating the global fossil record  
12 of the GWS may seem like a lot of work, but there aren't that many records in the PBDB (< 60) so it should  
13 not be so difficult considering the number of co-authors involved. I personally may have some of the  
14 references that would need to be evaluated (see detailed comments below) and would be happy to share  
15 the PDFs with the authors (through the editor, perhaps?), if accessibility is an issue. This should also be  
16 complemented by the addition of records that are not in the PBDB already, such as the various references  
17 cited in the paper on the MED Pliocene occurrences. Since the hypotheses here proposed are largely based  
18 on the fossil record, I consider critical to address this issue.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 **We thank the reviewer for offering the access to references. We strongly hope we've mentioned these**  
24 **references in the new version of the manuscript. A deeper scan of the available literature and related**  
25 **fossil records has been made in order to have all the available information on the origin of the species**  
26 **(See SI). However, we would like to point out that the origination time of the species is above the scope**  
27 **of this work, which is focused on the origin of the Mediterranean population using all the information**  
28 **available. The data from PaleoDB were filtered using the species name, the synonymous names, and all**  
29 **the records were subsequently checked and evaluated through literature. We have modified the**  
30 **statement in L143-150, in order to be clearer about that. The map where modified in order to remove**  
31 **dubious occurrences. We are aware that the origin of the species is a still-open debate in the scientific**  
32 **community. The earliest fossil attributed to the species is dated at 16 Mya from Calvert Formation,**  
33 **Maryland ( National Museum of Natural History USNM 336204), but overall, following the literature, it is**  
34 **stated that the origin of the species is dated back to about 11 Mya, in the late Miocene (see also Chapter**  
35 **4 of A. P. Klimley & D. G. Ainley (Eds.), Great white sharks: the biology of *Carcharodon carcharias* (pp. 19-**  
36 **36). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.). We have integrated some new divergence time analysis using a**  
37 **normal distributed prior for the first calibration point with mean at 11 Mya. Parallely, we have done also**  
38 **a divergence time analysis using the estimated divergence between the *Carcharodon carcharias* and the**  
39 ***Lamna nasus* as first calibration point, rather than using a fossil calibration for the origin of the species.**  
40 **The outcomes were attached to the manuscript, showing no differences in the results on which we have**  
41 **built our discussion. At the moment, not all the records from the Mediterranean were included in the**  
42 **PaleoDB database. Our work aim is to reveal the origin of the Mediterranean population of GWS using all**  
43 **the information available, without detracting from the fact that the records can be submitted in the near**  
44 **future in PaleoDB database, even in the context of a new work dedicated to the fossil history of the**  
45 **species.**  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Calibration point and the Isthmus of Panama: It has been proposed that the Isthmus of Panama formed  
51 much earlier than here used. I think the authors need to discuss how an earlier formation of the isthmus of  
52 Panama would affect their results. Also, I encourage the authors to consider the intermittent shallow  
53 connections that could have allowed migrations of sharks across the isthmus, even if there was indeed an  
54 earlier closure (references provided under L240; but also see Pimiento et al. 2013. Journal of Paleontology  
55 87: 755–774).  
56  
57

58  
59 **We thank the reviewer for the interesting point raised out. We would like to remark that the formation**  
60 **of the Isthmus of Panama has not been used as calibration point for our work, which rely on different**  
**calibrations from those used in Gubili, et al. 2010. We were aware of this discussion about a potential**

1  
2  
3 **earlier formation of the Isthmus of Panama, and we have discussed a possible effect of an earlier**  
4 **formation of the Isthmus of Panama (L357-364).**  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 The statements on local extinctions lack of support: What were the potential mechanisms of those  
10 extinctions and in what basis do the authors suggest that there were extinctions at all? Keep in mind when  
11 addressing this that absence of fossils does not necessarily mean that the species went extinct, especially at  
12 a regional level. If this is based on the molecular-level analyses, then it needs to be better explained.  
13  
14

15 **As explained in the manuscript, line 268-281, the analysis of RASP suggested that the population of the**  
16 **MED could be the result of a vicariance event. This fact, combined with the lack of an Atlantic lineage**  
17 **well structure, and a combined lineage NWA/SA, suggest the the NWA population represent a relatively**  
18 **young population which may have colonized the NWA from few South African individuals. The lack of a**  
19 **continuum NEP-NWA-MED, with the MED genetically similar to NEP, may indicate that the past GWS**  
20 **present in the NWA went through a local extinction or extirpation, leaving a phylogeographic gap filled**  
21 **subsequently by the SA lineage. Our discussion rely exclusively from these molecular analysis, since we**  
22 **are aware that the lack of fossils does not necessarily mean that the species went extinct in that specific**  
23 **area.**  
24  
25

26  
27 Line by line comments:

28  
29 Background:

30 L74: Appropriate global reference: Myers et al (2007) Science 315, 1846-1850.  
31

32 **The reference has been integrated**  
33  
34

35 L83: Missing reference on long distances: Domeier, M.L. & Nasby-Lucas, N. (2008) Marine Ecology: Progress  
36 Series, 370, 221–237.  
37

38 **The missed reference has been integrated**  
39  
40

41 L125: The use of private collections represent a problem in terms of reproducibility. I am not sure what to  
42 recommend to do about this, as I understand how they can be essential, but they are often disregarded in  
43 the literature.  
44

45 **The private collection mentioned here are the samples LICC01LI, FACC01TI, FACC02TI, FACC03TI,**  
46 **FACC04TI, FACC05TI, from a private archive at the Regional Agency for the Protection of the**  
47 **Environnement of Tuscany (ARPAT Livorno) the first, and from the tuna trap fishermen of Favignana the**  
48 **rest. The samples could be available under request, and some of these were used in past works (Gubili, et**  
49 **al. 2010). However, we think that given the difficulty of sampling the species in the Mediterranean area,**  
50 **it's essential to collect as many samples as possible with sufficient information on place and date of**  
51 **capture.**  
52  
53

54 General: Through the paper, it is bit hard to grasp the aims of the different methodologies. It would  
55 therefore be useful to explain, perhaps in the last paragraph of the background, in a logical order, how the  
56 different types of data and approaches are answering the research questions (e.g., with fossils we aim to  
57 know x, with historical collections we aim to answer y, etc.).  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 **Since the bibliographic research for fossil occurrences of the species have strengthened the results from**  
4 **molecular data, suggesting also good discussions and interpretations, we have modified the last**  
5 **paragraph of the background to “A deep evolutionary analysis of the newly generated Mediterranean**  
6 **sequences aligned with those from global GWS populations available in public repositories, and the scan**  
7 **of the fossil records occurrences in literature, with special emphasis on the Mediterranean area ,**  
8 **provided an opportunity to better unravel the origin of the GWS Mediterranean population.”. We**  
9 **strongly hope it is clearer now.**  
10

11  
12  
13 Methods:

14 L143: Specify what the filtering criteria was. Only the use of the species name? That would not be enough.  
15 The PBDB is great in that it presents all records of a species, but it has to be used carefully because some  
16 records are simply unreliable, i.e., some specimens are misidentified, or the age of some localities have  
17 been changed or refined. Unreliable records are still “correct” in the sense that they represent a record, but  
18 should not be included in the analyses. For an idea on how to filter the data you could see Pimiento and  
19 Clements (cited in the ms.), but basically, you would have to go to the primary reference that supports the  
20 PBDB occurrence and check if its accurate. As stated above, I may be able to help providing some PDFs (but  
21 would have to check).  
22

23 **The filtering criteria were the species name and relative synonyms. The Genus spp. records were**  
24 **discarded due to the doubts of wrong taxonomic assignments. Additionally, the related references**  
25 **associated to dubious fossil dating were checked for accuracy of species and dating assignment. The**  
26 **dubious records were then discarded. Additionally, a deep bibliographic research has been carried out, as**  
27 **mentioned above. All the info are attached in the SI.**  
28  
29

30  
31 L145: How was the bibliographic search made? Was it exhausted and comprehensive? What means were  
32 used (e.g., Google Scholar)? Were those papers added to the PBDB? Also, I am not sure if the map can be  
33 regarded as an analysis, and if the map is in fact an stratigraphic map.  
34  
35

36 **We went through a deep and exhausted bibliographic research using public repository (NCBI, Scholar,**  
37 **PaleoDB, ecc.) and for each work, the references we subsequently consulted. Some papers were still not**  
38 **added to PaleoDB, since our aim was to retrieve as much information as possible on the stratigraphic**  
39 **distribution of the species and information regarding key fossils for our study (e.g. from the**  
40 **Mediterranean area), and the map summarize these information as well as graphically showing the**  
41 **events that affected the species during the formation of the different populations we know today.**  
42

43 L151: Why do you want to verify the constant rate of substitution, and the lack of a saturation effect?  
44 Please explain the aim of your methods (see above).  
45

46 **We agree with the reviewer that these analysis did not add anything more to the manuscript, and were**  
47 **removed. Also taking in mind that we did a parallel analysis using an outgroup. So, a relaxed clock was**  
48 **the best choice (also taking into account the big divergence between the two main lineages, MED-NEP-**  
49 **AUS vs SA-NWA).**  
50

51  
52 General: The paper would benefit from a abbreviation sections as there are a lot throughout, some of them  
53 are not spelled out (e.g., CAS in L337).  
54  
55

56 **The Central American Seaway has been spelled at L 254 of the revised manuscript, as well as all the**  
57 **acronyms. We think it is not necessary to add an abbreviation section, also due to problem with words**  
58 **limit.**  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Results:

5 L240-241: There has been some solid evidence that the isthmus of Panama formed much earlier (Farris et  
6 al. 2011. *Geology*, 39:1007–1010; Montes et al. 2012. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117:B0410; Montes  
7 et al. 2012. *Geological Society of America*  
8 *Bulletin*, 124:780–799; also see Jaramillo et al. 2017 [comments on O’Dea et al. 2016] in *Science Advances*  
9 3: e1602321).

11 **A potential earlier formation of the Isthmus of Panama (Bacon et al., 2015; Lessions et al., 2015; Montes**  
12 **et al., 2015; O’Dea et al., 2016; Jaramillo et al., 2017) would not affect our results, since it is plausible that**  
13 **the Pacific lineage that gave rise to the MED population may already have been present in the Atlantic**  
14 **before and after the closure of the CAS and before its potential local extinction in the Atlantic. Also, past**  
15 **intermittent shallow connections are plausible and discussed in literature (Jaramillo et al., 2017).**

16 L244-245: Why middle Miocene if Table S4 shows early Miocene occurrences? Also, consider that the  
17 oldest fossil of a species does not necessarily represent the time of origin because species can originate  
18 before they leave a record. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that the evolutionary history of the GWS dates  
19 to middle Miocene (or early Miocene in agreement with Table S4). I looked at one of the references  
20 supporting an early Miocene occurrence in the PBDB (collection number 42842) and it is based on a list of  
21 species, so it cannot be confirmed that that record was actually a GWS (there is also a note next to the  
22 species list in such collection warning cautious about that record).

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 L245-246: The earliest occurrence in the MED is based on Table S4? If is, it is not possible to track it there as  
28 no locality/region is provided. It is fundamental here to provide more details/references on what is the  
29 earliest occurrence of the GWS in the MED.

30  
31  
32 **As explained in the manuscript, line xxx, the earliest occurrence in the MED, is the early Pliocene of South**  
33 **of Spain (see blabla), but it lack a defined dating. For the dating, we’ve used the fossil occurrences**  
34 **described and dated by xxx at around 3 Mya. There are also some Miocene records from the MED**  
35 **according to the work of XXx, but there is no consensus on the correct dating for these fossils (see XXX),**  
36 **and also, hypothetical Miocene individuals from the area would have faced local extinction due to the**  
37 **Messinian Salinity Crisis.**

38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Discussion:

43 L275: I am not sure “evolutionary pathway” is the right term here. Also, what is the biological or ecological  
44 implication of the Messinian salinity crisis? It is only mentioned, but no mechanisms are suggested.

45  
46 **We think that “evolutionary pathway” fit well here, since we are highlighting intraspecies evolutionary**  
47 **processes mediated by historical dispersion, vicariance, ecc. We have included a statement on the**  
48 **biological and ecological implication of the Messinian Salinity Crisis. “entering the Mediterranean after**  
49 **the Messinian salinity crisis, which may have caused the local extinction of the marine megafauna due to**  
50 **the total or partial drying up of the Mediterranean with related ecological upheavals”. L289-291.**

51  
52  
53  
54 L327: I can only see 4 records in the PBDB, 1 from Spain and 3 from Italy. If by abundant data the authors  
55 refer to are based on the references provided, are those included in the list of fossils? (I personally think  
56 should be added to the PBDB) and are they included in the map?

57  
58 **Actually, we have found several Mediterranean fossils of GWS, listed in the SI. In the PaleoDB and in the**  
59 **map, only the PaleoDB records are shown. A deeper analysis of the original location of these fossils is**  
60 **needed before the submission to PaleoDB (which is above the scope of this work).**

1  
2  
3  
4 L328: What do you mean by “origin of those specimens”? It seems to me that those are the dates of the  
5 fossils, so it is not necessarily the origin.  
6  
7

8 **We agree with the reviewer. The statement was modified removing “origin of”**  
9

10 L332: How do you know it was gradual? See Pimiento et al. 2016. Journal of Biogeography 43(8): 1645–  
11 1655.  
12

13 **We thank the reviewer for the missed reference. We removed the statement “gradually” from the line**  
14  
15

16 L356-362: Intriguing statement. It was proposed that the Pliocene marine megafauna extinction was  
17 related with sea level changes and consequent habitat loss. In this global event, which was studied at the  
18 genus level, the GWS was not affected. How does this fit with your hypothesis of a local extinction of great  
19 white shark populations in the MED?  
20  
21

22 **As explained in the statement, we don't think that the Mediterranean population of GWS has been**  
23 **affected by local extinction in the Pliocene. A Pliocene local extinction of the Pacific-derived GWS lineage**  
24 **in the North Atlantic Ocean and further replacement by Indian components, and the subsequent**  
25 **persistence of a Pacific-derived GWS in the Mediterranean, could explain such phylogeographic**  
26 **discontinuity. we have argued that a possible Mediterranean population settled before the Messinian**  
27 **Crisis of Salinity has gone extinct, but following suggestions from the reviewer 2 we removed this**  
28 **statement, since the presence of GWS in the Mediterranean Miocene is dubious, and it is irrelevant for**  
29 **our hypothesis.**  
30  
31

32 Supplement material:

33 Table S4: I was not able to retrieve records using PaleoDB N° column. Those numbers do not correspond to  
34 PaleoDB collection numbers. So what are they? Provide more info, collection number is crucial, but also,  
35 country and or locality.  
36  
37

38 **We thank the reviewer for pointing it out. We have replaced the column with the correct reference**  
39 **codes. All the necessary info were showed in the table. Contry and locality are implicit in the coordinates,**  
40 **since PaleoDB does not include country in the downloadable spreadsheet.**  
41  
42

43 Referee: 2  
44

45 Comments to the Author

46 Dear authors:  
47  
48

49 This study is well conceived and the manuscript is well and clearly written. There are only some minor  
50 corrections I'd like to ask you to consider. But there are also some inaccuracies concerning your usage of  
51 fossils, which might change your interpretations and discussion to some extend. Please consider the  
52 comments below.  
53  
54

55 **We thank the reviewer for finding our study interesting and worth reviewing, and we found the**  
56 **comments and suggestions very useful. We detail a point by point response below.**  
57  
58

59 Line 152: You consider that the substitution rate is constant and that you are intending to verify it. This  
60

1  
2  
3 seems odd since substitution rates normally are considered not to be constant. Could you please include a  
4 short reference or support why you consider it constant?  
5  
6  
7

8 **We reconsidered this analyses using a relaxed clock for substitution rate, allowing for rate changes across**  
9 **branches, differently from past published work on the species, which used the constant rate. Using the**  
10 **relaxed clock we were also able to to a divergence time using the estimated divergence between the**  
11 **GWS and the outgroup.**  
12  
13

14 Line 173: You are using the fossil shark described by Gottfried & Fordyce as oldest record of *Carcharodon*.  
15 This specimen is from the Oligocene. However, Gottfried is a proponent of traditional usage of taxonomic  
16 names and the assignment of this species to *Carcharodon* is considered not valid any more. The history of  
17 the taxonomic assignment of the species “megalodon”, “angustidens”, and auriculatus as several other  
18 megatooth lamniforms has been debated over decades. There is no common agreement that we are  
19 dealing with different clades, such as *Otodus*, *Carcharocles*, *Megaselachus*, *Carcharodon*, *Carcharomodus*,  
20 etc. The genus *Carcharodon* can only be traced back into the late Miocene, but normally it is a Pliocene  
21 species. The late Miocene occurrences are in South America - see Cione et al. (2012): Oldest record of the  
22 Great White Shark (Lamnidae, *Carcharodon*; Miocene) in the Southern Atlantic; Adnet et al. (2009): New  
23 fossil teeth of the White Shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) from the Early Pliocene of Spain. Implication for its  
24 paleoecology in the Mediterranean; Cappetta (2012: Handbook of Palaeoichthyology. Especially the paper  
25 by Adnet might be useful for the discussion about the origin of *Carcharodon carcharias*. The Handbook  
26 summarizes our current knowledge about the systematics of the megatooth lamniform sharks.  
27  
28  
29

30 **In the mentioned Gottfried & Fordyce paper, there is an interesting paragraph on the origination time of**  
31 ***C.carcharias* with the description of a 16 My dated fossil, already described in past work (we additionally**  
32 **added the older reference), and we are referring just on that, and not on the *C.angustidens*. However we**  
33 **decided to use a more conservative calibration (11Ma) due to the fierce debate around the oldest fossil**  
34 **records of GWS. The line has been modified accordingly.**  
35

36 **The work by Adnet et al. is extremely useful in terms of colonization of the MED by GWS, and we have**  
37 **considered all the info discussed in that work. We also proposed a new analysis taking into account the**  
38 **estimated divergence between the GWS and the *L.nasus* (see results and SI). Our hypothesis is still**  
39 **strongly supported by the results of the new analysis.**  
40

41 The discussion needs to be revised in the light of this information. I also would suggest to not use the  
42 Miocene records from PaleoDB, because this information is very outdated because of wrong taxonomic  
43 identifications and/or wrong stratigraphic placement. This is a general problem with this database. Rather  
44 refer to papers of specialists.  
45

46 **The reference records were deeply scanned for corrected species assignment to our target species, and**  
47 **the outdated records were removed. Also, we have considered the stratigraphic samples from middle**  
48 **Miocene, since we think they could add interesting information to discuss, and in any case, they don't**  
49 **affect our hypothesis since we tested it also considering different calibration priors (see divergence from**  
50 **outgroup in the results, as discussed above).**  
51  
52

53 Line 176: The paper of Cigala-Fulgosi reports on indirect evidence, but not on an actual record. These  
54 traces also could have be caused by some other large sharks with serrated tooth crowns such as snaggle  
55 tooth or tiger sharks that were very large during the Miocene and also Pliocene. Rather use information  
56 from the paper of Adnet et al. or similar publications.  
57

58 **This dating is justified by well dated *C.carcharias* fossil records associated with cetaceans remains from**  
59 **the Pliocene. We have integrated the references with the right work. Also the paper from Adnet et al.**  
60 **has been taken into consideration, but it lacks precise dates that can be considered in divergence time**

1  
2  
3 **analysis, even if it is extremely useful in terms of discussion (They mention just the Pliocene epoch).**

4  
5 Line 200: Shouldn't it be "A MCC estimated" rather than "An MCC estimated)?

6  
7 **Corrected**

8  
9 Line 243: The statement that divergence between Mediterranean and Pacific GWS coincides with the  
10 closure of the Isthmus seems odd, because one would expect that this event separated the Pacific from  
11 Caribbean/Atlantic populations. Mediterranean GWS populations are quite far away. But Atlantic  
12 populations seemingly are different? How can this be explained. Especially if the oldest record comes from  
13 the south Aouth American Atlantic coast? The records of Carcharodon from the late Miocene of Chile are  
14 actually Pliocene in age and the remains from Sacao might represent a different species. There was also a  
15 record of a new species from the late Miocene of Chile but the stratigraphic age seems also ambiguous.

16  
17  
18 **As explained in the manuscript, the closure of the CAS separated the Pacific populations from the Pacific-**  
19 **derived Atlantic and, consequently, Mediterranean populations. The local extinction of the Pacific-**  
20 **derived Atlantic population, allowing a more recent colonization of the North Atlantic by South African**  
21 **individuals, may explain the phylogeographic gap observed. We strongly think that any other**  
22 **phylogeographic pattern/hypothesis should have left a SA/NWA genetic signal in the MED population.**  
23 **We found unlikely the phylogeographic route proposed by past works, with single Pacific individuals**  
24 **crossing the entire Indian Ocean, then the Atlantic and finally the Mediterranean Sea without leaving a**  
25 **phylogeographic signal. Also, the Statistical Dispersal-Vicariance Analysis (S-DIVA), and the Dispersal-**  
26 **Extinction-Cladogenesis (DEC) analysis, suggest such vicariance hypothesis. Also, a local extinction in the**  
27 **Atlantic may have erased any local genetic signal, regardless of the fossil records, which, however, don't**  
28 **refute our hypothesis, especially concerning the Mediterranean.**

29  
30  
31  
32 In Line 320, you actually refer to the divergence of Pacific and Atlantic populations 3.5 Ma. Does this mean  
33 that you consider Atlantic and Mediterranean populations to be the synonymous?

34  
35  
36 **Here we are referring to the method used by Gubili et al. to estimate the substitution rate of the species.**  
37 **As extensively discussed in the manuscript, we don't consider the contemporary Atlantic and**  
38 **Mediterranean populations to be synonymous.**

39  
40  
41 Line 246: Your notion that the GWS extends back into the late Miocene in the Mediterranean area is  
42 wrong! The oldest records are from the Pliocene, well after the salinity crisis. This fossil record would  
43 support your interpretation that the GWS migrated into the Mediterranean Sea after the Messinian crisis.  
44 Otherwise, you have to consider that the GWS was in the Mediterranean Sea before the crisis, became  
45 extinct and was replaced in the Pliocene by a new, different population. In this scenario, one could argue  
46 that the GWS migrated into the Mediterranean Sea during the Miocene via the open gate towards the  
47 Indian Pacific and after it was closed (in the Pliocene), GWS migrated into the Mediterranean Sea through  
48 the Gibraltar strait.

49  
50  
51  
52 **The presence of GWS in the Miocene of Mediterranean is still an open debate. Marsili (2006) has been**  
53 **able to catalog fossils from the Miocene of the area (Marsili, 2008), discussing how these fossils became**  
54 **much more common in the Pliocene. It seems that these fossils are problematic and to be re-date to**  
55 **Pliocene. In this case we agree with the reviewer in removing this confusing statement, since this is not**  
56 **the scope of our work, and more detailed paleontological analyses are needed to clarify the presence or**  
57 **not of the GWS in the Miocene of the MED.**

58  
59  
60 Line 251: How do your estimates of divergences change when you exchange the incorrectly assigned fossil

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

records with correctly identified records? As I wrote above, don't rely to much on PaleoDB but make a through literature review using recent papers!

**There are no different results that invalidate our hypothesis, also using different calibration points (see results). The calibration points were extrapolated from literature.**

Discussion section: You have to reconsider your discussion in the framework of correctly used fossil records. This might change some of your interpretations.

**We went through all the manuscript in the framework of the points suggested by the reviewers, and the interpretations are still solids.**

Line 277: Is your interpretation still correct if the oldest fossil record of GWS is from the late Miocene of Argentina and not from Australia (the species "auriculatus" belongs to the genus Carcharocles)?

**Yes, the interpretations are still correct. We also kept in mind that the oldest fossil record from Paraná Formation in Argentina (Cione et al. 2012. Oldest record of the Great White Shark (Lamnidae, Carcharodon; Miocene) in the Southern Atlantic. Geobios, 45(2):167-172. doi: 10.1016/j.geobios.2011.06.002), could be a different species, as stated by the authors.**

Line 288: The low estimated genetic diversity correlates well with the assumption that GWS colonized the Mediterranean Sea during the Pliocene and might have underwent a bottleneck then in relation to climatic changes during the Pliocene and Pleistocene. You should include a short discussion of climatic changes in the Mediterranean Sea during the Pliocene and Pleistocene in relation to your genetic findings.

**We think it is well discussed, and a deeper analysis of the climate change in the paleo-Mediterranean and its effect on the genetic variation of the species (also more than our target species) need a dedicated work**

Lines 345 following. Does this mean that the Mediterranean population diverged from Atlantic populations at 2.93 Ma? And does this date really correlate with oceanographic phenomena? This needs to be more elaborated because it is confusing and even contradictory as it stands momentarily.

**We have retested the divergence time, which is now 3.23. That timing was an error. However, no. This divergence indicate that the Mediterranean population diverged from the common ancestors within the Pacific populations at 3.23 Mya.**

Overall: There might be minor changes by adjusting oldest verified records of GWS but your data, especially concerning the colonization of the Mediterranean Basin by GWS is in good accordance with the fossil record.

**We are glad of this, and the dubious oldest records were checked and eventually removed. For the divergence time analysis, we used only solid records.**

Kind regards,  
Jürgen Kriwet

1  
2  
3 1 **Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records,**  
4 **historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses**  
5 2  
6 3

7 4 Agostino Leone<sup>1,π,\*</sup>, Gregory Neils Puncher<sup>2,3</sup>, Francesco Ferretti<sup>4</sup>, Emilio Sperone<sup>5</sup>, Sandro Tripepi<sup>5</sup>,  
8 5 Primo Micarelli<sup>6</sup>, Andrea Gambarelli<sup>7</sup>, Maurizio Sarà<sup>8</sup>, Marco Arculeo<sup>8</sup>, Giuliano Doria<sup>9</sup>, Fulvio  
9 6 Garibaldi<sup>10</sup>, Nicola Bressi<sup>11</sup>, Andrea Dall'Asta<sup>11</sup>, Daniela Minelli<sup>12</sup>, Elisabetta Cilli<sup>13</sup>, Stefano  
10 7 Vanni<sup>14</sup>, Fabrizio Serena<sup>15</sup>, Píndaro Díaz-Jaimes<sup>16</sup>, Guy Baele<sup>17</sup>, Alessia Cariani<sup>1</sup>, Fausto Tinti<sup>1</sup>

11 8 <sup>1</sup>Dept. Biological, Geological & Environmental Sciences (BiGeA), Laboratory of Genetics &  
12 9 Genomics of Marine Resources and Environment (GenoDREAM), University of Bologna, 48123,  
13 10 Ravenna, Italy

14 11 <sup>2</sup>Dept Biological Sciences, Canadian Rivers Institute, University of New Brunswick, Saint John,  
15 12 NB, E2L 4L5, Canada

16 13 <sup>3</sup>Genomics Laboratory, Maurice-Lamontagne Institute, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Mont-Joli,  
17 14 QC, G5H 3Z4, Canada

18 15 <sup>4</sup>Hopkins Marine Station, Department of Biology, Stanford University, 120 Oceanview Boulevard,  
19 16 Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA

20 17 <sup>5</sup>DiBEST Department of Biology, Ecology and Earth Science, University of Calabria, 87036,  
21 18 Arcavacata di Rende, Italy

22 19 <sup>6</sup> Sharks Studies Center (C.S.S.), 58024, Massa Marittima (GR), Italy

23 20 <sup>7</sup>Museum of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy of Modena, University of Modena and Reggio  
24 21 Emilia, 41121, Modena, Italy

25 22 <sup>8</sup>Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Biologiche Chimiche e Farmaceutiche (STEBICEF),  
26 23 University of Palermo, 90123, Palermo, Italy

27 24 <sup>9</sup>Civic Museum of Natural History "Giacomo Doria", 16121, Genova, Italy

28 25 <sup>10</sup>Department of Earth Sciences, Environmental and Life, University of Genova, 16132, Genova, Italy

29 26 <sup>11</sup>Civic Museum of Natural History of Trieste, 34100, Trieste, Italy

30 27 <sup>12</sup>Museum of Comparative Anatomy, University of Bologna, 40126, Bologna, Italy

31 28 <sup>13</sup>Department of Cultural Heritage, University of Bologna, 48121, Ravenna, Italy

32 29 <sup>14</sup>Museum of Natural History of Firenze "La Specola", 50125, Firenze, Italy

33 30 <sup>15</sup>Institute for Biological Resources and Marine Biotechnology (IRBIM), National Research Council  
34 31 – CNR, 91026, Mazara del Vallo (TP), Italy

35 32 <sup>16</sup>Laboratorio de Genética de Organismos Acuáticos Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y Limnología,  
36 33 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. Postal 70-305, 04510 Mexico, D.F., Mexico

37 34 <sup>17</sup> Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Rega Institute, KU Leuven, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

38 35 \*Corresponding author: agostino.leone@unibo.it

39 36 <sup>π</sup> Present address: Marine Research Division, AZTI, 48395, Sukarrieta, Bizkaia, Spain

40 37

41 38

42 39

43 40

44 41

45 42

46 43

47 44



1  
2  
3 **Abstract**

4 **Aim** We aim to unravel the evolutionary origin of the contemporary, poorly characterized  
5 Mediterranean population of Great White Shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, GWS, tracing back its  
6 paleo-migration pattern by phylogenetic and dispersal vicariance analyses at the global level.  
7  
8

9 **Location** Mediterranean Sea

10 **Taxon** *Carcharodon carcharias*

11 **Methods** We have built the largest control region mtDNA (CR) sequence dataset for the  
12 Mediterranean GWS from referenced historical jaws spanning 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. Mediterranean  
13 and global GWS CR sequences were analyzed for genetic diversity, phylogenetic relationship and  
14 divergence time. A Bayes factor approach was finally used to test two scenarios of divergence time  
15 and paleo-colonization of the Mediterranean by GWS, calibrated using fossil records and paleo-  
16 geographical events.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 **Results** The results confirmed a closer evolutionary relationship between Mediterranean GWS and  
22 populations from Australia-New Zealand and the Northeastern Pacific coast rather than populations  
23 from South-African and Northwestern Atlantic. The Mediterranean GWS lineage showed the lowest  
24 genetic diversity at the global level, indicating its quite recent evolutionary origin. The divergence  
25 time of the Mediterranean GWS at 3.236 Ma by a potential dispersal-vicariance process involving  
26 Australian/Pacific paleo-populations was retrieved as the best divergence/paleobiogeographic  
27 scenario.  
28  
29  
30

31 **Main conclusion** Based on the fossil records, phylogeographic patterns and divergence time, we  
32 revealed that the Mediterranean GWS population originated in the Pliocene following the Messinian  
33 Salinity Crisis. Colonization of the Mediterranean by GWS likely occurred via an eastward paleo-  
34 migration of Australian/eastern Pacific elements through Central America Seaway, before the  
35 complete closure of the Isthmus of Panama. The Pliocene origin of Mediterranean GWS by Pacific  
36 paleo-populations is in contrast with the previously ad hoc reconstructed scenario in which Australian  
37 GWS colonized the Mediterranean by antipodean northward migration caused by navigational errors  
38 from South Africa during Quaternary climatic oscillations.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Keywords** Great White Shark, Mediterranean, historical DNA, divergence time, phylogeography,  
44 *Carcharodon carcharias*  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## 69 **Background**

70 Large predatory shark populations in the Mediterranean Sea have declined dramatically over  
71 the last century (Ferretti, Myers, Serena, & Lotze, 2008). The loss of apex shark predators, like sharks,  
72 throughout the world's oceans over the past century is likely to have caused profound ecological  
73 alterations and potentially large-scale trophic cascades (Myers et al., 2007; Ferretti, Worm, Britten,  
74 Heithaus, & Lotze, 2010). Among the species that witnessed the most precipitous declines is the Great  
75 White Shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*, L.1758, henceforth GWS; McPherson & Myers, 2009),  
76 which is currently listed as Critically Endangered in European seas (Nieto et al., 2015). GWS are  
77 widespread throughout the globe, aside from the polar regions, with hotspots of abundance located  
78 off the coasts of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, North and South America, and in the  
79 Mediterranean (Compagno, 1984; Fergusson, 1996). Integrated ecological, genetic and tagging data  
80 has revealed natal homing and philopatric behavior of GWS, with extraordinary trans-oceanic  
81 migrations of both sexes between geographically distant populations in the Indian (Pardini et al.,  
82 2001; Bonfil et al., 2005; Blower, Pandolfi, Bruce, Gomez-Cabrera, & Ovenden, 2012) and North  
83 Pacific Ocean (Domeier & Nasby-Lucas, 2008; Jorgensen et al., 2010, 2012). In the Mediterranean,  
84 GWS have long been observed and documented by the public, resource users and scientists, who have  
85 provided opportunistic occurrence records, from direct sightings, fisheries catch, records of bite  
86 marks found on prey, ~~like dolphins and tuna~~, and museum specimens dating back to the early 19<sup>th</sup>  
87 century (Mancusi et al., 2002; De Maddalena, 2006; Sperone et al., 2012). In the past, free-swimming  
88 individuals and pairs were frequently recorded in areas where large pelagic fisheries were intense  
89 (e.g. the Sicilian Channel, the Ligurian and Tyrrhenian seas; Fergusson, 1996; Storai, Vanni, Zuffa,  
90 & Biagi, 2005). A few records of GWS pups from Turkey and Tunisia, as well as juveniles in the  
91 Sicilian Channel, suggest that the Mediterranean may host GWS nursery areas (Fergusson, 1996;  
92 Storai, Mojetta, Zuffa, & Giulian, 2000; Kabasakal, & Gedikoğlu, 2008). However, the natural history  
93 of Mediterranean GWS still remains largely uncharacterized.

94 Efforts have been made in the past to resolve the phylogenetic relationships of the  
95 Mediterranean GWS population using mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) sequences (Gubili et al., 2010;  
96 2015). Using up to five specimens, Gubili et al. (2010, 2015) concluded that the Mediterranean  
97 population is more closely related to populations in the Pacific Ocean (Australia, New Zealand and  
98 Northeastern Pacific) than to those from the western Indian Ocean (South-Africa) and northwestern  
99 Atlantic Ocean (Florida). Based on a nucleotide substitution rate between the two major lineages  
100 (Northeastern Pacific vs. North West Atlantic and Eastern Indian) calibrated by the formation of the  
101 Isthmus of Panama (3.5 Ma) and the Sunda-Sahul Shelves (5 Ma) respectively, Gubili et al. (2010)  
102 suggested that Mediterranean GWS are descendants of a few disoriented individuals who immigrated  
103 from Australia/New Zealand during the Pleistocene (348-565 ka) by an antipodean route along the  
104 western coast of Africa. The hypothesis of multiple relatively recent colonization events was also  
105 considered given the haplotype relationships using few historical and contemporary Mediterranean  
106 specimens (Gubili et al., 2015).

107 The sampling of GWS specimens in the Mediterranean has proven to be difficult because of  
108 their decreased abundance in recent decades. However, there is a great number of referenced and dry-

1  
2  
3 109 preserved GWS specimens in several Italian museums and private scientific archives, such as stuffed  
4 110 and mounted skins, jaws, vertebrae and teeth collected over the last two centuries in the  
5 111 Mediterranean (Mancusi et al., 2002; De Maddalena, 2006). Considering the recent advances in  
6 112 ancient DNA (aDNA) technologies for addressing questions of conservation genetics, this material  
7 113 represents a great opportunity for reconstructing the natural history of Mediterranean GWS  
8 114 (~~Willerslev, & Cooper, 2005~~; Wandeler, Hoeck, & Keller, 2007; Ahonen, & Stow, 2008; Riccioni et  
9 115 al., 2010). Using a suite of newly developed techniques (Hofreiter, Serre, Poinar, Kuch, & Pääbo,  
10 116 2001), researchers have been able to analyze the spatio-temporal population dynamics and genetic  
11 117 diversity of several other marine fish species, using well-preserved historical samples (e.g. vertebrae,  
12 118 scales, shark teeth and jaws; Hauser, Adcock, Smith, Ramirez, & Carvalho, 2002; ~~Hutchinson, van~~  
13 119 ~~Oosterhout, Rogers, & Carvalho, 2003~~; Ahonen, & Stow, 2008; Riccioni et al., 2010). Unfortunately,  
14 120 most historical GWS specimens have been archived in sub-optimal conditions, thereby compromising  
15 121 their potential for DNA-based applications. Moreover, since the potential value of the preserved  
16 122 specimens can decrease considerably if they are subjected to damaging invasive sampling techniques,  
17 123 many collectors are reluctant to loan specimens for molecular studies.

18 124 By analyzing DNA sequences of preserved specimens of GWS caught over the last 195 years  
19 125 in the Mediterranean, from eight Italian museums and private collections, we have been able to deeply  
20 126 explore the evolutionary history of Mediterranean GWS. Using effective and affordable aDNA  
21 127 techniques widely used to extract and genotype DNA from historical specimens of marine fish (~~e.g.~~  
22 128 ~~vertebrae, bones, skin~~), we have generated a publicly available mtDNA sequence dataset from 18  
23 129 Mediterranean GWS individuals (see Table S1 in Appendix S3). A deep evolutionary analysis of the  
24 130 newly generated Mediterranean sequences aligned with those from global GWS populations available  
25 131 in public repositories, [and the scan of the –fossil records occurrences in literature, with special](#)  
26 132 [emphasis on the Mediterranean area](#), provided an opportunity to better unravel the origin of the GWS  
27 133 Mediterranean population.

## 42 135 **Methods**

43 136 Full details of the collected historical GWS specimens, sampling procedures, protocols for  
44 137 aDNA extraction, PCR amplification of Control Region (CR), sequencing and sequence analyses are  
45 138 provided in the Supplementary Methods in Appendix S1, Figures S1-S3 of Appendix S2 and Table  
46 139 S2 of Appendix S3.

### 50 140 *Analysis of fossil evidences*

51 141 The extensive catalogue of taxon-specific GWS fossils featured in the online and open access  
52 142 Paleobiology Database (<https://paleobiodb.org/#/>), and its R package ‘paleoDB’ (Varela et al., 2015),  
53 143 was used to create a distribution and stratigraphic map of global GWS fossils. The downloaded  
54 144 database was further filtered manually to avoid the use of homonym extinct taxa commonly named  
55 145 as "Great White Shark". Only records specifically classified as *Carcharodon carcharias* [and relatives](#)  
56 146 [synonyms](#) were retained (Table S4 in Appendix S3). Moreover, [a deep bibliographic records research](#)  
57 147 with most attention to those related to *C. carcharias* fossils from the Mediterranean area [was carried](#)

1  
2  
3 148 out (Table S5 in Appendix S3) (Cigala-Fulgosi, 1990; Applegate, & Espinosa-Arrubarrena, 1996;  
4 149 Gottfried, & Fordyce, 2001; Bianucci et al., 2002; Marsili, 2006; Marsili, 2008; Adnet, Balbino,  
5 150 Antunes, & Marin-Ferrer, 2009). ~~were selected and used to strengthen the analysis of fossil evidence.~~

8 151 *Time of the Most Recent Common Ancestor (TMRCA) and estimation of evolutionary rate*

10 152 ~~In order to verify the constant rate of substitution, and the lack of a saturation effect, a molecular~~  
11 153 ~~clock test as implemented in MEGA7 v.7.0.14 software (Kumar, Stecher, & Tamura, 2016) and a~~  
12 154 ~~correlation between transitions (Ts) and transversions (Tv) against the Tamura-Nei's distance model~~  
13 155 ~~(Tamura, & Nei, 1993) using the 'ape' R package (as the HKY model is not available in ape) (Paradis,~~  
14 156 ~~Claude, & Strimmer, 2004) were performed.~~

17 157 The divergence time analysis of the GWS lineages was carried out using Bayesian inference  
18 158 through Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) as implemented in BEAST v1.10.0 (Suchard et al.,  
19 159 2018). An initial analysis using calibration priors without sequence data was carried out to determine  
20 159 if the calibration priors ~~were specified properly~~, did not interact unexpectedly and to assess that the  
21 160 data were informative, ~~thus ensuring that the estimated divergence time was not the result of the~~  
22 161 ~~priors alone~~ (Fulton, & Strobeck, 2010). ~~A strict relaxed~~ molecular clock ~~and and a~~ constant  
23 162 population size coalescent model, ~~were used as the clock and coalescent models of choice~~ to recover  
24 163 time-stamped phylogenies ~~at the within species level using a single locus in BEAST~~. To ensure  
25 164 convergence of the posterior distributions, three independent MCMC analyses were run (20 million  
26 165 steps, sampled every 1k generation, burn-in 50%). Convergence and effective sample sizes (ESS)  
27 166 were verified using Tracer v.1.7.0 (Rambaut, Drummond, Xie, Baele, & Suchard, 2018). A maximum  
28 167 clade credibility (MCC) tree was summarized using TREEANNOTATOR V.1.10.0 and visualized in  
29 168 FIGTREE v.1.4.3 (Rambaut, 2009). Since the molecular clock is sensitive to bias when a short  
30 169 fragment with fewer polymorphisms is used, the TMRCA analyses were carried out using the two  
31 170 CR sequence datasets of different length (516bp and 828bp) as previously used in the haplotype  
32 171 network analysis. The divergence time of the GWS lineages was estimated using two alternative  
33 172 combinations of calibration priors in BEAST v1.10.0 (Suchard et al., 2018). The alternative  
34 173 combinations of calibration priors were built by integrating the estimated age of ~~the earliest the oldest~~  
35 174 GWS ~~fossils fossil records~~ (Applegate & Espinosa-Arrubarrena, 1996; ~~Gottfried, & Fordyce, 2001~~)  
36 175 (~~Offset Mean: 115.0 Ma; SD: 1.0 Ma - Quantiles: 2.5%=15.14; 5%=15.19; median=16.0; 95%=20.18;~~  
37 176 ~~97.5%=22.10~~) with two different secondary calibrations: a) the best dated fossil record of GWS in  
38 177 the Mediterranean Sea, ~~consisting of a GWS dolphin trophic interaction~~ dated back to the Pliocene  
39 178 (Cigala-Fulgosi, 1990; Bianucci et al., 2002) (Mean: 3.0 Ma; SD: 0.15-30 Ma ~~Quantiles: 2.5%=2.71;~~  
40 179 ~~5%=2.75; median=3.0; 95%=3.25; 97.5%=3.29~~); b) the molecular divergence previously estimated  
41 180 by Gubili et al. (2010) (Mean: 0.45 Ma; SD: 0.15 Ma ~~Quantiles: 2.5%=0.21; 5%=0.25; median=0.5;~~  
42 181 ~~95%=0.75; 97.5%=0.79~~). ~~In both combinations of calibration, were implemented as normally~~  
43 182 ~~distributed priors, the calibrations were implemented as lognormally and normally distributed,~~  
44 183 ~~respectively. The calibrations used were chosen to obviate undesirable effect of bias on node~~  
45 184 ~~calibration (Ho, & Phillips, 2009; O'Reilly, & Donoghue, 2016). Since the origination time of the~~  
46 185 ~~species is a still fiercely debated argument, the divergence time between the GWS and the outgroup~~

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

187 *Lamna nasus* (Genbank Acc. No. GU266755-GU266769) estimated at around 46 Mya (Martin, 1996)  
188 (Mean: 46.0 Ma; SD: 1.0), was used as alternative first calibration, rather than using debated fossil  
189 records from the middle Miocene (Gottfried & Fordyce, 2001).

### 190 *Marginal likelihood estimation and testing divergence time hypotheses*

191 After setting the first calibration for the earliest fossil attributed to the GWS, the two alternative  
192 secondary calibrations could be compared by estimating log marginal likelihoods using generalized  
193 stepping-stone (GSS) sampling, as implemented in BEAUti v1.10.0 and BEAST v1.10.0 (Suchard et  
194 al., 2018; Baele, Lemey, & Suchard, 2015). The log marginal likelihood values for the two different  
195 scenarios were first estimated using generalized stepping-stone sampling as 100 stepping stone of 1  
196 million of iterations, logging Log likelihood every 1,000. A total of 101 power posteriors of one  
197 million iterations each were sampled using MCMC for the GSS approach. Subsequently, the log  
198 Bayes factor was calculated for both scenarios using the formula  $\log BF = \log Pr(D | M1) - \log Pr(D$   
199  $| M2)$ , where  $\log Pr(D | M1)$  is the log marginal likelihood for model 1, and  $\log Pr(D | M2)$  is the log  
200 marginal likelihood for model 2, in order to select the alternative calibrations that fits best with the  
201 principal timing information fixed for both scenarios. This analysis was performed on both sequence  
202 datasets (i.e. 516bp and 828bp).

### 203 *Historical biogeography reconstruction*

204 Two different approaches were implemented in order to reconstruct the historical biogeography  
205 of species: the Statistical Dispersal-Vicariance Analysis (S-DIVA), which is a parsimony method of  
206 historical biogeography, and the Dispersal-Extinction-Cladogenesis (DEC) analysis (Yu, Harris, &  
207 He, 2010; Ree, & Smith, 2008). An MCC estimated by using BEAST and TreeAnnotator on just  
208 haplotype sequences, and the specimen distribution through all biogeographical areas (A:  
209 Australia/New Zealand, AUS; B: Northeastern Pacific, NEP; C: Mediterranean, MED; D: South-  
210 Africa, SA; E: Northwestern Atlantic, NWA) was used to perform the S-DIVA and DEC analyses  
211 implemented in RASP v. 4.0 (reconstruct ancestral state in phylogenies) (Yu, Harris, Blair, & He,  
212 2015).

## 214 **Results**

215 Partial CR sequences (516bp) were obtained from 18 GWS historical specimens (Acc. Num.  
216 XXXXXX-XXXXXX; provided after manuscript's acceptance).

217 The multiple sequence alignment obtained including sequences from all 18 historical samples  
218 and four Mediterranean homologous modern sequences deposited in GenBank (HQ540294-  
219 HQ540296; JF715925; Table S3 in Appendix S3) showed an extremely low nucleotide diversity for  
220 the CR fragment ( $< 0.1\%$ ), with only one variable site at position 244, in which the specimen  
221 FICCC01LI showed a transition  $A > G$ . Once Mediterranean sequences were merged with the  
222 homologous sequences from the other global populations ( $N = 99$ ), an indel at position 60 of the final  
223 alignment resulted in a final dataset of 117 CR sequences of 516bp. The global ML haplotype network  
224 revealed 31 haplotypes (Figure S4 in Appendix S2) that were clustered in two main haplogroups



1  
2  
3 225 differentiated by 28 mutations. As expected, based on the existing literature, the first haplogroup was  
4 226 formed by the individuals from the MED and the Pacific Ocean (AUS and NEP) and the second was  
5 227 composed of GWS from SA and the NWA. Three haplotypes of GWS collected in AUS (HQ414073,  
6 228 HQ414074 and AY026211; Table S3 in Appendix S3) clustered in the latter haplogroup and these  
7 229 individuals are SA-like individuals that likely migrated across the Indian Ocean (Pardini et al., 2001;  
8 230 Blower et al., 2012). The ML haplotype network built with 99 GWS sequences of 828bp revealed 68  
9 231 haplotypes and a similar topology (Figure S4 in Appendix S2) to the one reconstructed using the  
10 232 shorter sequence dataset, with 2 main haplogroups (AUS-NEP-MED vs SA-NWA).

11 233 The cross-plot for the haplotype and nucleotide diversity of the Mediterranean and global  
12 234 populations of GWS revealed that the MED population showed lowest indexes values among the  
13 235 other global populations, with AUS showing the highest values for both indexes shown (Figure 1;  
14 236 Table S65 in Appendix S3). The NEP and NWA populations showed high haplotype diversity and  
15 237 low nucleotide diversity while the SA population exhibited quite opposite positions in the plot  
16 238 depending on the reference study with high values for both estimates in Pardini et al. (2001) and  
17 239 O’Leary et al. (2015), and low values in Andreotti et al. (2016).

18 240 No polymorphisms were detected among the four complete contemporary CR sequences of  
19 241 GWS, demonstrating a low haplotype diversity among longer sequences as well, while the genetic  
20 242 diversity (e.g. nucleotide) is proportional to the length of the sequences.

#### 31 244 *Marginal likelihood estimation and test for divergence time hypotheses*

32 245 The application of the log Bayes factor formula gave ~~decisive~~ significant support to the Pliocene  
33 246 calibration scenario ~~using the 828bp dataset and non-significant support using the 516bp dataset in~~  
34 247 ~~every model tested~~ (Table 1), ~~suggesting the lack of signal in the short sequence dataset.~~ Based on  
35 248 the 828bp dataset, the GWS Mediterranean population diverged from the Pacific populations at 3.26  
36 249 23 Ma, a time that is congruent with the estimated closure of the Central American Seaway, CAS  
37 250 ( $\approx 3.5$  Ma), after the formation of the Isthmus of Panama (O’Dea et al., 2016). Interesting, we got a  
38 251 small mismatch between the “Pleistocene” calibration priors sampling and the priors posteriors,  
39 252 suggesting statistically that a Pleistocene second calibration is conflictual with the data, and a  
40 253 “Pliocenic divergence” scenario is preferable.

#### 47 254 *Time of the Most Recent Common Ancestor (TMRCA) and estimation of evolutionary rate*

48 255 The analysis of fossil evidence suggested that GWS experienced a long evolutionary history  
49 256 ~~dating back to the middle Miocene~~ (Table S4; S54 of Appendix S3). The occurrence of GWS fossils  
50 257 in the Mediterranean area ~~dated back to the Late Miocene and is rich in the~~ Pliocene, after the  
51 258 Messinian Salinity Crisis.

52 259 ~~The molecular clock test showed that the null hypothesis of equal evolutionary rate throughout~~  
53 260 ~~the tree was not rejected ( $p = 0.14$ ; Table S6 of Appendix S3). A saturation effect of transitions (Ts)~~  
54 261 ~~and transversions (Tv) was not detected (Ts:  $r^2 = 0.99$ ,  $P = < 0.0001$ ; Tv:  $r^2 = 0.91$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ).~~

55 262 The CR relaxed substitution rate range inferred from the TMRCA analysis was estimated at  
56 263 0.38%-0.72% 0.23% substitutions/site/my (~~divergence rate of 0.46%~~) and ~~0.33%~~ (~~divergence rate of~~

1  
2  
3 264 ~~0.66%) for the 3 Ma and 0.5 Ma calibrations, respectively~~for the best model following the Bayes  
4 265 factor. Based on these estimates, the coalescence of the Mediterranean and Pacific GWS lineages  
5 266 dated the divergence time of the Mediterranean population at 3.~~26-23~~ Ma (Figure 2) and 01.72-81 Ma  
6 267 (Figure S5 of Appendix S2), respectively.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 268 *Historical biogeography reconstruction*

11 269 The analysis of the ancestral ranges of GWS, using both S-DIVA and DEC approaches,  
12 270 suggests that the Mediterranean population is the result of a potential dispersal-vicariance scenario.  
13 271 The biogeographical reconstruction of the Mediterranean lineage estimated using S-DIVA resulted  
14 272 in two principal ancestral ranges, AC (AUS-MED) and ABC (AUS-NEP-MED) with probabilities  
15 273 (relative frequencies) for each range of 52.44% and 46.69% respectively. Two minor ancestral ranges  
16 274 were detected with very low probability: AB (AUS-NEP) and BC (NEP-MED), with probabilities of  
17 275 0.52% and 0.35% respectively. The DEC analysis resulted in concordant results with two ancestral  
18 276 ranges, AC (AUS-MED); BC (NEP-MED), with probabilities of 50.01% and 49.99% respectively,  
19 277 supporting that the origin of the Mediterranean population is likely among GWS of Australia and the  
20 278 North Eastern Pacific. Both approaches suggest a route of dispersal-vicariance of route  
21 279 AC>CAB>C|AB scenario. Interesting, for both S-DIVA and DEC analyses, Australian and North  
22 280 Eastern Pacific lineages originated from a Pacific ancestral range AB (AUS-NEP) with a probability  
23 281 of 100.00% through a vicariance phenomenon.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 32 283 **Discussion**

33 284 Our phylogenetic analyses of contemporary and historical sequences indicated that the existing  
34 285 population of GWS in the Mediterranean could be a relic of the Pacific GWS clade. This scenario  
35 286 would suggest that Pacific-born ancestors migrated eastward across the ocean, before the complete  
36 287 closure of the Central American Seaway, and colonized the North Atlantic Ocean before entering the  
37 288 Mediterranean after the Messinian salinity crisis, which may have caused the local extinction of the  
38 289 marine megafauna due to the total or partial drying up of the Mediterranean with related subsequent  
39 290 ecological upheavals (Garcia-Castellanos et al., 2009). This evolutionary pathway (Figure 3) is  
40 291 supported by Bayesian analyses of genetic diversity and divergence time estimates and it is coherent  
41 292 with the age of the main paleo-geographical events, paleo-climatic patterns and fossil records. Our  
42 293 proposed pathway represents an alternative hypothesis to that of an accidental antipodean long-  
43 294 distance dispersal of a few Australian/New Zealand founder females that visited the Good Hope Cape  
44 295 area and, because of Pleistocene climatic oscillations, navigated erroneously northward and entered  
45 296 into the Mediterranean Sea (henceforth named “the antipodean dispersal hypothesis”; Gubili et al.,  
46 297 2010).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 298 The phylogenetic analyses of the CR sequences for the 18 Mediterranean GWS confirmed once  
56 299 again a closer evolutionary relationship of this population with the Australian/New Zealand and  
57 300 Northeastern Pacific lineage than with the South African and Northwestern Atlantic lineage (Pardini  
58 301 et al., 2001; Jorgensen et al., 2010; Gubili et al., 2010; Blower et al., 2012). The Mediterranean GWS  
59 302 exhibited a very shallow mtDNA genetic variation with only two haplotypes and extremely low  
60

1  
2  
3 303 genetic diversity. Among the modern samples collected from throughout the world that have been  
4 304 analyzed to date, the Mediterranean GWS have provided the lowest estimates of genetic diversity,  
5 305 indicating that this population is relatively young and has likely originated by a founder event by a  
6 306 single or a few mtDNA lineages or that the population has experienced a recent population bottleneck  
7  
8 307 (Group 1 of Grant, & Bowen (1998); Grant, & Waples, 2000). Within the Pacific/Mediterranean  
9 308 mitochondrial clade, the Australian/New Zealand GWS population was identified as the most  
10 309 ancestral with long evolutionary/demographic history and divergent haplotypes that have  
11 310 accumulated over long periods of time (as indicated by the high values of haplotype and nucleotide  
12 311 diversity; Group 3 of Grant, & Bowen (1998); Grant, & Waples, 2000). An intermediate evolutionary  
13 312 position in the clade can be that of the Northeastern Pacific GWS population that possessed high  
14 313 haplotype diversity and low nucleotide diversity which indicated a pattern typically associated with  
15 314 population that have experienced a bottleneck event followed by rapid demographic growth and  
16 315 accumulation of mutations (Group 2 of Grant, & Bowen (1998); Grant, & Waples, 2000).

17 316 The evolutionary pattern revealed by the plot analysis of haplotype and nucleotide diversity is  
18 317 corroborated by the historical biogeography of the species, that suggests the closest relationship  
19 318 between Mediterranean and both Pacific lineages as the best evolutionary scenario.

20 319 From those ancestral lineages from which the Mediterranean one originated, the Northeastern  
21 320 Pacific GWS appears to have been an important contributor to the genetic composition of the  
22 321 Mediterranean population. Furthermore, since both S-DIVA and DEC analyses suggest that the  
23 322 Mediterranean GWS originated from a dispersal-vicariance event, an origin via westward dispersal  
24 323 from a few Australian individuals during the Pleistocene. The founder event that gave origin to the  
25 324 modern Mediterranean GWS was dated by the TMRCA analysis with high statistical support, to 3.26  
26 325 23 Ma, during the late Pliocene, in the Piacenzian (3.60 – 2.58 Ma) and immediately after the  
27 326 Zanclean (5.33 – 3.60 Ma). This estimate is greatly older than that reconstructed in the antipodean  
28 327 dispersal hypothesis (348-565 ka; Calabrian, Pleistocene) by Gubili et al. (2010) based on an estimate  
29 328 of mtDNA substitution rate of 1.19-0.74% of divergence between lineages per million year. These  
30 329 rates of evolutionary change were calibrated by Gubili et al. (2010) using estimates of vicariance  
31 330 events that separated GWS populations from the Northeastern Pacific and Northwestern Atlantic  
32 331 oceans (i.e. the rising of the Isthmus of Panama dated at 3.5 Ma; O’Dea et al., 2016) and from the  
33 332 Western Pacific and Indian oceans (i.e. the rising of the Sunda-Sahul shelves dated at 5 Ma; Haq,  
34 333 Hardenbol, & Vail, 1987). However, all phylogenetic analyses carried out so far (Gubili et al., 2010;  
35 334 Andreotti et al., 2016; present work) have revealed that the Northwestern Atlantic GWS are  
36 335 phylogenetically linked to the South African population but not to the Northeastern Pacific GWS.  
37 336 Therefore, the use of the vicariance event separating Atlantic and Pacific GWS at 3.5 Ma from a  
38 337 common recent ancestor might have led to an overestimation of the mutation rate and the time of  
39 338 divergence between Mediterranean and Pacific GWS at 348-565 ka in the Pleistocene. On the  
40 339 contrary, all phylogenetic analyses consistently suggested that the Mediterranean and the Western  
41 340 Atlantic populations belong to two different lineages, wherein the Mediterranean GWS are  
42 341 descendants of populations found in the Australian/New Zealand and Northeastern Pacific, and



1  
2  
3 342 modern Northwestern Atlantic elements likely descended from South African GWS by a founder  
4 343 event (Andreotti et al., 2016).

6 344 Abundant fossil data suggests that GWS have inhabited the Mediterranean Sea since the early  
7  
8 345 Pliocene, following the Messinian Salinity Crisis, with ~~origin of~~ numerous specimens estimated to be  
9 346 between ~5 and ~2 Ma old, with peaks of abundance occurring during the Pliocene (Cigala-Fulgosi,  
10 347 1990; Bianucci et al., 2002; Marsili, 2008; Adnet, Balbino, Antunes, & Marín-Ferrer, 2009). After  
12 348 these paleoclimatic phases, GWS could have colonized the Mediterranean Sea occupying the  
13  
14 349 ecological niches ~~gradually~~ left empty by other apex marine predators, such as the giant megatooth  
15 350 shark *Carcharocles megalodon*, which went extinct between 3.5 and 2.6 Ma (Pimiento, & Clements,  
16 351 2014). Fossil evidence from Central America suggests that many species of sharks and marine  
18 352 mammals that were part of the region's faunal assemblage may have migrated across the CAS  
19  
20 353 continuously before the formation of the Isthmus of Panama (Steeman et al., 2009; Pimiento et al.,  
21 354 2013; Velez-Juarbe, Wood, De Gracia, & Hendy, 2015). Upon the closure of the CAS, the newly  
22 355 formed Gulf Stream current could have facilitated an eastward trans-Atlantic migration by GWS  
24 356 during the late Pliocene by way of the eastward dispersion of nutrients and, consequently, food  
25  
26 357 resources. There is evidence that intense fluctuations in the speed of the Gulf Stream occurred during  
27 358 the formation of the Isthmus of Panama, reaching a height during the late Miocene and early Pliocene  
28  
29 359 (~6.1-4.8 Ma; Kaneps, 1979). The intensification of currents coincides with the end of the Messinian  
30 360 Salinity Crisis (5.33 Ma), which culminated with the Zanclean inflow in the Mediterranean Sea  
31  
32 361 (Garcia-Castellanos et al., 2009), and it may have been the driver of eastward migrations by various  
33 362 species of fish, and consequently, of their predators. Therefore, all these oceanographic phenomena  
34  
35 363 are concordant with the estimated divergence of the Mediterranean GWS population that we have  
36 364 obtained (~~2.93 Ma~~).

37  
38 365 A potential earlier formation of the Isthmus of Panama (Bacon et al., 2015; Lessions et al.,  
39 366 2015; Montes et al., 2015; O'Dea et al., 2016) would not affect our results, since it is plausible that  
40 367 the Pacific lineage that gave rise to the MED population may already have been present in the  
42 368 Atlantic before and after the closure of the CAS and before its potential local extinction in the  
43 369 Atlantic. Also, past intermittent shallow connections are plausible and discussed in literature  
44 370 (Jaramillo et al., 2017).

46 371 The global phylogeography of contemporary GWS populations reveals a discontinuous  
47 372 distribution of the Pacific/Mediterranean GWS evolutionary lineage in the North Atlantic being  
48 373 interrupted by the recent penetration and colonization of the Northwestern Atlantic area by the Indian  
49 374 lineage. The phylogenetic analyses highlighted that the GWS of Northwestern Atlantic population  
50 375 does not exhibit a separated mtDNA cluster like the Pacific and Mediterranean populations, and it  
51 376 form a unique lineage with the South-Africa (Figure S4 of Appendix S2). This evidence is suggestive  
52 377 of a recent evolutionary history or a population bottleneck followed by population growth and  
53 378 accumulation of mutations.

58 379 A local extinction of the past Pacific GWS lineage in the North Atlantic Ocean and further  
59 380 replacement by Indian components could explain such a phylogeographic discontinuity. An extensive  
60 381 analysis of the fossil records, highlighted an exceptional extinction rate of the marine fauna, including


1  
2  
3 382 sharks, during the Pliocene epoch (Pimiento et al., 2017). Furthermore, the highest extinction rates  
4 383 occurred in the late Pliocene, between 3.8 and 2.4 Ma, which coincides with the Mediterranean  
5 384 population divergence time, and may have led the local extinction of the ancient Atlantic population  
6 385 of GWS.

9 386 Additional genetic and tagging studies are required to determine if the Mediterranean GWS are  
10 387 ecologically and reproductively isolated from the adjacent populations occupying the North Atlantic  
12 388 Ocean. This issue is of high-priority for the development of robust conservation criteria and  
13 389 implementation of management strategies. In spite of this data poor situation, some information can  
15 390 be gleaned from the other populations in the Atlantic as well as other species. For example, several  
16 391 other epipelagic sharks migrate throughout the temperate waters of the Atlantic and several are  
18 392 suspected of having nursery areas in the mid-Atlantic Ridge (Kohler, Turner, Hoey, Natanson, &  
19 393 Briggs, 2002; Stevens, 2010; Vandeperre et al., 2014; O'Leary et al., 2015). Elsewhere, in the Indian  
21 394 Ocean GWS have been observed migrating between Australia and South Africa, while in the Pacific,  
22 395 GWS frequently migrate between the western coast of North America and Hawaii (Bonfil et al., 2005;  
24 396 Jorgensen et al., 2010, 2012; Blower et al., 2012). Clearly, the species is not averse to far reaching  
25 397 longitudinal movements. However, antipodean connections appear less frequent and have only been  
27 398 observed in the variation of the DNA sequences (O'Leary et al., 2015). Latitudinal range of GWS  
28 399 could be limited by thermal tolerance (Cliff, Dudley, & Davis, 1989), prey availability, social  
30 400 structure and fidelity to nursery areas.

31 401 Our results suggested that the Mediterranean GWS have a more ancient origins than previously  
32 402 thought, and that this population is genetically disconnected from the adjacent Atlantic population.  
33 403 Due to historical and widespread declines of sharks in the Mediterranean Sea (~~Coll, Palomera, Tudela,~~  
34 404 ~~& Dowd, 2008; Lotze, Coll, & Dunne, 2011;~~ Colloca et al., 2013; Ferretti, Osio, Jenkins, Rosenberg,  
35 405 & Lotze, 2013) as well as the ongoing over-exploitation of marine resources in the region, the current  
36 406 white shark population is at minimal levels of abundance and consequently may play a less prominent  
37 407 ecological role than in historical times. Yet this distinct genetic pool represents a valuable, albeit  
38 408 extremely precarious, component of the genetic diversity of a species that is endangered worldwide.  
39 409 Losing the Mediterranean GWS population would represent a hard blow to the global white shark.  
40 410 More effort for characterizing the ecology, biology and population structure of this critically  
41 411 endangered population (i.e. through tagging, genetic analyses and historical analyses of occurrence  
42 412 records) are now paramount to plan conservation and management actions to restore this important  
43 413 oceanic top-predator in the region.


1  
2  
3 422  
4  
5 423 **Figures and Tables**

6 424 **Figure 1.** Plot of the haplotype and nucleotide diversity values (expressed as percentage values)  
7  
8 425 estimated by the global populations of *Carcharodon carcharias* inferred using the 828bp dataset of  
9 426 control region sequences. AUS: Australia/New Zealand; NEP: Northeastern Pacific; MED:  
10  
11 427 Mediterranean; SA: South-Africa; NWA: Northwestern Atlantic. The asterisk marks the values  
12 428 reported by Andreotti et al. [29] for the South African population.  
13  
14 429



Review

**Figure 2.** Bayesian divergence time tree of populations of *Carcharodon carcharias* inferred using the 828bp dataset of control region sequences. High posterior density (HPD 95%) values are featured as blue bars. Only information of node with at least 0.5 posterior value are shown. Abbreviations are given in Figure 1.



439

1

2

3 440

4 441

5 442

6 443

7 444

8 445

9 446

10 447

11 448

12 449

13 450

14 451

15 452

16 453

17 454

18 455

19 456

20 457

21 458

22 459

23 460

24 461

25 462

26 463

27 464

28 465

29 466

30 467

31 468

32 469

33 470

34 471

35 472

36 473

37 474

38 475

39 476

40 477

41 478

42 479

43 480

44 481

45 482

46 483

47 484

48 485

49 486

50 487

51 488

52 489

53 490

54 491

55 492

56 493


57 494


58 495

59 496

60 497

**Figure 3.** Global dispersal and Pacific/Mediterranean vicariance hypothesis for *Carcharodon carcharias*. Ancient great White Sharks from the Pacific Ocean, namely Australia, dispersed via two routes: westward to South African coasts (1, light grey dotted line) and eastward to Northeastern Pacific Americas (2, black dotted line). The Pacific Great White Sharks were free to move eastward to the Atlantic, and in the Pliocene to an ancient Mediterranean Sea after the Messinian Salinity Crisis, that could have caused the local extinction of a great white shark population established in the middle Miocene (3-4). Past climatic oscillation due to the closure of the Central America Seaway and the formation of the Isthmus of Panama, could have caused a local extinction or an eastward mass migration of white shark from the North Atlantic Ocean, isolating the Mediterranean population from other ancestral populations. The North Atlantic was colonized, then, in relatively recent history, when the climate conditions were ideal to maintain a great white shark population, once again (5). Fossil records extrapolated from Paleobiology Database are shown by colored points (red: Miocene, blue: Pliocene, green: Pleistocene). The map was created using 'paleobioDB' package in R version 3.5.1 (Varela et al., 2015). Abbreviations are given in Figure 1.





Jr Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 455  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1.** Best model selection based on Bayes factors of tree topologies reconstructed with the earliest fossil occurrences and the estimated divergence between the GWS and the outgroup *L.nasus* (the 828bp and 516bp sequence datasets, respectively). Node constraints and calibration parameters on the phylogeographical tree of *Carcharodon carcharias* for the two divergence models are also provided. logML\_GSS: log marginal likelihood from generalized stepping stone model, BF\_GSS: Bayes factors calculated using the logML\_GSS. Models are ranked according to the logML values.

<u>Model</u>	<u>Dataset</u>	<u>Node1</u>	<u>Node2</u>	<u>logML_GSS</u>	<u>logBF_GSS</u>
<u>MED Pliocene divergence</u>	<u>828bp</u>	<u>Ingroup</u> <u>Mean: 11 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma</u>	<u>MED/Pacific</u> <u>Mean: 3.0 Ma, SD: 0.30 Ma</u>	<u>-2455.2796</u>	<u>0 (Best)</u>
<u>MED Pleistocene divergence</u>	<u>828bp</u>	<u>Ingroup;</u> <u>Mean: 11 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma</u>	<u>MED/Pacific</u> <u>Mean: 0.4Ma, SD: 0.15 Ma</u>	<u>-2458.1264</u>	<u>2.8468</u>
<u>MED Pleistocene divergence</u>	<u>516bp</u>	<u>Ingroup;</u> <u>Offset: 11 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma</u>	<u>MED/Pacific</u> <u>Mean: 3.0 Ma, SD: 0.30 Ma</u>	<u>-1440.6171</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>MED Pliocene divergence</u>	<u>516bp</u>	<u>Ingroup;</u> <u>Offset: 11 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma</u>	<u>MED/Pacific</u> <u>Mean: 0.4Ma, SD: 0.15 Ma</u>	<u>-1443.0069</u>	<u>2.3898</u>



## Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Alessandro Velonà, Adriana Villamor and Marco Stagioni for providing valuable technical support and advice. Clemente Veltrone and Gerlando Spagnolo provided samples from Favignana tuna trap.

## Funding

AL, GNP, AC and FT were funded by the University of Bologna by RFO 2016-2018 and Canziani grants to FT. AL is also funded by Italian Ministry for University and Research by a PhD grant 2015-2017. All the other authors were funded by respective institutions. GB acknowledges support from the Interne Fondsen KU Leuven / Internal Funds KU Leuven under grant agreement C14/18/094.

## References

- Adnet, S., Balbino, A. C., Antunes, M. T., & Marín-Ferrer, J. M. (2009). New fossil teeth of the white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) from the early Pliocene of Spain. Implication for its paleoecology in the Mediterranean. *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie – Abhandlungen*, 256(1), 7-16. <https://doi:10.1127/0077-7749/2009/0029>
- Ahonen, H., & Stow, J. (2008). Shark jaws and teeth: an unexploited resource for population genetic studies. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 73(2), 450-455. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2008.01896.x>
- Andreotti, S., von der Heyden, S., Henriques, R., Rutzen, M., Meyer, M., Oosthuizen, H., & Mathee, C. A. (2016) New insights into the evolutionary history of white sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias*. *Journal of Biogeography*, 43(2), 328-339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12641>
- Applegate, S. P., & Espinosa-Arrubarrena, L. (1996). The fossil history of *Carcharodon* and its possible ancestor, *Cretolamna*: a study in tooth identification. In A. P. Klimley & D. G. Ainley (Eds.), *Great white sharks: the biology of Carcharodon carcharias* (pp. 19-36). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- [Bacon, C. D., Silvestro, D., Jaramillo, C., Smith, B. T., Chakrabarty, P., Antonelli, A. \(2015\). Biological evidence supports an early and complex emergence of the Isthmus of Panama. \*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A.\*, 112\(19\), 6110-6115. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1423853112>](#)
- Baele, G., Lemey, P., & Suchard, M. A. (2015). Genealogical working distributions for Bayesian model testing with phylogenetic uncertainty. *Systematic Biology*, 65(2), 250-264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syv083>
- Bianucci, G., Bisconti, M., Landini, W., Storai, T., Zuffa, M., Giuliani, S., & Mojetta, A. (2002). Trophic interaction between white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, and cetaceans: a comparison between Pliocene and recent data from Central Mediterranean Sea. In M. Vacchi, G. Lamesa, F.

- 1  
2  
3 496 Serena, & B. Seret (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th European Elasmobranch Association Meeting 28-*  
4 497 *30 November 2000* (pp. 33-48). Livorno, Italy: ICRAM, ARPAT & SFI.
- 6  
7 498 Blower, D. C., Pandolfi, J. M., Bruce, B. D., Gomez-Cabrera, M.D., & Ovenden, J. R. (2012)  
8 499 Population genetics of Australian white sharks reveals fine-scale spatial structure, transoceanic  
9 500 dispersal events and low effective population sizes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 455, 229-244.  
11 501 [https://doi: 10.3354/meps09659](https://doi:10.3354/meps09659)
- 13  
14 502 Bonfil, R., Meyer, M., Scholl, M. C., Johnson, R., O'Brien, S., Oosthuizen, H., ... Paterson, M.  
15 503 (2005). Transoceanic migration, spatial dynamics, and population linkages of white sharks. *Science*,  
16 504 310(5745), 100-103. <https://doi:10.1126/science.1114898>
- 18  
19 505 Canese, S. P., Giusti, M., Salvati, E., Angiolillo, M., Cardinali, A., & Consalvo, I. (2011). *Final*  
21 506 *Report Project ISPRA PR0.3.452 Biodiversity of Sicily Channel*. Rome, Italy: Ministry of the  
22 507 Environment, Territorial and Sea Protection.
- 24  
25 508 Cigala-Fulgosi, F. (1990). Predation (or possible scavenging) by a great white shark on an extinct  
26 509 species of bottlenosed dolphin in the Italian Pliocene. *Tertiary Research*, 12, 17-36.
- 28  
29 510 Cliff, G., Dudley, S. F. J., & Davis, B. (1989). Sharks caught in the protective gill nets off Natal,  
30 511 South Africa. 2. The great white shark *Carcharodon carcharias* (Linnaeus). *South African Journal*  
31 512 *of Marine Science*, 8, 131-144. <https://doi:10.2989/02577618909504556>
- 33  
34 513  
35 514 ~~Coll, M., Palomera, I., Tudela, S., & Dowd, M. (2008). Food web dynamics in the South Catalan Sea~~  
36 515 ~~ecosystem (NW Mediterranean) for 1978-2003. *Ecological Modelling*, 217(1-2), 95-116.~~  
37 516 ~~<https://doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2008.06.013>~~
- 39  
40 517
- 41 518 Colloca, F., Cardinale, M., Maynou, F., Giannoulaki, M., Scarcella, G., Jenko, K., ... Fiorentino, F.  
42 519 (2013). Rebuilding Mediterranean fisheries: a new paradigm for ecological sustainability. *Fish and*  
43 520 *Fisheries*, 14(1), 89-109. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00453.x>
- 45  
46 521 Compagno, L. J. V. (1984). FAO species catalogue. Vol. 4. Sharks of the world. An annotated and  
47 522 illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Part 1. Hexanchiformes to Lamniformes. *FAO*  
48 523 *Fish Synopsis*, 125, 1-249.
- 51  
52 524 De Maddalena, A. 2006 A catalogue of great white sharks *Carcharodon carcharias* (Linnaeus, 1758)  
53 525 preserved in European museums. *Journal of the National Museum, Natural History Series*, 175(3-4),  
54 526 109-125.
- 56  
57 527 [Domeier, M. L., Nasby-Lucas, N. \(2008\). Migration patterns of white sharks \*Carcharodon carcharias\*](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07628)  
58 528 [tagged at Guadalupe Island, Mexico, and identification of an eastern Pacific shared offshore foraging](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07628)  
59 529 [area. \*Marine Ecology Progress Series\*, 370, 221-237. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07628>](https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07628)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 530 Ferretti, F., Worm, B., Britten, G. L., Heithaus, M. R., & Lotze, H. K. (2010). Patterns and ecosystem  
531 consequences of shark declines in the ocean. *Ecology Letters*, 13(8), 1055-1071.  
532 <https://doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01489.x>
- 533 Fergusson, I. K. (1996) Distribution and autoecology of the white shark in the Eastern North Atlantic  
534 and the Mediterranean Sea. In A. P. Klimley & D. G. Ainley (Eds.), *Great white sharks: the biology*  
535 *of Carcharodon carcharias* (pp. 321-345). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 536 Ferretti, F., Myers, R. A., Serena, F., & Lotze, H. K. (2008). Loss of large predatory sharks from the  
537 Mediterranean Sea. *Conservation Biology*, 22(4), 952-964. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00938.x>
- 539 Ferretti, F., Osio, G. C., Jenkins, C. J., Rosenberg, A. A., & Lotze, H. K. (2013) Long-term change  
540 in a meso-predator community in response to prolonged and heterogeneous human impact. *Scientific*  
541 *Reports*, 3, 1057. <https://doi:10.1038/srep01057>
- 542 Fulton, T. L., & Strobeck, C. (2010). Multiple fossil calibrations, nuclear loci and mitochondrial  
543 genomes provide new insight into biogeography and divergence timing for true seals (Phocidae,  
544 Pinnipedia). *Journal of Biogeography*, 37(5), 814-829. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2010.02271.x>
- 546 Garcia-Castellanos, D., Estrada, F., Jiménez-Munt, I., Gorini, C., Fernández, M., Vergés, J., & De  
547 Vicente, R. (2009). Catastrophic flood of the Mediterranean after the Messinian salinity crisis.  
548 *Nature*, 462, 778-781. <https://doi:10.1038/nature08555>
- 549 Gottfried, M. D., & Fordyce, R. E. (2001). An associated specimen of *Carcharodon angustidens*  
550 (Chondrichthyes, Lamnidae) from the late Oligocene of New Zealand, with comments on  
551 *Carcharodon* interrelationships. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 21(4), 730-739.  
552 [https://doi:10.1671/0272-4634\(2001\)021\[0730:AASOCA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi:10.1671/0272-4634(2001)021[0730:AASOCA]2.0.CO;2)
- 553 Grant, W. S., & Bowen, B. W. (1998). Shallow population histories in deep evolutionary lineages of  
554 marine fishes: insights from sardines and anchovies and lessons for conservation. *Journal of Heredity*,  
555 89(5), 415–426. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/89.5.415>
- 556 Grant, W. S., & Waples, R. S. (2000). Spatial and temporal scales of genetic variability in marine and  
557 anadromous species: implications for fisheries oceanography. In P. J. Harrison & T. R. Parsons (Eds.),  
558 *Fisheries oceanography: an integrative approach to fisheries ecology and management* (pp. 63–93).  
559 Oxford, UK: Blackwell Science.
- 561 Gubili, C., Bilgin, R., Kalkan, E., Karhan, S. Ü., Jones, C. S., Sims, D. W., ... Noble, L. R. (2010).  
562 Antipodean white sharks on a Mediterranean walkabout? Historical dispersal leads to genetic

- 1  
2  
3 563 discontinuity and an endangered anomalous population. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
4 564 *Biological Sciences*, 278(1712), 1679–1686. <https://doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.1856>  
5  
6  
7 565 Gubili, G., Robinson, C. E. C., Cliff, G., Wintner, S. P., de Sabata, E., De Innocentiis, S., ... Jones,  
8 566 C. S. (2015). DNA from historical and trophy samples provides insights into white shark population  
9 567 origins and genetic diversity. *Endangered Species Research* 27(3), 233-241. [https://doi:](https://doi:10.3354/esr00665)  
10 568 10.3354/esr00665  
11  
12  
13  
14 569 Haq, B. U., Hardenbol, J., & Vail, P. R. (1987). Chronology of fluctuating sea levels since the  
15 570 Triassic. *Science*, 235(4793), 1156-1167. <https://doi:10.1126/science.235.4793.1156>  
16 571 Hasegawa, M., Kishino, H., & Yano, T. (1985). Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular  
17 572 clock of mitochondrial DNA. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 22(2), 160-174.  
18  
19  
20  
21 573 Hauser, L., Adcock, G. J., Smith, P. J., Ramirez, J. H. B., & Carvalho, G. R. (2002). Loss of  
22 574 microsatellite diversity and low effective population size in an overexploited population of New  
23 575 Zealand snapper (*Pagrus auratus*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*  
24 576 *States of America*, 99(18), 11742–11747. <https://doi:10.1073/pnas.172242899>  
25  
26  
27  
28 577 ~~Ho, S. Y. W., & Phillips, M. J. (2009). Accounting for calibration uncertainty in phylogenetic~~  
29 578 ~~estimation of evolutionary divergence times. *Systematic Biology*, 58(3), 367-380.~~  
30 579 ~~<https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syp035>~~  
31  
32  
33  
34 580 Hofreiter, M., Serre, D., Poinar, N. H., Kuch, M., & Pääbo, S. (2001). Ancient DNA. *Nature Reviews*  
35 581 *Genetics*, 2, 353-359. <https://doi:10.1038/35072071>  
36  
37  
38 582 ~~Hutchinson, W. F., van Oosterhout, C., Rogers, S. I., & Carvalho, G. R. (2003). Temporal analysis~~  
39 583 ~~of archived samples indicates marked genetic changes in declining North Sea cod (*Gadus morhua*).~~  
40 584 ~~*Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 270(1529), 2125-2132.~~  
41 585 ~~<https://doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2493>~~  
42  
43  
44  
45 586 [Jaramillo, C., Montes, C., Cardona, A., Silvestro, D., Antonelli, A., Bacon, C. D. \(2017\). Comment](#)  
46 587 [\(1\) on “Formation of the Isthmus of Panama” by O’Dea et al. \*Science Advances\*, 3\(6\), e1602321. doi:](#)  
47 588 [10.1126/sciadv.1602321](#)  
48  
49  
50 589 Jorgensen, S. J., Arnoldi, N. S., Estess, E. E., Chapple, T. K., Rückert, M., Anderson, S. D., & Block,  
51 590 B. A. (2012). Eating or meeting? Cluster analysis reveals intricacies of white shark (*Carcharodon*  
52 591 *carcharias*) migration and offshore behavior. *PLOS ONE* 7, e47819.  
53 592 <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0047819>  
54  
55  
56  
57 593 Jorgensen, S. J., Reeb, C. A., Chapple, T. K., Anderson, S., Perle, C., Van Sommeran, S.R., ... Block,  
58 594 A. B. (2010). Philopatry and migration of Pacific white sharks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
59 595 *Biological Sciences*, 277(1682), 679-688. <https://doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1155>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

Kabasakal, H., & Gedikoğlu, Ö. S. (2008). Two new-born great white sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Lamniformes; Lamnidae) from Turkish waters of the north Aegean Sea. *Acta Adriatica*, 49, 125–135.

Kaneps, A. G. (1979). Gulf stream: velocity fluctuations during the late Cenozoic. *Science*, 204(4390), 297-301. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.204.4390.297>

Kohler, N. E., Turner, P. A., Hoey, J. J., Natanson, L. J., & Briggs, R. (2002). Tag and recapture data for three pelagic shark species: blue shark (*Prionace glauca*), shortfin mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus*), and porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) in the North Atlantic Ocean. *ICCAT Collective Volumes of Scientific Papers*, 54, 1231-1260.

Kumar, S., Stecher, G., & Tamura, K. (2016). MEGA7 Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Version 7.0 for Bigger Datasets. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(7), 1870-1874. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw054>

[Lessios, H. A. \(2015\). Appearance of an early closure of the Isthmus of Panama is the product of biased inclusion of data in the metaanalysis. \*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA\*, 112\(43\), E5765-E5765. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1514719112](#)

~~Lotze, H. K., Coll, M., & Dunne, J. A. (2011). Historical changes in marine resources, food-web structure and ecosystem functioning in the Adriatic Sea, Mediterranean. *Ecosystems*, 14(2), 198-222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-010-9404-8>~~

Mancusi, C., Nicolosi, P., Arculeo, M., Barbagli, F., Carlini, R., Costantini, M., ... Vacchi, M. (2002). The presence of elasmobranchs in the collections of the main Italian natural history museums. In M. Vacchi, G. Lamesa, F. Serena, & B. Seret (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th European Elasmobranch Association Meeting 28-30 November 2000* (pp. 97-108). Livorno, Italy: ICRAM, ARPAT & SFI.

Marsili, S. (2008). Systematic, paleoecologic and paleobiogeographic analysis of the Plio-Pleistocene Mediterranean elasmobranch fauna. *Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali, Memorie, Serie A*, 113, 81-88.

~~Marsili, S. (2006). [Analisi Sistematica, Paleoecologica e Paleobiogeografica della Selociofauna plio-pleistocenica del Mediterraneo. University of Pisa. PhD thesis](#)~~

~~Martin, A. P. (1996). [Systematics of the Lamnidae and the Origination Time of Carcharodon carcharias Inferred from the Comparative Analysis of Mitochondrial DNA Sequences. In A. P. Klimley & D. G. Ainley \(Eds.\), \*Great white sharks: the biology of Carcharodon carcharias\* \(pp. 49-53\). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.](#)~~

McPherson, J. M., & Myers, R. A. (2009). How to infer population trends in sparse data: examples with opportunistic sighting records for great white sharks. *Diversity and Distributions* 15(5), 880-890. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2009.00596.x>



- 1  
2  
3 630 [Montes, C., Cardona, A., Jaramillo, C., Pardo, A., Silva, J. C., Valencia, ... Niño, H. \(2015\). Middle](#)  
4 631 [Miocene closure of the Central American Seaway. \*Science\* 348\(6231\), 226–229. doi:](#)  
5 632 [10.1126/science.aaa2815](#)  
6  
7  
8 633 [Myers, R. A., Baum, J. K., Shepherd, T. D., Powers, S. P., Peterson, C. H. \(2007\). Cascading Effects](#)  
9 634 [of the Loss of Apex Predatory Sharks from a Coastal Ocean. \*Science\*, 315\(5820\), 1846–1850. doi:](#)  
10 635 [10.1126/science.1138657](#)  
11  
12  
13  
14 636 Nieto, A., Ralph, G. M., Comerós-Raynal, M. T., Kemp, J., García Criado, M., Allen, D. J., ...  
15 637 Williams, J. T. (2015) *European Red List of marine fishes*. Luxembourg, EU: Rosseels Printing.  
16  
17  
18 638 O’Dea, A., Lessios, H. A., Coates, A. G., Eytan, R. I., Restrepo-Moreno, S. A., Cione, A. L., ...  
19 639 Jackson, J. B. C. (2016). Formation of the Isthmus of Panama. *Science Advances*, 2(8), e1600883.  
20 640 <https://doi:10.1126/sciadv.1600883>  
21  
22  
23 641 O’Leary, S. J., Feldheim, K. A., Fields, A. T., Natanson, L. J., Wintner, S., Hussey, N., ... Chapman,  
24 642 D. D. (2015). Genetic diversity of white sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias*, in the Northwest Atlantic  
25 643 and Southern Africa. *Journal of Heredity*, 106(3), 258–265. <https://doi:10.1093/jhered/esv001>  
26  
27  
28  
29 644 ~~O’Reilly, J. E., & Donoghue, P. C. J. (2016). Tips and nodes are complementary not competing~~  
30 645 ~~approaches to the calibration of molecular clocks. *Biology Letters*, 12(4), 20150975.~~  
31 646 ~~<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0975>~~  
32  
33  
34 647 ~~Paradis, E., Claude, J., & Strimmer, K. (2004). APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R~~  
35 648 ~~language. *Bioinformatics*, 20(2), 289–290. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412>~~  
36  
37  
38 649 Pardini, A. T., Jones, C. S., Noble, L. R., Kreiser, B., Malcolm, H., Bruce, B. D., ... Martin, A. P.  
39 650 (2001). Sex-biased dispersal of great white sharks. *Nature*, 412(6843), 139–140.  
40 651 <http://doi:10.1038/35084125>  
41  
42  
43  
44 652 Pimiento, C., & Clements, C. F. (2014). When did *Carcharocles megalodon* become extinct? A new  
45 653 analysis of the fossil record. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10), e111086.  
46 654 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0111086>  
47  
48  
49 655  
50 656 Pimiento, C., Gonzalez-Barbad, G., Hendy, A. J. W., Jaramillo, C., MacFadden, B. J., Montes, C., ...  
51 657 Shippritt, M. (2013). Early Miocene chondrichthyans from the Culebra formation, Panama: a window  
52 658 into marine vertebrate faunas before closure the Central American Seaway. *Journal of South*  
53 659 *American Earth Sciences*, 42, 159–170. <https://doi:10.1016/j.jsames.2012.11.005>  
54  
55  
56 660  
57 661 Pimiento, C., Griffin, J. N., Clements, C. F., Silvestro, D., Varela, S., Uhen, M. D., & Jaramillo, C.  
58 662 (2017). The Pliocene marine megafauna extinction and its impact on functional diversity. *Nature*  
59 663 *Ecology & Evolution*, 1, 1100–1106. <https://doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0223-6>  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 664 Puncher, G. N. (2015). *Assessment of the population structure and temporal changes in spatial*  
665 *dynamics and genetic characteristics of the Atlantic bluefin tuna under a fishery independent*  
666 *framework*. PhD Thesis, University of Bologna, Italy, and University of Ghent, Belgium.
- 667 Rambaut, A. (2009). FigTree v1.4.3. Retrieved from <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/>
- 668 Rambaut, A., Drummond, A. J., Xie, D., Baele, G., & Suchard, M. A. (2018). Posterior summarisation  
669 in Bayesian phylogenetics using Tracer 1.7. *Systematic Biology*, 67(5), 901–904.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syy032>
- 671 Ree, R. H., & Smith, S. A. (2008). Maximum Likelihood inference of geographic range evolution by  
672 dispersal, local extinction, and cladogenesis. *Systematic Biology*, 57(1), 4–14.  
673 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10635150701883881>
- 674 Riccioni, G., Landi, M., Ferrara, G., Milano, I., Cariani, A., Zane, L., ... Tinti, F. (2010). Spatio  
675 temporal population structuring and genetic diversity retention in depleted Atlantic bluefin tuna of  
676 the Mediterranean Sea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
677 *America*, 107(5), 2102–2107. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0908281107>
- 678 Sperone, E., Parise, G., Leone, A., Milazzo, C., Circosta, V., Santoro, F., ... Tripepi, S. (2012).  
679 Spatiotemporal patterns of distribution of large predatory sharks in Calabria (Central Mediterranean,  
680 Southern Italy). *Acta Adriatica*, 53, 13-24.
- 681 Steeman, M. E., Hebsgaard, M. B., Fordyce, R. E., Ho, S. Y. W., Rabosky, D. L., Nielsen, R., ...  
682 Willerslev, E. (2009). Radiation of Extant Cetaceans Driven by Restructuring of the Oceans.  
683 *Systematic Biology*, 58(6), 573-585. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syp060>
- 684 Stevens, J. D. (2010). Epipelagic Oceanic Elasmobranchs. In J. C. Carrier, J. A. Musick, & M. R.  
685 Heithaus (Eds.), *Sharks and Their Relatives II: Biodiversity, Adaptive Physiology, and Conservation*  
686 (pp. 3-37). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- 687 Storai, T., Mojetta, A., Zuffa, M., Giulian, S. (2000). Nuove segnalazioni di *Carcharodon carcharias*  
688 (L.) nel Mediterraneo centrale. *Atti Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali*, 107, 139-142.
- 689 Storai, T., Vanni, S., Zuffa, M., & Biagi, V. (2005). Presenza di *Carcharodon carcharias* (Linnaeus,  
690 1758) nelle acque toscane (Mar Ligure meridionale e Mar Tirreno settentrionale; Mediterraneo):  
691 analisi e revisione delle segnalazioni (1839-2004). *Atti Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali*, 112,  
692 153-166.
- 693 Suchard, M. A., Lemey, P., Baele, G., Ayres, D. L., Drummond, A. J., & Rambaut, A. (2018).  
694 Bayesian phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using BEAST 1.10. *Virus Evolution*, 4(1),  
695 vey016. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ve/vey016>
- 696



- 1  
2  
3 697 Tamura, K., & Nei, M. (1993). Estimation of the number of nucleotide substitutions in the control  
4 698 region of mitochondrial DNA in humans and chimpanzees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 10(3),  
5 699 512-526. <https://10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a040023>  
6  
7  
8  
9 700 Vandeperre, F., Aires-da-Silva, A., Fontes, J., Santos, M., Serrão Santos, R., & Afonso, P. (2014).  
10 701 Movements of blue sharks (*Prionace glauca*) across their life history. *PLoS ONE* 9(8), e103538.  
11 702 <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103538>  
12  
13  
14 703 Varela, S., González-Hernández, J., Sgarbi, L. F., Marshall, C., Uhen, M. D., Peters, S., &  
15 704 McClennen, M. (2015). paleobioDB: an R package for downloading, visualizing and processing data  
16 705 from the Paleobiology Database. *Ecography*, 38(4), 419–425. <https://doi:10.1111/ecog.01154>  
17  
18  
19  
20 706 Velez-Juarbe, J., Wood, A. R., De Gracia, C., & Hendy, A. J. W. (2015). Evolutionary patterns among  
21 707 living and fossil kogiid sperm whales: evidence from the Neogene of Central America. *PLoS ONE*,  
22 708 10(4), e0123909. <https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0123909>  
23  
24  
25 709 Wandeler, P., Hoeck, P. E. A., & Keller, L. F. (2007). Back to the future: museum specimens in  
26 710 population genetics. *Trends in Ecology Evolution*, 22(12), 634-642.  
27 711 <https://doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.08.017>  
28  
29  
30  
31 712 ~~Willerslev, E., & Cooper, A. (2005). Ancient DNA. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
32 713 *Sciences*, 272(1558), 3-16. <https://doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2813>~~  
33  
34  
35 714 Yu, Y., Harris, A. J., & He, X. (2010). S-DIVA (Statistical Dispersal-Vicariance Analysis): A tool  
36 715 for inferring biogeographic histories. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 56(2), 848-850.  
37 716 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2010.04.011>  
38  
39 717  
40  
41 718 Yu, Y., Harris, A. J., Blair, C., & He, X. J. (2015) RASP (Reconstruct Ancestral State in Phylogenies):  
42 719 a tool for historical biogeography. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 87, 46-49.  
43 720 <https://doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2015.03.008>  
44  
45 721  
46 722

## 48 723 Biosketch

49 724  
50  
51 725 **Agostino Leone** is a researcher of the marine research division at fundación AZTI  
52 726 (<https://www.azti.es/join-azti-tecnalia/team/name/agostino-leone/>), and past PhD student at the  
53 727 University of Bologna in the Tinti Lab. He has broad interests in researches related to marine  
54 728 conservation, ranging from biogeography to population genomics, investigating marine populations  
55 729 structure and their response to different pressures. AL, FT conceived the study; AL, GNP, EC, AC  
56 730 carried out molecular work and sequences analysis; AL, GNP, FF, PDJ, GB carried out statistical  
57 731 analyses; ES, ST, PM, AG, MS, MA, GD, FG, ADA, DM, SV, FS collected specimens; AL, GNP,  
58  
59  
60  
61 732 MA, EC, FS, PDJ, GB, AC, FT drafted the manuscript.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

733

734 **Supporting Information**

735

736 Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version:

737 **Appendix S1** Supplementary methods for the tissue sampling, historical DNA extraction, species-  
738 specific primers design, DNA amplification, sequencing and genetic diversity analysis.

739 **Appendix S2** Supplementary figures

740 **Appendix S3** Supplementary tables

For Peer Review

*Journal of Biogeography***Supporting Information****Pliocene colonization of the Mediterranean by Great White Shark inferred from fossil records, historical jaws, phylogeographic and divergence time analyses**

Agostino Leone, Gregory Neils Puncher, Francesco Ferretti, Emilio Sperone, Sandro Tripepi, Primo Micarelli, Andrea Gambarelli, Maurizio Sarà, Marco Arculeo, Giuliano Doria, Fulvio Garibaldi, Nicola Bressi, Andrea Dall'Asta, Daniela Minelli, Elisabetta Cilli, Stefano Vanni, Fabrizio Serena, Píndaro Díaz-Jaimes, Guy Baele, Alessia Cariani, Fausto Tinti

**Appendix S1** Supplementary methods for the tissue sampling, historical DNA extraction, species-specific primers design, DNA amplification, sequencing and genetic diversity analysis. *Sampling*

**Supplementary methods**

Tissue samples from 18 historical specimens identified as *Carcharodon carcharias*, captured in the Italian Seas from 1823 to the 1980s, were collected from museums and private archives (table S1; figure S1). Due to the cultural importance of the GWS museum specimens, sampling operations were carried out with utmost care to avoid extensive and unsightly damage (e.g. collecting tissue samples from the inner surface of jaws, internal dental pulp of teeth and dried skin debris). When jaws were available, the internal point of attachment between the lower hemi-arches was used for sampling, as it is concealed from public view and is the thickest part of the jaw. In this way, it was possible to drill deep into the jaw and avoid the use of surface materials that could act as a source of contaminants (figure S2). Exogenous DNA was removed by saturating sample surfaces with a 3.0% v/v sodium hypochlorite solution for approximately 10 minutes according to the protocol of Kemp and Smith (Kemp & Smith, 2005). All instruments were sterilized with bleach and UV irradiation between samplings. Holes of 5 mm in diameter were drilled into each jaw using an electric drill set to minimum speed to avoid damage to DNA due to thermal stress (Gibbon, Penny, Štrkalj, & Ruff, 2009). As the drill bit was removed from the cartilaginous jaws and vertebrae, all dust was carefully collected. The amounts of collected tissue ranged from 16 to 409.2 mg. The powdered tissue was then transported to a sterilized laboratory dedicated to aDNA analysis. The resulting holes left in specimens were filled with a low temperature restorative paste commonly used in anthropological studies (figure S2).

*Historical DNA extraction*

Extraction of DNA and polymerase chain reaction set-up were conducted in the “pre-PCR” clean-room of the Laboratory of Genetics & Genomics of Marine Resources and Environment (GenoDREAM) of the University of Bologna, dedicated to the analysis of degraded and low copy number DNA. The most stringent criteria to minimize and detect exogenous contamination in aDNA

1  
2  
3 analysis (Cooper & Poinar, 2000) were followed (e.g. the use of extraction and amplification blanks  
4 as negative controls in each reaction).  
5

6 DNA was extracted from all samples using a protocol modified from Riccioni et al. (2010),  
7 whereby homogenized tissue powder was incubated in EDTA buffer (0.5M, pH 8.0) in a shaker  
8 overnight at room temperature. Samples were then precipitated and incubated in an extraction buffer  
9 (0.1M EDTA, 0.5% N-laurylsarcosine-Na) and Proteinase K (20 mg/mL) for an additional 24 hours  
10 at 44°C. After spinning, 250 µL supernatants were transferred to tubes containing 3.5 µL of 1 µg/µL  
11 Dextran Blue, 250 µL of 4M NH<sub>4</sub>-acetate, and 500 µL of 96% v/v ethanol. After precipitation,  
12 washing and drying, the genomic DNA was re-suspended in 50 µL of distilled sterile water and stored  
13 at -20°C.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 *Design of primer pairs, PCR amplification and sequencing of historical DNA*

20 A fragment of the highly variable fragment of mitochondrial control region (CR) was targeted  
21 for analysis, since it is the most commonly used marker for reconstructing white shark  
22 phylogeography, and because there are available several sequences and haplotypes deposited in the  
23 public repositories (e.g. GenBank). Since historical DNA can be extensively fragmented (Allentoft  
24 et al. 2012), species-specific primers suitable for amplifying short fragments (167-221bp) of  
25 overlapping and adjacent DNA sequence fragments were developed (figure S3). Due to the intrinsic  
26 characteristic of ancient genetic material to be highly damaged, mainly for deamination processes,  
27 resulting in transitions from C to T and G to A (Hansen, Willerslev, Wiuf, Mourier, & Arctander,  
28 2001), at least two independent amplifications were performed for each sample, in order to improve  
29 the detection of the damaged sites. Control region sequences/haplotypes of contemporary GWS  
30 specimens were retrieved from GenBank (table S3) and aligned with MEGA v.7.0.14 (Kumar,  
31 Stecher, & Tamura, 2016). using the ClustalW algorithm (Thompson, Higgins, & Gibson, 1994).  
32 From the alignment, five CR primer pairs (table S2) were designed with the software PRIMER3  
33 v.4.0.0 (Untergasser et al. 2012). These were subsequently tested *in silico* (figure S3) using AmplifX  
34 software, version 1.44 (©Nicolas Jullien 2004-2013; CNRS, Aix-Marseille Université,  
35 <http://crn2m.univ-mrs.fr/pub/amplifx-dist>). PCR conditions for all gene fragments consisted of 3  
36 minutes of denaturation at 94°C, followed by 35 cycles of 30s at 94°C, 30s at 50°C, 30s at 72°C, and  
37 a final extension period of 7 minutes at 72°C. All PCR reactions were performed in a volume of 50  
38 µL containing approximately 10-20ng of template DNA, 1X Tris-HCl, 200mM of each dNTP, 3mM  
39 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.5µM of forward and reverse primers, and 1.25 units of *Taq* DNA Polymerase (Invitrogen).  
40 PCR amplicons were cycle-sequenced from both strands by a commercial sequence service provider  
41 (Macrogen Europe, Amsterdam, Netherlands).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 *Sequence Analysis*

55 The mitochondrial Control Region (CR) partial sequences obtained from the historical samples  
56 were checked and edited using MEGA v.7.0.14 (Kumar, Stecher, & Tamura, 2016) and aligned with  
57 homologous sequences deposited in the GenBank (table S3) using the ClustalW algorithm  
58 (Thompson, Higgins, & Gibson, 1994). The total number of haplotypes and haplotype and nucleotide  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 diversities of the Mediterranean sequences (with associated standard deviations) were estimated using  
4 DnaSP v.5.1 (Librado, & Rosaz, 2009). The genetic diversity data of the global populations were  
5 taken from literature (see results). The relationship between haplotype and nucleotide diversity of  
6 each population was plotted using the R software package (R Core Team, 2008) to investigate GWS  
7 population diversity history. Phylogenetic relationships and haplotype genealogies were inferred  
8 using HapView (Salzburger, Ewing, & von Haeseler, 2011). Maximum likelihood (ML) clustering  
9 was constructed using the DNAML program in PHYLIP v.3.695 (Felsenstein, 2005), run in  
10 HapView. The best evolutionary model used in the phylogenetic analyses was inferred with  
11 JModelTest 2.1.1 (Darriba, Taboada, Doallo, & Posada, 2012), according to the Akaike Information  
12 Criteria (AIC; Akaike, 1974). Subsequently, the Hasegawa-Kishino-Yano model (Hasegawa,  
13 Kishino, & Yano, 1985) with the discrete Gamma distribution (0.8) and allowing for a proportion of  
14 invariant sites (0.4) to exist (HKY85+G+I) was selected as the best-fit model.

15  
16 Since the historical Mediterranean sequence alignment (515bp) was shorter than most of the  
17 CR sequences deposited in the GenBank, a ML haplotype network was also reconstructed using a  
18 longer sequence alignment of 828bp based on haplotypes available in GenBank obtained from global  
19 contemporary GWS populations and specimens, including four Mediterranean sequences previously  
20 reported (table S3). A comparison between the topologies of the two haplotype networks permitted a  
21 test of the potential loss of informative sites in the shorter sequence alignment and the possible effects  
22 this might have on the reconstructed phylogenetic relationships.

### 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 **References of the supplementary methods**

36 Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on*  
37 *Automatic Control*, 19(6), 716–723. <https://doi:10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705>

38  
39 Allentoft, M. E., Collins, M., Harker, D., Haile, J., Oskam, C. L., Hale, M. L., ... Bunce, M., (2012).  
40 The half-life of DNA in bone: measuring decay kinetics in 158 dated fossils. *Proceedings of the Royal*  
41 *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 279(1748), 4724-4733. <https://doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1745>

42  
43 Cooper, A., & Poinar, H. N. (2000). Ancient DNA: do it right or not at all. *Science*, 289(5482), 1139.  
44 <https://doi:10.1126/science.289.5482.1139b>

45  
46 Darriba, D., Taboada, G. L., Doallo, R., & Posada, D. (2012). jModelTest 2: more models, new  
47 heuristics and parallel computing. *Nature Methods*, 9, 772. <https://doi:10.1038/nmeth.2109>

48  
49 Felsenstein, J. (2005). *PHYLIP (Phylogeny Inference Package) version 3.6*. University of  
50 Washington, Seattle. Retrieved from <http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip.html>.


51  
52 Gibbon, V. E., Penny, C. B., Štrkalj, G., & Ruff, P. (2009). Brief Communication: Minimally Invasive  
53 Bone Sampling Method for DNA Analysis. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 139(4), 596-  
54 599. <https://doi:10.1002/ajpa.21048>  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hansen, A. J., Willerslev, E., Wiuf, C., Mourier, T., & Arctander, P. (2001) Statistical Evidence for  
4 Miscoding Lesions in Ancient DNA Templates. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 18(2), 262–265.  
5 <https://doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a003800>.  
6  
7  
8 Hasegawa, M., Kishino, H., & Yano, T. (1985). Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular  
9 clock of mitochondrial DNA. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 22(2), 160-174.  
10  
11  
12 Kemp, B. M., & Smith, D. G. (2005). Use of bleach to eliminate contaminating DNA from the surface  
13 of bones and teeth. *Forensic Science International*, 154(1), 53-61.  
14 <https://doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2004.11.017>  
15  
16  
17  
18 Kumar, S., Stecher, G., & Tamura, K. (2016). MEGA7 Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis  
19 Version 7.0 for Bigger Datasets. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 33(7), 1870-1874.  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msw054>  
21  
22  
23 Librado, P., & Rosaz, J. (2009). DNAsp v5: A software for comprehensive analysis of DNA  
24 polymorphism data. *Bioinformatics*, 25(11), 1451-1452. <https://doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp187>  
25  
26  
27 R Core Team. (2008). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R  
28 Foundation for Statistical Computing.  
29  
30  
31 Riccioni, G., Landi, M., Ferrara, G., Milano, I., Cariani, A., Zane, L., ... Tinti, F. (2010). Spatio  
32 temporal population structuring and genetic diversity retention in depleted Atlantic bluefin tuna of  
33 the Mediterranean Sea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
34 *America*, 107(5), 2102–2107. <https://doi:10.1073/pnas.0908281107>  
35  
36  
37  
38 Salzburger, W., Ewing, G. B., & von Haeseler, A. (2011). The performance of phylogenetic  
39 algorithms in estimating haplotype genealogies with migration. *Molecular Ecology*, 20(9), 1952-  
40 1963. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05066.x>  
41  
42  
43  
44 Thompson, J. D., Higgins, D. G., & Gibson, T. J. (1994). CLUSTAL W: improving the sensitivity  
45 of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap  
46 penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 22(22), 4673-4680.  
47 <https://doi:10.1093/nar/22.22.4673>  
48  
49  
50 Untergrasser A, Cutcutache I, Koressaar T, Ye J, Faircloth BC, Remm M, Rozen SG. 2012 Primer3  
51 - new capabilities and interfaces. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **40**, e115. <https://doi:10.1093/nar/gks596>  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Appendix S2 Supplementary figures


**Figure S1.** a) Jaws of the Great White Shark archived in the Museum of Comparative Anatomy of the University of Bologna. b, c) The cover and original illustrative note from Antonio Alessandrini (1854) “Catalogo degli Oggetti e Preparati più interessanti del Gabinetto D’Anatomia Comparata della Pontificia Università di Bologna dalla sua Fondazione all’ Ottobre del 1852”. The jaws were prepared from a GWS individual (TL = 473 cm) collected in the Adriatic Sea in 1827 and displayed to the public at the University of Bologna. d) Original cover from the publication of Ricciardi (1721) Pontificia Università di Bologna, Italy.



1  
2  
3 **Figure S2.** Illustration of the sampling procedures for the museum specimens of Great White Shark.  
4 a: Tooth pulp extraction from the crown. b-d: Drill sampling from dried jaw and restoration of the  
5 holes.  
6  
7  
8  
9




**Figure S3.** Results of the *in silico* PCR simulation with primer pairs designed for the amplification of the Control Region (CR) of *Carcharodon carcharias* (see Table S2). The annealing positions of the primers with respect to the starting position of the gene on a reference mitochondrial genome (GenBank accession number NC\_022415) was shown in brackets. The length in base pairs (bp) of the amplified fragments are marked in yellow.





**Figure S5.** Bayesian divergence time tree of populations of *Carcharodon carcharias* inferred using the 516bp dataset of control region sequences. High posterior density (HPD 95%) in blue bars. Abbreviations are given in table S2.



Peer Review







1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

### Appendix S3 Supplementary tables

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

**Table S1.** List of the 18 historical specimens of Mediterranean Great White Sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias* collected from museum and private archives.

Specimen code	Geographic area	Sampling year/period	Tissue type*	Source§	Museum/Archive, Biological and Collecting Data
TRCC01AD	Adriatic Sea	1906	V, T	1	Cat. No. 1182. Sex: female. Collecting site: Quarnero Gulf (Istria, Croatia). Collecting date: 29 May 1906. Donor: A. Morin
GECC01LI	Ligurian Sea	1935	J	2	Cat. No. C.E. 32695. Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Riva Trigoso, Sestri Levante (Genoa, Italy). Collecting date: 03 July 1935
GECC02LI	Ligurian Sea	1930s	J	2	Cat. No. C.E. 31916. Sex: unknown. Collecting site: unknown. Collecting date: 17 March 1933. Donor: E. Olivieri
GECC03LI	Ligurian Sea	1958	J, T	2	No detailed data are available
LICC01LI	Ligurian Sea	1950s	J	3	No detailed data are available
BOCC01AD	Adriatic Sea	1823	J	4	Cat. No. 811, Catalogue Alessandrini. 1823 Sex: unknown. Collecting site: unknown. Collecting date: unknown. Additional info: mouth extension of 1.15 m
BOCC02AD	Adriatic Sea	1827	J	4	Cat. No. ACP 114*; 1216 Catalogue Alessandrini. Sex: unknown. Collecting site: unknown. Collecting date: unknown. Additional info: mouth extension of 1.80 m
FICC01LI	Ligurian Sea	1891	J	5	Cat. No. 6032; <i>Carcharodon rondeletii</i> M.H., 2775. Sex: female. Collecting site: Monterosso (Spezia, Italy). Collecting date: 10 December 1891. Additional info: Total length ~600 cm; Weight ~600 Kg. Donor: S.H. Giglioli.
FICC02LI	Ligurian Sea	1879	V, T	5	Cat. No. 5983. Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Viareggio (Lucca, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.
MOCC01LI	Ligurian Sea	1883	J, T	6	Cat. No. 50; <i>Carcharodon rondeletii</i> M.H. Sex: Male. Collecting site: Portofino (Genoa, Italy). Collecting date: January 1883.
PACC01TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	J	7	No detailed data are available
PACC02TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	J	7	No detailed data are available
PACC03TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	J	7	No detailed data are available
FACC01TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	V, M	8	Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Favignana (Trapani, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.
FACC02TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	M	8	Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Favignana (Trapani, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.
FACC03TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	V	8	Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Favignana (Trapani, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.
FACC04TI	Tyrrhenian Sea	1980s	V	8	Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Favignana (Trapani, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.

1 FACC05TI Tyrrhenian Sea 1980s M 8 Sex: unknown. Collecting site: Favignana (Trapani, Italy). Collecting date: unknown.  
2

---

3 \* V: cartilage, vertebrae; T: osteodentine, tooth; J: cartilage, jaws; M; dried skeletal muscle

4  
5 § 1: Civic Museum of Natural History of Trieste; 2: Civic Museum of Natural History of Genova "Giacomo Doria"; 3: Regional Agency for Environmental  
6 Protection of Tuscany, ARPAT Livorno; 4: Museum of Comparative Anatomy, University of Bologna; 5: Museum of Natural History of Firenze "La Specola"; 6:  
7 University Museum of Natural History and Instrumentation of Modena; 7: Museum of Zoology of Palermo "P. Doderlein"; 8: Favignana Tuna Trap  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

For Peer Review

**Table S2.** List of primer pairs (F: forward primer; R: reverse primer) designed for the PCR amplification and sequencing of the CR gene fragments from the historical DNA of Great White Shark.

---

Primer	5'>3' sequence
GWCRA1F:	TGACCTTCACCTAATGGTATCACA
GWCRA1R*:	AAGTCTCTGTGAGTGGAAGGAA
GWCRA2F:	CCTTCACCTAATGGTATCACACTC
GWCRA2R*:	AAGTCTCTGTGAGTGGAAGGAA
GWCRB1F:	TTCCTTCCACTCACAGAGACTT
GWCRB1R:	CAAGGACTGAAGTGTTACAAGCA
GWCRB2F:	TTTATTCCTTCCACTCACAGAGAC
GWCRB2R:	GACGGAAATGCTGTAAAGG

---

\* these two primers have identical sequences

**Table S3.** The mtDNA Control Region (CR) haplotypes and/or sequences of modern Great White Shark deposited and retrieved from the GenBank.

<b>Geographic Origin</b>	<b>Acronym</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>GenBank Accession Number</b>
Australia	AUS	14	[9]	HQ414073 - HQ414086
Australia	AUS	12		
New Zealand	AUS	4	[7]	AY026196 - AY026224
South Africa	SA	13		
Northeastern Pacific	NEP	20	[10]	GU002302 - GU002321
Florida	NWA	2		
Mediterranean	MED	3	[17]	HQ540294 - HQ540298
Mediterranean	MED	1	[27]	JF715925
Northwestern Atlantic	NWA	11		
South Africa	SA	15	[28]	KC511601 - KC511626
South Africa*	SA	4*	[29]	KP058665 - KP058902*

\*During the analyses, the 238 unique sequences from Andreotti et al. [29], were collapsed in the unique four haplotypes observed and added to the final dataset. AUS: Australia/New Zealand; NEP: Northeastern Pacific; MED: Mediterranean; SA: South-Africa; NWA: Northwestern Atlantic.

**Table S4.** Fossil data downloaded from Paleodb (<https://paleobiodb.org/#/>) using the species-specific taxon “*Carcharodon carcharias*” and synonyms. References downloadable from the Paleodb database.

<u>PaleoDB N°</u>	<u>coll no</u>	<u>match no</u>	<u>early interval</u>	<u>Epoch</u>	<u>early age</u>	<u>late age</u>	<u>Ref no</u>	<u>longitude</u>	<u>latitude</u>
<a href="#">248318</a>	<a href="#">24237</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Tortonian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.62</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">6853</a>	<a href="#">-79.800.003</a>	<a href="#">9.35</a>
<a href="#">248318</a>	<a href="#">24237</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Tortonian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.62</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">6853</a>	<a href="#">-79.800.003</a>	<a href="#">9.35</a>
<a href="#">465463</a>	<a href="#">45458</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12282</a>	<a href="#">-115.175.552</a>	<a href="#">28.114.721</a>
<a href="#">465463</a>	<a href="#">45458</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12282</a>	<a href="#">-115.175.552</a>	<a href="#">28.114.721</a>
<a href="#">465581</a>	<a href="#">13079</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12182</a>	<a href="#">-74.719.719</a>	<a href="#">-15.580.833</a>
<a href="#">465581</a>	<a href="#">13079</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12182</a>	<a href="#">-74.719.719</a>	<a href="#">-15.580.833</a>
<a href="#">465597</a>	<a href="#">46083</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12182</a>	<a href="#">-74.690.277</a>	<a href="#">-15.557.222</a>
<a href="#">465597</a>	<a href="#">46083</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">12182</a>	<a href="#">-74.690.277</a>	<a href="#">-15.557.222</a>
<a href="#">504614</a>	<a href="#">51304</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Calabrian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">13658</a>	<a href="#">139.516.663</a>	<a href="#">35.383.331</a>
<a href="#">504614</a>	<a href="#">51304</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Calabrian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">13658</a>	<a href="#">139.516.663</a>	<a href="#">35.383.331</a>
<a href="#">506112</a>	<a href="#">51328</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">141.603.058</a>	<a href="#">-38.361.942</a>
<a href="#">506112</a>	<a href="#">51328</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">141.603.058</a>	<a href="#">-38.361.942</a>
<a href="#">506149</a>	<a href="#">51335</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">141.944.443</a>	<a href="#">-37.728.333</a>
<a href="#">506149</a>	<a href="#">51335</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">141.944.443</a>	<a href="#">-37.728.333</a>
<a href="#">506450</a>	<a href="#">46068</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">14.796.666</a>	<a href="#">-37.854.721</a>
<a href="#">506450</a>	<a href="#">46068</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">14.796.666</a>	<a href="#">-37.854.721</a>
<a href="#">506468</a>	<a href="#">51405</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">138.609.726</a>	<a href="#">-34.833.332</a>
<a href="#">506468</a>	<a href="#">51405</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">138.609.726</a>	<a href="#">-34.833.332</a>
<a href="#">506557</a>	<a href="#">51414</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">148.083.328</a>	<a href="#">-39.983.334</a>
<a href="#">506557</a>	<a href="#">51414</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">13672</a>	<a href="#">148.083.328</a>	<a href="#">-39.983.334</a>
<a href="#">518397</a>	<a href="#">52644</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Calabrian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">14149</a>	<a href="#">-52.326.389</a>	<a href="#">-32.388.332</a>
<a href="#">518397</a>	<a href="#">52644</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Calabrian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.806</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">14149</a>	<a href="#">-52.326.389</a>	<a href="#">-32.388.332</a>
<a href="#">520948</a>	<a href="#">28039</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Waipipian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">3</a>	<a href="#">14399</a>	<a href="#">17.428.334</a>	<a href="#">-39.583.332</a>
<a href="#">520948</a>	<a href="#">28039</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Waipipian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">3</a>	<a href="#">14399</a>	<a href="#">17.428.334</a>	<a href="#">-39.583.332</a>
<a href="#">533364</a>	<a href="#">20400</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Irvingtonian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.8</a>	<a href="#">0.3</a>	<a href="#">1960</a>	<a href="#">-82.5</a>	<a href="#">27.700.001</a>
<a href="#">533364</a>	<a href="#">20400</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Irvingtonian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.8</a>	<a href="#">0.3</a>	<a href="#">1960</a>	<a href="#">-82.5</a>	<a href="#">27.700.001</a>
<a href="#">558936</a>	<a href="#">58089</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Irvingtonian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.8</a>	<a href="#">0.3</a>	<a href="#">15601</a>	<a href="#">-80.811.386</a>	<a href="#">27.830.278</a>
<a href="#">558936</a>	<a href="#">58089</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Irvingtonian</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">1.8</a>	<a href="#">0.3</a>	<a href="#">15601</a>	<a href="#">-80.811.386</a>	<a href="#">27.830.278</a>
<a href="#">593653</a>	<a href="#">52582</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">18094</a>	<a href="#">-76.817.497</a>	<a href="#">35.359.722</a>
<a href="#">593653</a>	<a href="#">52582</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">18094</a>	<a href="#">-76.817.497</a>	<a href="#">35.359.722</a>

1	<a href="#">634589</a>	<a href="#">68271</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">19640</a>	<a href="#">-71.5</a>	<a href="#">-30.333.332</a>
2	<a href="#">634589</a>	<a href="#">68271</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">19640</a>	<a href="#">-71.5</a>	<a href="#">-30.333.332</a>
3	<a href="#">634589</a>	<a href="#">68271</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">19640</a>	<a href="#">-71.5</a>	<a href="#">-30.333.332</a>
4	<a href="#">639047</a>	<a href="#">55535</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">19852</a>	<a href="#">-70.841.667</a>	<a href="#">-27.080.833</a>
5	<a href="#">639047</a>	<a href="#">55535</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Messinian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">19852</a>	<a href="#">-70.841.667</a>	<a href="#">-27.080.833</a>
6	<a href="#">645725</a>	<a href="#">69730</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Tortonian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.62</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">23394</a>	<a href="#">-7.087.944</a>	<a href="#">-27.139.168</a>
7	<a href="#">645725</a>	<a href="#">69730</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Tortonian</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.62</a>	<a href="#">7.246</a>	<a href="#">23394</a>	<a href="#">-7.087.944</a>	<a href="#">-27.139.168</a>
8	<a href="#">645727</a>	<a href="#">69731</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">23394</a>	<a href="#">-7.087.944</a>	<a href="#">-27.139.168</a>
9	<a href="#">645727</a>	<a href="#">69731</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">23394</a>	<a href="#">-7.087.944</a>	<a href="#">-27.139.168</a>
10	<a href="#">645727</a>	<a href="#">69731</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">23394</a>	<a href="#">-7.087.944</a>	<a href="#">-27.139.168</a>
11	<a href="#">706800</a>	<a href="#">45480</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">24838</a>	<a href="#">10.737.222</a>	<a href="#">43.636.665</a>
12	<a href="#">706800</a>	<a href="#">45480</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">24838</a>	<a href="#">10.737.222</a>	<a href="#">43.636.665</a>
13	<a href="#">716083</a>	<a href="#">76844</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">25983</a>	<a href="#">120.407.219</a>	<a href="#">23.048.889</a>
14	<a href="#">716083</a>	<a href="#">76844</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">25983</a>	<a href="#">120.407.219</a>	<a href="#">23.048.889</a>
15	<a href="#">716083</a>	<a href="#">76844</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">25983</a>	<a href="#">120.407.219</a>	<a href="#">23.048.889</a>
16	<a href="#">732439</a>	<a href="#">78614</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Middle Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">15.97</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">26436</a>	<a href="#">9.273.333</a>	<a href="#">22.883.333</a>
17	<a href="#">732439</a>	<a href="#">78614</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Middle Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">15.97</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">26436</a>	<a href="#">9.273.333</a>	<a href="#">22.883.333</a>
18	<a href="#">789236</a>	<a href="#">20646</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">0.126</a>	<a href="#">0.0117</a>	<a href="#">28773</a>	<a href="#">-118.199.997</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
19	<a href="#">789236</a>	<a href="#">20646</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">0.126</a>	<a href="#">0.0117</a>	<a href="#">28773</a>	<a href="#">-118.199.997</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
20	<a href="#">789236</a>	<a href="#">20646</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">0.126</a>	<a href="#">0.0117</a>	<a href="#">28773</a>	<a href="#">-118.199.997</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
21	<a href="#">803512</a>	<a href="#">42842</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">23.03</a>	<a href="#">15.97</a>	<a href="#">29458</a>	<a href="#">8.672.139</a>	<a href="#">21.934.999</a>
22	<a href="#">803512</a>	<a href="#">42842</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">23.03</a>	<a href="#">15.97</a>	<a href="#">29458</a>	<a href="#">8.672.139</a>	<a href="#">21.934.999</a>
23	<a href="#">807796</a>	<a href="#">88328</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">29650</a>	<a href="#">10.888.611</a>	<a href="#">43.672.222</a>
24	<a href="#">807796</a>	<a href="#">88328</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">29650</a>	<a href="#">10.888.611</a>	<a href="#">43.672.222</a>
25	<a href="#">807796</a>	<a href="#">88328</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Piacenzian</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">29650</a>	<a href="#">10.888.611</a>	<a href="#">43.672.222</a>
26	<a href="#">899319</a>	<a href="#">100174</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">34371</a>	<a href="#">-70.534.447</a>	<a href="#">-233.575</a>
27	<a href="#">899319</a>	<a href="#">100174</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">34371</a>	<a href="#">-70.534.447</a>	<a href="#">-233.575</a>
28	<a href="#">899319</a>	<a href="#">100174</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">34371</a>	<a href="#">-70.534.447</a>	<a href="#">-233.575</a>
29	<a href="#">981089</a>	<a href="#">117471</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">37795</a>	<a href="#">-122.446.381</a>	<a href="#">3.747.015</a>
30	<a href="#">981089</a>	<a href="#">117471</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">37795</a>	<a href="#">-122.446.381</a>	<a href="#">3.747.015</a>
31	<a href="#">981089</a>	<a href="#">117471</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">37795</a>	<a href="#">-122.446.381</a>	<a href="#">3.747.015</a>
32	<a href="#">984829</a>	<a href="#">118104</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">38036</a>	<a href="#">-0.676944</a>	<a href="#">38.084.999</a>
33	<a href="#">984829</a>	<a href="#">118104</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">38036</a>	<a href="#">-0.676944</a>	<a href="#">38.084.999</a>
34	<a href="#">984829</a>	<a href="#">118104</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">38036</a>	<a href="#">-0.676944</a>	<a href="#">38.084.999</a>
35	<a href="#">1087691</a>	<a href="#">136597</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">43697</a>	<a href="#">14.004.444</a>	<a href="#">32.732.498</a>
36	<a href="#">1087691</a>	<a href="#">136597</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">43697</a>	<a href="#">14.004.444</a>	<a href="#">32.732.498</a>
37	<a href="#">1087691</a>	<a href="#">136597</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Zanclean</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">43697</a>	<a href="#">14.004.444</a>	<a href="#">32.732.498</a>
38	<a href="#">1192384</a>	<a href="#">154111</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49963</a>	<a href="#">13.3</a>	<a href="#">-8.75</a>
39	<a href="#">1192384</a>	<a href="#">154111</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49963</a>	<a href="#">13.3</a>	<a href="#">-8.75</a>
40	<a href="#">1192384</a>	<a href="#">154111</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49963</a>	<a href="#">13.3</a>	<a href="#">-8.75</a>
41	<a href="#">1192476</a>	<a href="#">154117</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49968</a>	<a href="#">-112.291.389</a>	<a href="#">27.368.055</a>
42	<a href="#">1192476</a>	<a href="#">154117</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49968</a>	<a href="#">-112.291.389</a>	<a href="#">27.368.055</a>
43	<a href="#">1192476</a>	<a href="#">154117</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49968</a>	<a href="#">-112.291.389</a>	<a href="#">27.368.055</a>
44	<a href="#">1192505</a>	<a href="#">154118</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49969</a>	<a href="#">-109.616.669</a>	<a href="#">23.166.668</a>
45	<a href="#">1192505</a>	<a href="#">154118</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49969</a>	<a href="#">-109.616.669</a>	<a href="#">23.166.668</a>
46	<a href="#">1192505</a>	<a href="#">154118</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49969</a>	<a href="#">-109.616.669</a>	<a href="#">23.166.668</a>



1	<a href="#">1192505</a>	<a href="#">154118</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">49969</a>	<a href="#">-109.616.669</a>	<a href="#">23.166.668</a>
2	<a href="#">1221552</a>	<a href="#">159914</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">52184</a>	<a href="#">138.600.006</a>	<a href="#">-34.916.668</a>
3	<a href="#">1221552</a>	<a href="#">159914</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">3.6</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">52184</a>	<a href="#">138.600.006</a>	<a href="#">-34.916.668</a>
4	<a href="#">1227809</a>	<a href="#">161451</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">52598</a>	<a href="#">139.645.554</a>	<a href="#">35.447.498</a>
5	<a href="#">1227809</a>	<a href="#">161451</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">52598</a>	<a href="#">139.645.554</a>	<a href="#">35.447.498</a>
6	<a href="#">1228090</a>	<a href="#">161503</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">52618</a>	<a href="#">13.696.666</a>	<a href="#">36.763.889</a>
7	<a href="#">1228090</a>	<a href="#">161503</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Early Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">2.588</a>	<a href="#">0.781</a>	<a href="#">52618</a>	<a href="#">13.696.666</a>	<a href="#">36.763.889</a>
8	<a href="#">1234295</a>	<a href="#">162457</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">52569</a>	<a href="#">-81.650.002</a>	<a href="#">30.33</a>
9	<a href="#">1234295</a>	<a href="#">162457</a>	<a href="#">83174</a>	<a href="#">Late Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">52569</a>	<a href="#">-81.650.002</a>	<a href="#">30.33</a>
10	<a href="#">1236423</a>	<a href="#">162703</a>	<a href="#">132707</a>	<a href="#">Late Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">52975</a>	<a href="#">4.304.722</a>	<a href="#">39.850.555</a>
11	<a href="#">1236423</a>	<a href="#">162703</a>	<a href="#">132707</a>	<a href="#">Late Miocene</a>	<a href="#">Miocene</a>	<a href="#">11.608</a>	<a href="#">5.333</a>	<a href="#">52975</a>	<a href="#">4.304.722</a>	<a href="#">39.850.555</a>

**Table S5.** Fossil data from the Mediterranean area. For museal fossil teeth catalogued from 1 to 87 see S. Marsili (2006).

<u>n</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Stratigraphic References</u>
<a href="#">1a</a>	<a href="#">Salsomaggiore Terme, Parma, Emilia-Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Bianucci et al. 2002</a>	<a href="#">Bianucci et al. 1998</a>
<a href="#">2a</a>	<a href="#">Guardamar del Segura, Alicante (Spain) Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Adnet et al. 2009</a>	
<a href="#">1</a>	<a href="#">Terreti, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup./Pleistocene ?</a>	<a href="#">Seguenza, 1901</a>	<a href="#">Gaetani et al., 1986.</a>
<a href="#">2</a>	<a href="#">Nasiti e S.Agata, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Seguenza, 1901</a>	<a href="#">Lombardo</a>
<a href="#">3</a>	<a href="#">Cetona (vicinanze), Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Principi, 1920</a>	
<a href="#">4</a>	<a href="#">Castiglione del Lago (a Ovest di), Perugia: Umbria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Principi, 1920</a>	
<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">Città della Pieve, Perugia: Umbria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Principi, 1920</a>	
<a href="#">6</a>	<a href="#">Imola (varie località): Emilia Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Scarabelli (De Stefano, 1911)</a>	
<a href="#">7</a>	<a href="#">Imola (varie località): Emilia Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Scarabelli (De Stefano, 1911)</a>	
<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">Castell'Arquato, Piacenza: Emilia Romagna (Italy).</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">De Stefano, 1912</a>	
<a href="#">9</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Landini, 1977</a>	
<a href="#">10</a>	<a href="#">Punta Ristola, Capo di Leuca, Lecce: Puglia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle</a>	<a href="#">Menesini, 1968</a>	
<a href="#">11</a>	<a href="#">Torre del Lago, Lucca: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Ghelardoni, 1956</a>	
<a href="#">12</a>	<a href="#">Calanna, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup.</a>	<a href="#">De Stefano, 1901</a>	<a href="#">Barrier et al., 1986.</a>
<a href="#">13</a>	<a href="#">Castell'Arquato, Piacenza: Emilia Romagna (Italy).</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Carraroli, 1897</a>	

14	<a href="#">Rometta, Messina: Sicilia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup.-Pleistocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Seguenza, 1900</a>	<a href="#">For Violanti, 1989</a>
15	<a href="#">Milazzo, Messina: Sicilia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup ?</a>	<a href="#">Seguenza, 1900</a>	
16	<a href="#">Guardamar del segura, Alicante: Valezia (Spain)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Mora Morote, 1996</a>	
17	<a href="#">Ruvo del Monte, Potenza: Basilicata (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Bassani, 1901</a>	
18	<a href="#">Taranto: Puglia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Bassani, 1905</a>	
19	<a href="#">Volpedo, Alessandria: Piemonte (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle-sup</a>	<a href="#">De Alessandri, 1895</a>	<a href="#">Gabba, 82</a>
20	<a href="#">Ruvo del Monte, Potenza: Basilicata (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	
21	<a href="#">S.Agata , Reggio Calabria: Calabria(Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	<a href="#">Lombardo</a>
22	<a href="#">Terreti, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	<a href="#">Gaetani et al., 1986.</a>
23	<a href="#">Reggio, Nasiti, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	
24	<a href="#">Capo di Leuca, Lecce: Puglia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	<a href="#">Bossio et al., 2001</a>
25	<a href="#">San Demetrio Corone, Cosenza: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	
26	<a href="#">Tabiano, Piacenza: Emilia Romagna (Italy);.</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">De Stefano, 1912</a>	
27	<a href="#">Calanna, Reggio Calabria: Calabria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup.</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	<a href="#">Barrier et al., 1986.</a> <a href="#">Iannone et al., 1979;</a> <a href="#">Cherubini et al., 1996; Pomar et al., 2001.</a>
28	<a href="#">Matera: Basilicata (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene sup.-Pleistocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Pasquale, 1903</a>	
29	<a href="#">Sestano e Medano, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Manganelli &amp; Spadini, 2003</a>	
30	<a href="#">San Quirico d'Orcia, Giustringona, Terre Rosse e I Sodi, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle</a>	<a href="#">Manganelli &amp; Spadini, 2003</a>	
31	<a href="#">Allerona, Terni: Umbria (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle</a>	<a href="#">Bellocchio et al., 1991</a>	
32	<a href="#">Guardamar del segura, Alicante: Valezia (Spain)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.</a>	<a href="#">Mora Morote, 1996</a> <a href="#">De Stefano, 1910: Collection</a>	
33	<a href="#">Colline Toscane (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Lawley di Bologna</a> <a href="#">De Stefano, 1910: Collection</a>	
34	<a href="#">Colline Toscane (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Lawley di Bologna</a>	
35	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>	
36	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
37	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
38	<a href="#">Val d'Orcia: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
39	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
40	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
41	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
42	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
43	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	
44	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>	

1				
2	<a href="#">45</a>		<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
3	<a href="#">46</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
4	<a href="#">47</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
5	<a href="#">48</a>	<a href="#">San Frediano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
6	<a href="#">49</a>	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
7	<a href="#">50</a>	<a href="#">Colline Senesi: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
8	<a href="#">51</a>		<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
9	<a href="#">52</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
10	<a href="#">53</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
11	<a href="#">54</a>	<a href="#">San Vivaldo, Firenze: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
12	<a href="#">55</a>	<a href="#">San Quirico d'Orcia, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
13	<a href="#">56</a>	<a href="#">Colline Senesi: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
14	<a href="#">57</a>	<a href="#">Chiusi, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
15	<a href="#">58</a>		<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
16	<a href="#">59</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
17	<a href="#">60</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
18	<a href="#">61</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
19	<a href="#">62</a>	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
20	<a href="#">63</a>	<a href="#">Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
21	<a href="#">64</a>	<a href="#">San Quirico d'Orcia, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
22	<a href="#">65</a>	<a href="#">Bagni di Casciana, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
23	<a href="#">66</a>	<a href="#">Orciano, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
24	<a href="#">67</a>	<a href="#">San Quirico d'Orcia, Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
25	<a href="#">68</a>	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
26	<a href="#">69</a>	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
27	<a href="#">70</a>	<a href="#">Santa Luce, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection fossil teeth di Firenze</a>
28	<a href="#">71</a>	<a href="#">Rione Castellana, Palermo: Sicilia (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pleistocene</a>	<a href="#">Gemellaro, 1913</a>
29	<a href="#">72</a>	<a href="#">Pradalbino (varie loc.), Bologna: Emilia Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Vinassa de Regny, 1899</a>
30	<a href="#">73</a>	<a href="#">Pradalbino (varie loc.), Bologna: Emilia Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Vinassa de Regny, 1900</a>
31	<a href="#">74</a>	<a href="#">Orciano; Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Bassani, 1901</a>
32	<a href="#">75</a>	<a href="#">San Quirico d'Orcia (dintorni), Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Simonelli, 1880</a>
33	<a href="#">76</a>	<a href="#">unknown locality</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
34	<a href="#">77</a>	<a href="#">unknown locality</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				

78	<a href="#">? Monte Follonico(1), Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
79	<a href="#">Monte Follonico, Siena; ? Volterra(1), Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
80	<a href="#">Pod. Casabianca (Trequanda), Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
81	<a href="#">Medane (Asciano), Siena: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Accademia Fisiocritici di Siena</a>
82	<a href="#">Volterra, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene inf.-middle</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>
83	<a href="#">Pontedera, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>
84	<a href="#">Piacentino: Emilia Romagna (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>
85	<a href="#">Terricciola, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>
86	<a href="#">Val di Cecina: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>
87	<a href="#">Peccioli, Pisa: Toscana (Italy)</a>	<a href="#">Pliocene</a>	<a href="#">Collection Lawley di Pisa</a>

<b>PaleoDB-N°</b>	<b>early_age (Ma)</b>	<b>late_age (Ma)</b>	<b>early_age_interval</b>	<b>epoch</b>	<b>longitude</b>	<b>latitude</b>
49	0.126	0.0117	Late-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	-118.199.997	34
50	0.126	0.0117	Late-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	-118.199.997	34
25	1.8	0.3	Irvingtonian	Pleistocene	-82.5	27.700.001
26	1.8	0.3	Irvingtonian	Pleistocene	-82.5	27.700.001
27	1.8	0.3	Irvingtonian	Pleistocene	-80.811.386	27.830.278
28	1.8	0.3	Irvingtonian	Pleistocene	-80.811.386	27.830.278
9	1.806	0.781	Calabrian	Pleistocene	139.516.663	35.383.331
10	1.806	0.781	Calabrian	Pleistocene	139.516.663	35.383.331
21	1.806	0.781	Calabrian	Pleistocene	-52.326.389	-32.388.332
22	1.806	0.781	Calabrian	Pleistocene	-52.326.389	-32.388.332
43	2.588	0.781	Early-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	120.407.219	23.048.889
44	2.588	0.781	Early-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	120.407.219	23.048.889
77	2.588	0.781	Early-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	13.696.666	36.763.889
78	2.588	0.781	Early-Pleistocene	Pleistocene	13.696.666	36.763.889
17	3.6	1.806	Piacenzian	Pliocene	138.609.726	-34.833.332
18	3.6	1.806	Piacenzian	Pliocene	138.609.726	-34.833.332
41	3.6	2.588	Piacenzian	Pliocene	10.737.222	43.636.665
42	3.6	2.588	Piacenzian	Pliocene	10.737.222	43.636.665

1							
2	53	3.6	2.588	Piacenzian	Pliocene	10.888.611	43.672.222
3	54	3.6	2.588	Piacenzian	Pliocene	10.888.611	43.672.222
4	55	3.6	2.588	Late-Pliocene	Pliocene	-70.534.447	-233.575
5	56	3.6	2.588	Late-Pliocene	Pliocene	-70.534.447	-233.575
6	73	3.6	2.588	Late-Pliocene	Pliocene	138.600.006	-34.916.668
7	74	3.6	2.588	Late-Pliocene	Pliocene	138.600.006	-34.916.668
8	74	3.6	2.588	Late-Pliocene	Pliocene	138.600.006	-34.916.668
9	23	3.6	3	Waipipian	Pliocene	17.428.334	-39.583.332
10	24	3.6	3	Waipipian	Pliocene	17.428.334	-39.583.332
11	19	5.333	2.588	Early-Pliocene	Pliocene	148.083.328	-39.983.334
12	20	5.333	2.588	Early-Pliocene	Pliocene	148.083.328	-39.983.334
13	20	5.333	2.588	Early-Pliocene	Pliocene	148.083.328	-39.983.334
14	65	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	13.3	-8.75
15	66	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	13.3	-8.75
16	66	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	13.3	-8.75
17	69	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	-112.291.389	27.368.055
18	70	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	-112.291.389	27.368.055
19	71	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	-109.616.669	23.166.668
20	72	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	-109.616.669	23.166.668
21	72	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	-109.616.669	23.166.668
22	75	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	139.645.554	35.447.498
23	76	5.333	2.588	Pliocene	Pliocene	139.645.554	35.447.498
24	11	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	141.603.058	-38.361.942
25	12	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	141.603.058	-38.361.942
26	12	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	141.603.058	-38.361.942
27	13	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	141.944.443	-37.728.333
28	14	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	141.944.443	-37.728.333
29	15	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	14.796.666	-37.854.721
30	16	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	14.796.666	-37.854.721
31	16	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	14.796.666	-37.854.721
32	29	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-76.817.497	35.359.722
33	30	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-76.817.497	35.359.722
34	31	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-71.5	-30.333.332
35	32	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-71.5	-30.333.332
36	32	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-71.5	-30.333.332
37	37	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-7.087.944	-27.139.168
38	38	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-7.087.944	-27.139.168
39	59	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-122.446.381	3.747.015
40	60	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-122.446.381	3.747.015
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

1							
2	61	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-0.676944	38.084.999
3	62	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	-0.676944	38.084.999
4	63	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	14.004.444	32.732.498
5	64	5.333	3.6	Zanclean	Pliocene	14.004.444	32.732.498
6							
7	3	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-115.175.552	28.114.721
8	4	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-115.175.552	28.114.721
9	5	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-74.719.719	-15.580.833
10	6	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-74.719.719	-15.580.833
11	7	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-74.690.277	-15.557.222
12	8	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-74.690.277	-15.557.222
13							
14	33	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-70.841.667	-27.080.833
15	34	7.246	5.333	Messinian	Late Miocene	-70.841.667	-27.080.833
16							
17	79	11.608	5.333	Late Miocene	Late Miocene	-81.650.002	30.33
18	80	11.608	5.333	Late Miocene	Late Miocene	-81.650.002	30.33
19	81	11.608	5.333	Late Miocene	Late Miocene	4.304.722	39.850.555
20	82	11.608	5.333	Late Miocene	Late Miocene	4.304.722	39.850.555
21							
22	1	11.62	7.246	Tortonian	Late Miocene	-79.800.003	9.35
23	2	11.62	7.246	Tortonian	Late Miocene	-79.800.003	9.35
24	35	11.62	7.246	Tortonian	Late Miocene	-7.087.944	-27.139.168
25	36	11.62	7.246	Tortonian	Late Miocene	-7.087.944	-27.139.168
26							
27	67	15.97	3.6	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	-70.833.336	-27.133.333
28	68	15.97	3.6	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	-70.833.336	-27.133.333
29	39	15.97	11.608	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	90.666.664	25.166.668
30	40	15.97	11.608	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	90.666.664	25.166.668
31							
32	45	15.97	11.608	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	9.273.333	22.883.333
33	46	15.97	11.608	Middle Miocene	Middle Miocene	9.273.333	22.883.333
34							
35	57	23.03	2.588	Miocene	Early Miocene	-70.966.667	-27.633.333
36	58	23.03	2.588	Miocene	Early Miocene	-70.966.667	-27.633.333
37	47	23.03	15.97	Early Miocene	Early Miocene	93	23
38	48	23.03	15.97	Early Miocene	Early Miocene	93	23
39							
40	51	23.03	15.97	Early Miocene	Early Miocene	8.672.139	21.934.999
41	52	23.03	15.97	Early Miocene	Early Miocene	8.672.139	21.934.999
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

For Peer Review

**Table S65.** Control Region diversity of the Mediterranean and global populations of *Carcharodon carcharias*.

Population	Acronym	N	Nh	$h \pm SD$	$\pi \pm SD$	Reference
Mediterranean	MED	22*	3	0.091 $\pm$ 0.124	0.0002 $\pm$ 0.0007	This work
Australia-New Zealand	AUS	94	14	0.880 $\pm$ 0.015	0.0085 $\pm$ 0.0045	[7,9]
Northeastern Pacific	NEP	59	20	0.790 na	0.0013 $\pm$ 0.0009	[10]
South Africa	SA	34	15	0.720 na	0.0059 na	[28]
South Africa	SA*	238	4	0.205	0.0027	[29]

Acronyms are given in table S3.

N: number of individuals analysed; Nh: number of haplotypes;  $h$ : haplotype diversity;  $\pi$  nucleotide diversity; SD: Standard deviation

\* this sample included sequence records from GenBank (Acc. Num. JF715925, HQ540294, HQ540295, HQ540296).

**Table S6.** Best model selection based on Bayes factors using alternative primary calibration. logML\_GSS: log marginal likelihood from generalized stepping stone model, BF\_GSS: Bayes factors calculated using the logML\_GSS. Molecular clock test performed by comparing the Maximum Likelihood values for the given topology with and without the molecular clock constraints under Hasegawa-Kishino-Yano (1985) model (+G+I) [39]. The null hypothesis of equal evolutionary rate throughout the tree was not rejected at a 5% significance level. Significance:  $P = 0.14$  ( $P$ -value less than 0.05 is used to reject the hypothesis of equal evolutionary rate throughout the tree). The analysis involved 56 nucleotide sequences. All positions with less than 95% site coverage were eliminated. That is, fewer than 5% alignment gaps, missing data, and ambiguous bases were allowed at any position. There was a total of 1,080 nucleotide positions in the final dataset. Evolutionary analyses were conducted with MEGA7 v.7.0.14 [31].

Constraint	lnL	Parameters	+G	+I
With Clock	-2887.856	61	0.868	0.48
Without Clock	-2826.106	115	0.91	0.47

Model	Dataset	Node1	Node2	logML_GSS	logBF_GSS
MED Pliocene divergence	828bp	<i>C.carcharias/L.nasus</i> divergence	MED/Pacific		
		Mean: 46 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma	Mean: 3.0 Ma, SD: 0.3 Ma	-3210.6566	0 (Best)
MED Pleistocene divergence	828bp	<i>C.carcharias/L.nasus</i> divergence	MED/Pacific		
		Mean: 46 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma	Mean: 0.4Ma, SD: 0.15 Ma	-3215.5172	4.8606
MED Pleistocene divergence	516bp	<i>C.carcharias/L.nasus</i> divergence	MED/Pacific		
		Offset: 46 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma	Mean: 3.0 Ma, SD: 0.3 Ma	-1905,6997	0

1  
2 MED Pliocene divergence 516bp *C.carcharias/L.nasus* divergence MED/Pacific  
3  
4  
5 Offset: 46 Ma, SD: 1.0 Ma Mean: 0.4Ma, SD: 0.15 Ma -1914,4034 8.7037  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

For Peer Review