Historical specimens and the limits of subspecies phylogenomics in the New World quails (Odontophoridae)
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**ABSTRACT**

As phylogenomics focuses on comprehensive taxon sampling at the species and population/subspecies levels, incorporating genomic data from historical specimens has become increasingly common. While historical samples can fill critical gaps in our understanding of the evolutionary history of diverse groups, they also introduce additional sources of phylogenomic uncertainty, making it difficult to discern novel evolutionary relationships from artifacts caused by sample quality issues. These problems highlight the need for improved strategies to disentangle artifactual patterns from true biological signal as historical specimens become more prevalent in phylogenomic datasets. Here, we tested the limits of historical specimen-driven phylogenomics to resolve subspecies-level relationships within a highly polytypic family, the New World quails (Odontophoridae), using thousands of ultraconserved elements (UCEs). We found that relationships at and above the species-level were well-resolved and highly supported across all analyses, with the exception of discordant relationships within the two most polytypic genera which included many historical specimens. We examined the causes of discordance and found that inferring phylogenies from subsets of taxa resolved the disagreements, suggesting that analyzing subclades can help remove artifactual causes of discordance in datasets that include historical samples. At the subspecies-level, we found well-resolved geographic structure within the two most polytypic genera, including the most polytypic species in this family, Northern Bobwhites (*Colinus virginianus*), demonstrating that variable sites within UCEs are capable of resolving phylogenetic structure below the species level. Our results highlight the importance of complete taxonomic sampling for resolving relationships among polytypic species, often through the inclusion of historical specimens, and we propose an integrative strategy for understanding and addressing the uncertainty that historical samples sometimes introduce to phylogenetic analyses.

**1. Introduction**

Phylogenomic studies during the previous two decades have used increasing numbers of loci to resolve relationships at finer and finer taxonomic scales from families (Hackett et al., 2008) to genera (Burleigh et al., 2015) to species (Harvey et al., 2020). Although some of these deeper relationships are still debated (Reddy et al., 2017), the attention of phylogenetics has begun to turn towards resolving relationships at and below the species level (Harvey et al., 2016). Dense sampling at the species and subspecies levels has historically been limited by the cost of generating sequence data and the availability of tissues suitable for DNA extraction. However, improvements in sequencing and laboratory techniques have provided solutions to both problems by reducing the unit cost of sequencing and enabling the collection of genome-scale data from contemporary and historical sources, such as museum specimens (Bi et al., 2013; Derkarabetian et al., 2019; Faircloth et al., 2015; McCormack et al., 2017; Ruane and Austin, 2017; Tsai et al., 2019b). Historical specimens are often used to fill sampling gaps left by rare,
endangered, or extinct taxa that lack available tissues, and their inclusion in phylogenomic analyses can dramatically reshape our understanding of the evolutionary history, systematics, and taxonomy of organismal groups (Salter et al., 2020). Yet, for all the opportunities museum specimens offer, they also introduce novel methodological challenges and potential sources of error in downstream phylogenomic analyses, particularly when a study focuses on resolving fine-scale differences among species and subspecies.

For example, previous studies incorporating historical specimens have noted several recurrent issues associated with sample quality that manifest as failures to detect some loci, shorter contigs assembled for detected loci, and DNA damage within assembled contigs (Hosner et al., 2016; Moyle et al., 2016; Olveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2020; Swanson et al., 2019). These effects can lead to analytical issues like abnormally long branch lengths (McCormack et al., 2012), alternative placements of taxa between concatenated and coalescent analyses (Moyle et al., 2016; Olveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020), and consistent placement of historical samples as sister to all remaining taxa within a clade (Moyle et al., 2016; Olveros, 2015). Discordant topologies that include historical samples are especially vexing because it can be unclear whether legitimate differences arise from more complete taxonomic sampling or whether the incorporation of sequencing and assembly errors from lower quality samples is driving spurious results. Unresolved differences in placement can also leave lingering uncertainty surrounding the evolutionary history of lineages that might be important targets for conservation or additional study (Salter et al., 2020). Although these issues have been noted repeatedly, few studies (Moyle et al., 2016; Olveros, 2015; Smith et al., 2020) have explored mechanisms for addressing these apparent analytical artifacts.

Here, we use historical and contemporary specimens to reconstruct a subspecies phylogeny of a highly polytypic group of birds, the New World quails (Odontophoridae). New World quails are small (140–170 g) terrestrial birds found in forest and grassland habitats from southern Canada to southeastern Brazil and northern Argentina (Brennan et al., 2020; Carroll, 1994). Originally named for the serrated edge of their mandible (from the Greek odontos, tooth, phor, bearer, i.e., tooth-bearer) (Johnsgard, 1988), New World quails are distinguished by their complex plumage patterns and occasional head ornamentation, ranging from crests to teardrop-shaped plumes to single-feather “spikes.” The family reaches peak diversity in southern Mexico and Central America, where 17 species are found and up to eight species may co-occur (Johnsgard, 1988).

The taxonomic status of the New World quails has long been the subject of debate. Although New and Old World quails have been recognized as distinct clades since the first comprehensive taxonomy of quails and partridges (Ogilvie-Grant, 1893), phenotypic similarities between New and Old World quail species resulted in the description of New World quails as either a tribe (Odontophorini; Verheyen, 1956) or a subfamily (Odontophorinae; Ogilvie-Grant, 1896) within the pheasants (Phasianidae). Based on comparative osteological evidence, Holman (1961) argued New World quails warranted recognition as a distinct family, an idea validated by DNA-DNA hybridization analyses (Sibley and Ahlquist, 1986, 1985) that showed New World quails were more divergent from Old World galliforms than other New World taxa such as turkeys and grouse. More recent molecular studies of Galliformes have confirmed the placement of New World quails as sister to pheasants (Phasianidae; Cox et al., 2007; Hosner et al., 2016; Kimball and Braun, 2014; Wang et al., 2013). Because of this sister relationship between the clade of New World quails and African (Old World) partridges in the genus Pilipachus (Cohen et al., 2012; Crowe et al., 2006; Hosner et al., 2015), calling into question whether the sister lineage of pheasants consists of only “New World” species. Dating analyses and inferred rates of sequence evolution suggest Pilipachus and the New World quails diverged from an Old World common ancestor 32 Ma, coincident with the existence of the Beringian land bridge between the Nearctic and Palearctic (Hosner et al., 2015). Because referring to Odontophorids as “New World” quail is inconsistent with the inclusion of Pilipachus, we will refer to the group as “odontophorids”.

Similar to higher level galliform taxonomy, early systematics within odontophorids used comparative osteology (Holman, 1961) and species ecology (Johnsgard, 1973) to describe the relationships among genera. Both classification schemes identified two major clades (Gutiérrez et al., 1983): the Odontophorus group, comprising the genera Odontophorus, Rhynchortyx, Dactylortyx, and Cyrtortyx; and the Dendrotorx group, comprising the genera Dendrotorx, Philorix, Oreortyx, Colinus, and Callipepla (Fig. 1A and 1B). Although molecular studies of odontophorids have validated the general membership of each clade, most recent studies suggest the monotypic genus Rhynchortyx is sister to both clades (Fig. 1C) while the arrangement of genera within each clade has differed (Cohen et al., 2012; Crowe et al., 2006; Hosner et al., 2015). The most complete molecular phylogeny of odontophorids (Hosner et al., 2015) included sequence data from three mitochondrial and eight nuclear loci from 23 species and recovered strong support across analyses for intergeneric relationships (Fig. 1C). At the species-level, relationships within odontophorids are less clear. For example, the numbers of odontophorid species and subspecies have fluctuated dramatically through time (Fig. 2), largely due to the difficulty of ascribing consistent taxonomic boundaries to a group that displays remarkable phenotypic variability (Johnsgard, 1988). As a result, different taxonomies recognize anywhere from 27 to 35 species distributed among ten genera (Carroll, 2019; Clements et al., 2019; Dickinson and Remsen, 2013; Johnsgard, 1988). This uncertainty is magnified at the subspecies level, where 126 to 145 subspecies of odontophorids are recognized, primarily based on variation in plumage and disjunctions in geographic ranges (Carroll, 2019; Clements et al., 2019; Dickinson and Remsen, 2013; Johnsgard, 1988). To put this incredible phenotypic diversity in context, odontophorids are more polytypic than 89% of all other bird families (Dickinson and Remsen, 2013), when controlling for family size, including the famously polytypic pheasants. Interestingly, this diversity is not distributed evenly across the family: 13 species of odontophorids are monotypic, while the three species of bobwhites (genus Colinus) include 44 subspecies – approximately one-third the total diversity of the entire family (Dickinson and Remsen, 2013). Previous genetic studies with subspecies-level sampling of odontophorids have included only three genera comprising less than half of all subspecies (Callipepla, Zink and Blackwell, 1998; Colinus, Williford et al., 2016, 2014; and Dendrotorx, Tsai et al., 2019a) and, with the exception of Dendrotorx (Tsai et al., 2019a), all have used a small number of mitochondrial loci (Williford et al., 2016, 2014; Zink and Blackwell, 1998). Furthermore, within the two most polytypic genera, Odontophorus and Colinus, different analyses have produced equivocal results, often with low support (Hosner et al., 2015; Williford et al., 2016, 2014). As a result, it is unclear whether the lack of resolution within these relatively young clades (4–5 Ma; Hosner et al., 2015; Williford et al., 2016) reflects real biological signal arising from differences in locus histories due to incomplete lineage sorting or introgression, or whether the lack of resolution is simply due to low power of the small number of loci sampled.

Incomplete sampling at the species and subspecies level combined with analyses including few independent loci have limited our understanding at all taxonomic levels within odontophorids and obscured how evolutionary processes may have shaped the remarkable phenotypic diversity observed in the group. Bulk sampling efforts have been limited by lack of access to fresh tissues for many range-restricted and increasingly rare taxa. Sixty-nine percent of odontophorid species have experienced population declines during the past century, and 31% of species are listed as near-threatened or vulnerable by the IUCN (IUCN, 2020). However, historical collections of odontophorids are extensive (>40,000 specimens listed on VertNet.org as of February 2021) due to their popularity as game birds. The extensive availability of historical specimens makes odontophorids an ideal taxonomic group to address
some of the larger questions about the role of sample quality in phylogenomic analyses at the species and subspecies level, which we investigate by performing an analysis of ultraconserved elements (UCEs) collected from 42 modern tissues, 83 historical specimens, and six published genomes representing 115 odontophorid taxa (88% of all subspecies) from 83 states/provinces in 22 countries.
2. Methods

2.1. Taxonomy

For the sake of clarity throughout the manuscript, we followed version 4 of the Howard and Moore taxonomy (Dickinson and Remsen, 2013), which recognizes 10 genera, 33 species, and 131 subspecies of odontophorids. We recognize that subspecies are imperfect taxonomic units that may describe organisms at different stages on the continuum between populations and species (O’Neill, 1982). We chose to focus our sampling strategy at the subspecies level because: (1) subspecies are, in theory, used to describe diagnosable populations (Mayr, 1982); (2) subspecies are used in management and conservation decisions for this group (e.g., Eo et al., 2009); and (3) because this approach allowed us to evaluate whether current subspecies taxonomy represents meaningful evolutionary units across odontophorids.

2.2. Sampling and DNA extraction

We collected new sequence data from 120 samples, including 78 toepads from historical specimens and 42 tissues (Table 1). To avoid re-sampling historical specimens, we also incorporated published sequence data from five individuals (Tsai et al., 2019b), and we harvested UCE loci from whole genome assemblies (Table 1) for six additional individuals using Phyluce (Faircloth, 2016) following the Phyluce Tutorial III guidelines (Faircloth, 2015). Whenever possible, we sampled two individuals of each monotypic odontophorid species. Our final sampling design included sequence data collected from 42 tissues, 83 toepads (collected between 1906 and 1996), and six published genomes spanning 125 ingroup samples corresponding to 115 of the 131 subspecies of odontophorids (88%) and six outgroup species from other families in Galliformes and the sister order Anseriformes (Table 1).

We extracted total DNA from tissues using a Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit following the manufacturer’s instructions, and we extracted total DNA from toepads of historical museum specimens using a phenol–chloroform protocol (Tsai et al., 2019b).

2.3. Sequence capture and next-generation sequencing

We prepared genomic libraries from all DNA extracts and performed target enrichment of ultraconserved elements (UCEs; Faircloth et al., 2012a) from genomic libraries following the protocol outlined in Salter et al. (2020). In brief, we sheared tissue samples using a QSonica ultrasonicator to a peak size distribution of 400 to 600 bp. We did not shear toepad samples because they already had a peak size distribution of 100 to 300 bp due to DNA degradation (McCormack et al., 2015). We prepared dual-indexed genomic libraries of each sample using the KAPA Hyper Prep library preparation kit (F. Hoffman-LaRoche AG, Basel, Switzerland) and custom indexes (Glenn et al., 2019). We combined the libraries into fourteen pools containing between six and eight samples for enrichment, and we kept tissues and toepads in separate pools. We enriched each library pool for 5,060 UCE loci using a MyBaits Tetrapods-UCE-5 K kit (Daiciel Arbor Biosciences, Ann Arbor, MI) following a protocol modified from Faircloth et al. (2012b, 2018). After enrichment, we performed 16 cycles of PCR recovery. To remove adapter-dimers, we processed each enriched pool with a Qiagen GeneRead Size Selection Kit, which removes fragments below 150 bp. We then ran post-enrichment pools on a Bioanalyzer to verify peak size distributions and ensure the absence of adapter-dimers. Finally, we quantified pools free of adapter-dimers using the KAPA qPCR quantification kit, and we combined pools at equimolar ratios prior to collecting sequence data using two lanes of 150- to 300-bp paired-end (PE150) sequencing on an Illumina HiSeq 3000 (Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City, OK).

2.4. Bioinformatic processing, assembly, and alignment of UCEs

After receiving demultiplexed reads from the sequencing facility, we used illumiprocessor (Faircloth, 2013), a wrapper around Trimomatic (Bolger et al., 2014), to remove adapter sequences from the data and trim raw reads for quality. We followed this same procedure to incorporate reads from the five toepad samples sequenced by Tsai et al. (2019a). Because some libraries received a larger number of FASTQ reads than others, we used seqtk (Li, 2012) to randomly downsampl libraries having >1.5 million cleaned read pairs (i.e., 3 million reads, in total). We then assembled the data using itero v1.1.2 (Faircloth, 2018), a guided iterative assembly approach designed to improve assembly of target enrichment data. To start the assembly process, itero uses bwa (Li and Durbin, 2009) to seed reads with a reference sequence and assemble loci using SPAdes (Bankevich et al., 2012); each subsequent round of assembly uses the assembled contigs from the previous iteration as the seed. We performed five iterations of assembly with itero using the UCE probe sequences we targeted during enrichment as the initial seed, and after five rounds of assembly we discarded contigs with <5x coverage. To check assembled libraries for the correct species identification and potential contamination, we ran the phyluce program match-contig-to-barcodes (Faircloth, 2016) using a Colinus virginianus COI sequence (NCBI GenBank DQ432859.1) as a reference. We then input extracted contigs that matched the reference COI to NCBI BLAST (Johnson et al., 2008) to compare the extracted sequences to those present in NCBI GenBank, confirm the identity of each sample, and check for any contaminating (different species identity) COI sequences. Following assembly, we used phyluce v1.6.7 (Faircloth, 2016) to export the UCE loci into a database, from which we created an incomplete matrix of loci across all samples. We aligned the incomplete matrix with mafft (Katoh and Standley, 2013) using default parameters and internally trimmed the alignment with the -automated1 option in trimAl v1.4. rev15 (Capella-Gutierrez et al., 2009), before creating a matrix of loci where every locus had at least 75% taxon occupancy.

2.5. UCE phylogenies with concatenated and coalescent methods

After concatenating loci in the 75% complete data matrix, we used raxml-ng v0.9.0 (Kozlov et al., 2019) to estimate a maximum likelihood (ML) tree from the unpurified data. We estimated 20 ML trees, selected the tree that best fit the data, and we estimated branch support on the best fitting tree by bootstrapping with the autoMRE function, which checks for convergence every 50 bootstraps. The analysis converged after 100 bootstrap replicates, and we reconciled the best ML tree with the bootstrap replicates using raxml-ng. We collapsed nodes with < 70% bootstrap support (Hillis and Bull, 1993).

To account for heterogeneous gene/locus histories in our UCE data, we also used a coalescent-based approach to estimate a species tree. Specifically, we selected SVDquartets (Chifman and Kubatko, 2014) for these analyses because our dataset included many historical samples, which have fewer loci and shorter contigs than tissue samples (Table 1), and SVDquartets is less sensitive to these types of missing data than gene tree reconciliation methods (Hosner et al., 2016; Moyle et al., 2016; Oliveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020; Suyari et al., 2017). To infer the SVDquartets tree, we used PAUP* v4.0a166 (Swoford, 2002) to evaluate all quartets by singular value decomposition and perform bootstrap analysis (svdq evalq = all bootstrap nthreads = 12). We collapsed nodes with < 70% bootstrap support (Hillis and Bull, 1993).

2.6. Subset phylogenies with concatenated and coalescent methods

We observed several inconsistencies between the concatenated ML topology and the SVDquartets topology (hereafter “complete” datasets) within the Odontophorus and Colinus clades that we hypothesized were spurious results caused by the inclusion of low-quality historical samples, which can have a higher noise to signal ratio. Specifically, we
Table 1
Sample information and sequencing statistics. Type refers to type of material: T = tissue; S = sequence; for toepads, the year of collection is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species / subspecies</th>
<th>Museum / Source</th>
<th>Catalog No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Read Pairs</th>
<th>Contigs</th>
<th>UCEs</th>
<th>Avg. Locus Length</th>
<th>Collection Locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anas platyrhynchos</td>
<td>GenBank</td>
<td>SAMN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anseranas semipalmata</td>
<td>GenBank</td>
<td>10245527</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla californica achatuata</td>
<td>UBMW</td>
<td>81488</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>791,079</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>Baja California Sur, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla californica brunnescens</td>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>2-29626</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,451,824</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>Nevada, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla californica californica</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>B-17959</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,246,791</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>California, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla californica canifaei</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>B-34531</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>488,930</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>California, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla californica canifaei</td>
<td>LACM</td>
<td>19812</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1,901,089</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Santa Catalina Island, California, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla douglasi bensoni</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>B-59474</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,004,915</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>Sonora, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla douglasi douglasi</td>
<td>UBMW</td>
<td>81316</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>429,620</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>Sinaloa, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla gambelli fulvipes</td>
<td>UBMW</td>
<td>90862</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,156,957</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>Sinaloa, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla gambelli gambelli</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>B-62399</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,323,662</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>4,397</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>Texas, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla squamata castanograsis</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>B-64166</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,205,069</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>Texas, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla squamata pallida</td>
<td>UBMW</td>
<td>777-30</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>249,076</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>3,993</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Arizona, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callipepla squamata squamata</td>
<td>KU</td>
<td>29970</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>879,187</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>San Luis Potosi, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauna torquata</td>
<td>GenBank</td>
<td>SAMN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
suspected that strongly conflicting results were caused by the “toepad effect” where short, low-quality UCE contigs assembled from toepad DNA extracts are sometimes resolved as sister to remaining taxa within a clade (Moyle et al., 2016; Oliveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020). Because sequence variability and phylogenetic informativeness increase with distance from the core conserved UCE region (Faircloth et al., 2012a) and many toepad samples lack these variable flanking regions, we suspect that toepad samples in other portions of the tree may be
responsible for the toepad effect by pulling problematic taxa towards
them due to the degree of sequence similarity shared between the
relatively short, core UCE regions that are commonly enriched from
toeapds. To investigate these effects, we subsampled the concatenated
dataset output by trimAl to produce two subclades, which we rooted on
the most closely related taxa that were stable across the complete ML
and SVDquartets analyses: (1) an Odontophorus group, rooted on
O. ballivi an i and O. atrifr on s, and (2) a Colinus group, which we rooted on
Callipepla sp. To subsample the trimAl data matrix, we used GNU Grep
with regular expressions, and we inferred concatenated and coal each-
ent-based trees using raxml-ng and SVDquartets with parameters that were
identical to those applied to the entire concatenated matrix. In both
trees, we collapsed nodes with < 70% bootstrap support (Hills and Bull,
1993). To assess whether this approach reduced discordance, we used
DendroPy v4.5.2 (Sukumaran and Holder, 2010) to calculate un-
weighted Robinson-Foulds (RF) distances between the Odontophorus and
Colinus subclades from the ML and SVDquartets trees using the full
alignment as well as the ML and SVDquartets trees from the subset
alignments.

3. Results:

3.1. Recovery of UCEs

After demultiplexing and trimming the raw reads, we obtained an
average of 1.8 million read pairs (range 249,076–23,331,061) for tissue
samples and 3 million read pairs for toepad samples (range
420,216–13,531,186) (Table 1). After downsampling sequence files, we
assembled an average of 4,212 (4,126–4,225 ± 133) contigs of contig
samples and 4,043 (3,971–4,115 ± 143) contigs for toepad samples.
From the assembled contigs, we identified an average of 4,087 UCE loci,
which was consistent across sample types (Table 1); however, the
average contig length of the loci differed between sample types: 912 bp
(870–954 bp 95 CI) for tissues; 378 bp (360–396 bp 95 CI) for toepads;
and 757 bp (614–900 bp 95 CI) for contigs extracted from genome se-
tables (Table 2). We enriched a total of 3,884 UCE loci shared by at
least 98 ingroup and outgroup taxa, which we concatenated into a 75%
complete data matrix that comprised 2,005,421 total characters and
included 274,886 parsimony informative sites (13.7%).

3.2. Concatenated UCE phylogeny

The ML tree we inferred from 3,884 concatenated UCE loci was well
resolved and strongly supported for more generic and species-level rela-
tionships (Fig. 3A; see Supplementary Fig. S1 for branch lengths).
Consistent with previous molecular phylogenies (Cohen et al., 2012;
Crowe et al., 2006; Hosner et al., 2015), we resolved Ptilopachus as sister
to all New World species, and, within the New World clade, we resolved
the monotypic genus Rhynchortyx as sister to the Odontophorus and
Dendrortyx groups.

Within the Odontophorus group, we resolved the branching order as
Cyrtonyx, Dactylyortyx, and Odontophorus, and within Odontophorus,
we resolved the northernmost species, O. guttatus, as sister to two clades:
one comprising five predominantly lowland tropical forest species (O.
stellatus, O. capitena, O. erythrops, O. melanotis, and O. guianensis) and
one comprising nine montane-associated species (O. ballivi an i, O.
atrifr ons, O. leucolaenaus, O. di a e u x o s, O. melanototus, O. hy perythrus,
O. speciosus, O. columbianus, and O. strophoim), although support for the
branch uniting these two clades was low. We also observed two in-
stances of non-monophyletic species that we detected as a result of
subspecies-level sampling: Cyrtonyx ocellatus was nested within C.
montezunae, and Odontophorus melanotis was nested within O.
erythrops (Fig. 3A, Supplementary Fig. S1).

Within the Dendrortyx group, we resolved Oreortyx, Dendrortyx,
Philortyx, and Callipepla + Colinus as successive sister groups, and
species-level relationships were consistent with previous studies of each
genus (Tsai et al., 2019a; Williford et al., 2016; Zink and Blackwell,
1998).

At the subspecies-level, resolution was more variable across the tree,
although results were generally consistent with the broad biogeographic
patterns of each species’ distribution (Supplementary Fig. S1). For
example, within Cyrtonyx, the ML analysis resolved two well-supported
clades: one comprising the three subspecies of C. montezunae from the
southwestern U.S. and northern Mexico (C. m. mearnsi, C. m. merriamii, C.
C. ocellatus), and a second clade comprising C. ocellatus of southern
Mexico and Central America along with the two Oaxacan subspecies of
C. montezunae (C. m. sallei, C. m. rowleyi), which are more similar in
plumage to C. ocellatus and are sometimes considered a separate species
named C. sallei (Carroll, 2019). Similarly, we recovered a south-north
grade among the two subspecies of O. erythrops in Ecuador and Colombia
and the two subspecies of O. melanotis in Central America, consistent with
previous treatments of all four taxa as subspecies of O. erythrops
(Johnsgard, 1988). Within Colinus cristatus, the ML analysis strongly
supported two clades: one comprising 13 subspecies of eastern
Panama and northern South America and a sister clade comprising the
six Central American subspecies of the C. [cristatus] leucopogon group
(Fig. 4E, Supplementary Fig. S1), which are sometimes treated as a
separate species (Carroll, 2019; Johnsgard, 1988). We observed a
similar pattern within C. virginianus, the most polytypic odontophorid
species: a well-supported split between eight subspecies north of Mex-
ico’s Transvolcanic belt and eleven subspecies south of this barrier,
although we were generally unable to resolve phylogenetic relationships
among subspecies within either of these clades.

3.3. Coalescent UCE phylogeny

The tree we inferred with SVDquartets was well resolved, strongly
supported, and largely congruent with the topology we reconstructed
with the ML analysis, particularly at the species level (Fig. 3B; see
Supplementary Fig. S2 for the uncollapsed topology). In particular, the
SVDquartets tree improved support for the sister relationship between
the two major Odontophorus clades (lowland tropical forest + montane-
associated species). At the species level, only two areas of the coalescent
tree disagreed with the ML topology: among the seven species in the
montane-associated Odontophorus clade and within Colinus. Within
the montane Odontophorus clade, the SVDquartets analysis resolved
O. strophoim + O. columbianus as sister to remaining lineages in the clade
and suggested a sister relationship between O. dialeu x o s and O. speciosus,
although this relationship was poorly supported. In contrast, the ML
analysis resolved the Central American species O. leucolaenaus and
O. dialeu x o s as successive sister lineages to the remaining sister clades of
trans-Andean species (O. melanonotus + O. hyperythrus) and cis-Ande-
an species (O. speciosus, O. strophoim + O. columbianus). Within Col-
inus, the major difference was that the SVDquartets analysis resolved C.
virginianus aridus of northeastern Mexico as sister to all other taxa
within Colinus.

Table 2

Summary statistics of sequencing output by sample type. Values represent mean ± 95% confidence interval. Toepads were collected between 1906 and 1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>No. of samples</th>
<th>Avg. clean read pairs</th>
<th>Avg. contigs</th>
<th>Avg. UCE loci</th>
<th>Avg. contig length (bp)</th>
<th>Avg. collection year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tissues</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,802,937 ± 1,111,737</td>
<td>4,212 ± 127</td>
<td>4,190 ± 127</td>
<td>912 ± 42</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toepads</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3,099,816 ± 385,186</td>
<td>4,043 ± 336</td>
<td>4,023 ± 73</td>
<td>378 ± 18</td>
<td>1954 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,225 ± 71</td>
<td>4,267 ± 133</td>
<td>757 ± 143</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We observed more discordance between the ML and SVDquartets topologies at the subspecies-level, although most of this discordance existed in parts of either tree having low support (Supplementary Fig. S3). In general, the SVDquartets analysis was less precise, and the lower support values collapsed to a number of polytomies, as seen in *Cyrtonyx*, *Callipepla californica*, and *Dendrortyx macroura* (Supplementary Fig. S3). Despite these areas of low support, the ML and SVDquartets topologies largely agreed in the arrangement of subspecies groups within highly polytypic species, such as *C. cristatus* and *C. virginianus* (Fig. 4).

### 3.4. Subset concatenated and coalescent phylogenies

For the two clades in which we observed species-level discordance between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred from the complete dataset, these conflicts were largely resolved when we inferred trees using only those subsets of taxa (Fig. 4). In the *Odontophorus* group, the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data both resolved a branching order consistent with the ML topology inferred using the complete dataset, placing the Central American species *O. leucaelaeus* and *O. dialeucos* as successive sister lineages to the clade comprising three South American groups, including *O. strophium* + *O. columbianus* (Fig. 4C-D). Although the subset SVDquartets tree could not resolve the polytomy between *O. hyperythrus* + *O. melanonotus*, *O. speciosus*, and *O. strophium* + *O. columbianus*, this topology was consistent with both ML trees and resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *O. strophium* + *O. columbianus* were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (37B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).

Within the *Colinus* clade, there were two major differences between the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred with the complete dataset: (1) the placement of *C. cristatus* panamensis in a polytomy in the SVDquartets tree; and (2) the placement of *C. virginianus* aridus sister to all remaining *Colinus* in the SVDquartets trees (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4F). Both the ML and SVDquartets trees inferred using subclade data resolved the major discordance observed in the complete SVDquartets tree, which initially suggested *C. cristatus* panamensis were sister to other taxa within this group (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 6; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets trees for subset alignment = 1).
subspecies (Fig. 4G). The subset SVDquartets tree also resolved northern and southern clades of subspecies, consistent with both ML trees, although it placed *C. v. aridus* as sister to the clade of subspecies from southern Mexico (Fig. 3H). Although this placement differs from the ML topologies, the subset analysis resolved the implausible placement of *C. v. aridus* in the complete SVDquartets tree and the major discordance between the SVDquartets and ML trees inferred with the complete dataset (Fig. 4, Fig. 3E-F; RF distance between ML and SVDquartets subclades estimated from the full alignment = 26; RF distance between the ML and SVDquartets tree for subset alignments = 18).

4. Discussion

4.1. High-level odontophorid phylogeny is stable across studies, methods, and data types

Across all analyses, we resolved topologies that are consistent with previous studies of major odontophorid clades (Cohen et al., 2012; Crowe et al., 2006; Hosner et al., 2015). Our results from thousands of nuclear loci support the sister relationship between the African genus *Ptilopachus* and the remaining New World odontophorids (Cohen et al., 2012; Crowe et al., 2006; Hosner et al., 2015). Similarly, within the New World clade, we resolved the monotypic genus *Rynchortyx* as sister to the *Odontophorus* group and the *Dendrortyx* group, a pattern that is generally consistent with previous phylogenetic hypotheses based on morphology and ecology (Johnsgard, 1973). We included representatives of all currently recognized odontophorid species and most analyses inferred consistent, highly-supported relationships at the species level with two notable differences between our UCE topologies, which we discuss below.

Due to a lack of contemporary genetic material, previous molecular phylogenies of odontophorids included just eight of the 15 described species in *Odontophorus*, the most species-rich genus in the family, with different analyses inferring different topologies for five of the sampled species (Hosner et al., 2015). Similarly, within the New World clade, we resolved the monotypic genus *Rynchortyx* as sister to the *Odontophorus* group and the *Dendrortyx* group, a pattern that is generally consistent with previous phylogenetic hypotheses based on morphology and ecology (Johnsgard, 1973). We included representatives of all currently recognized odontophorid species and most analyses inferred consistent, highly-supported relationships at the species level with two notable differences between our UCE topologies, which we discuss below.

Due to a lack of contemporary genetic material, previous molecular phylogenies of odontophorids included just eight of the 15 described species in *Odontophorus*, the most species-rich genus in the family, with different analyses inferring different topologies for five of the sampled species (Hosner et al., 2015). Similarly, within the New World clade, we resolved the monotypic genus *Rynchortyx* as sister to the *Odontophorus* group and the *Dendrortyx* group, a pattern that is generally consistent with previous phylogenetic hypotheses based on morphology and ecology (Johnsgard, 1973). We included representatives of all currently recognized odontophorid species and most analyses inferred consistent, highly-supported relationships at the species level with two notable differences between our UCE topologies, which we discuss below.
three main lineages within the genus: (1) the northermost species, *O. guttatus*; (2) a clade of five predominantly lowland tropical forest species; and (3) a clade of nine montane-associated species. These results are consistent with a coalescent topology inferred from a combined mito-nuclear dataset for eight species (Hosner et al., 2015), and with the biogeographic hypothesis that *Odontophorus* had a Central American ancestor (ca. 5.8 Ma) that colonized South America multiple times and diversified rapidly following closure of the Isthmus of Panama (Hosner et al., 2015).

Because we sampled all species, our results refute previous hypotheses that grouped *Odontophorus* species by plumage (Johnsgard, 1988), and they highlight the recurrence of different plumage elements in multiple, presumably independent, radiations—suggesting a shared genomic framework underlying the “mix-and-match” appearance of the 29 taxa in this genus. Johnsgard (1988) recognized three species groups within *Odontophorus* based on shared plumage themes: dark-backed species with rufous fronts (*O. hyperythrus*, *O. melanotus*, *O. spectiosus*, and *O. erythrops/melanops*); species with prominent crests and chestnut plumage lacking a white throat (*O. capuera*, *O. stellatus*, *O. gujanensis*, and *O. ballivianum*); and dark-backed species with striking black-and-white throats and facial patterns (*O. atrifrons*, *O. leucolaemus*, *O. dialeucos*, *O. strophiolum*, and *O. colombianus*). Our results support some of these relationships, but our results also highlight that similar plumage patterns exist between non-sister lowland and montane species, as well as identifying several previously overlooked plumage similarities between species that our results suggest are closely related. For example, we resolved a sister relationship between two highly disjunct species, *O. atrifrons* and *O. ballivianum*. *Odontophorus atrifrons* is extremely range restricted, inhabiting the subtropical montane forests of northern Colombia and northwestern Venezuela, whereas *O. ballivianum* is more broadly distributed throughout montane subtropical forests in southeastern Peru and northern Bolivia (Johnsgard, 1988). Although Johnsgard characterized these species as belonging to two distinct plumage groups, they share a rufous crown and distinctive white, diamond-shaped streaking across the chest. Similar disjunct distributions are observed within other Andean bird species, such as Golden Grosbeaks (*Pheucticus chrysogaster* (Brewer, 2020)) and Red-rumped Bush-Tyrants (*Cnemarchus erythropygus*) (Schulenberg and Kirwan, 2020), and may reflect a history of extinction in the intermediate populations.

4.2. Discordant UCE topologies are artifacts of low-quality historical samples

Our dataset is composed of 66% historical samples (Table 1), and we observed many of the sample quality issues noted in previous studies incorporating this type of material (Moyle et al., 2016; Oliveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020; Swanson et al., 2019). Fortunately, we only recovered species-level topological conflicts in two clades: *Odontophorus* and *Colinus*.

Within both *Odontophorus* and *Colinus*, we observed a previously noted pattern of discordance that we refer to as the “toepad effect”: in SVDQuartets analyses, low-quality samples often aggregate as sister to all other members of the clade in which concatenated analyses place them (Moyle et al., 2016; Oliveros et al., 2019; Salter et al., 2020). By all metrics, the four taxa (represented by six historical samples) that showed this pattern in our analyses (*O. strophiolum*, *O. colombianus*, *C. virginianus aridus*, and *C. crista panamensis*) were among the lowest quality historical samples in our dataset: all six samples fell below the 95% confidence interval for cleaned read pairs, number of UCEs, and average contig length (Table 1, Table 2). Three of these samples were collected during the early 1920s, placing them among the oldest samples we sequenced (median collection year 1954), and although the remaining three samples were collected between 1947 and 1952, specimen preparation and long-term storage conditions can have significant impacts on DNA degradation and quality in addition to sample age (Hall et al., 1997; McCormack et al., 2017; Wandeler et al., 2007).

We further examined the causes of this discordance by analyzing subsets of these data to assess whether spurious relationships could be resolved by reducing the noise to signal ratio introduced with the inclusion of distantly related taxa. The results of our subset-based phylogenies provide compelling evidence that in our dataset, these “toepad effects” are artifacts of sample quality, rather than biological signal. In *Odontophorus*, the concatenated and coalescent subclade trees resolved the discordance we observed among the topologies inferred with the complete dataset, and the subclade topologies ultimately supported the relationships we observed in the complete ML tree (Fig. 4A-D). Although we observed differences in bootstrap support for relationships within *Odontophorus*, such as the polytomy between *O. hyperythrus* + *O. melanotus*, *O. spectiosus*, and *O. strophiolum* + *O. colombianus* in the subset SVDQuartets tree, these differences do not change the relationships or their phylogeographic interpretation within this group (Fig. 4C-D).

Within *Colinus*, the subset topologies resolved the polytomy of *C. crista panamensis*, the Central American *C. crista* leucopogon clade, and the South American *C. crista* clade that we observed in the complete SVDQuartets tree, and inferred a placement of *C. crista panamensis* consistent with the complete ML tree (Fig. 4E-H). Although the discordant placement of most low-quality samples in our dataset was ameliorated by the subset analyses, some combination of missing loci, exceptionally short contigs, and perhaps other DNA damage proved particularly recalcitrant for *C. virginianus aridus*. Though much improved from the complete SVDQuartets tree, the placement of *C. v. aridus* in the subclade SVDQuartets tree differs from both ML trees (Fig. 4E-H). Based on the original description of *C. v. aridus* as an intermediate form between *C. v. texanus* and *C. v. maculatus* and its distribution between these two subspecies (Aldrich, 1942), the topology inferred in the ML trees is consistent with our expectations of the relationships among these subspecies; however, we were unable to completely resolve the placement of this sample due to poor data quality.

Our results also underscore the importance of sampling multiple historical specimens within each taxon, when possible. For example, because we resolve the sister relationship of *O. strophiolum* + *O. colombianus* across all analyses, we are confident that this relationship is not a “toepad effect”, but likely reflects biological signal and confirms previous hypotheses of a close relationship between these species based on plumage (Johnsgard, 1988). Whereas previous examples of the “toepad effect” have been noted with a single sample per taxon, our results suggest that including multiple toepad samples per taxon can help distinguish between the effects of low-quality samples (as in *C. v. aridus*) and true phylogenetic signal. Considering our results, we advocate for an integrative approach to examining the causes of topological discordance as large datasets encompassing samples of heterogeneous quality become commonplace in phylogenomics.

4.3. Odontophorid taxonomy is largely congruent with genetic data

The impressive phenotypic diversity among odontophorids, especially in male plumage, has contributed to historical fluctuations in odontophorid taxonomy, especially at the subspecies-level (Fig. 2). However, both our ML and coalescent phylogenies using UCEs demonstrate that current taxonomy is largely consistent with the genetic relationships within and among most species of odontophorids (Fig. 3), although we did find two examples of species that were not monophyletic. All analyses (Supplementary Fig. S3) failed to recover *Cyrtonyx montezumae* and *C. ocellatus* as reciprocally monophyletic, instead suggesting these taxa form a grade from north to south. In our concatenated UCE ML tree, the three northernmost *C. montezumae* subspecies form one clade, sister to a clade of *C. ocellatus* and the two Oaxacan subspecies, *C. m. rowleyi* and *C. m. sallae* (Supplementary Fig. S1). Although the SVDQuartets analysis recovered a different topology (Supplementary Fig. S2), it still did not support the reciprocal monophyly of *C. montezumae* and *C. ocellatus*, suggesting that population-level sampling and further investigation of plumage, morphology, and vocal data
are needed to assess species boundaries within this genus. Based on
the available evidence, our results support merging C. montezumae and
C. ocellatus into C. montezumae (Vigors, 1830). Similarly, neither our ML
nor SVDquartets analyses resolved Odontophorus melanotis and O.
eurythrps as reciprocally monophyletic (Supplementary Material S3),
suggesting these taxa constitute a single species (O. eurythrps, Gould,
1859), consistent with previous classifications (Johnsgard, 1988).
Both of these examples highlight the importance of complete taxon sampling
for accurate systematic analysis of polytypic species.

In birds, subspecies designations have traditionally been used to
describe diagnosable geographic differences among populations in some
morphological or behavioral trait, such as plumage color or song (Mayr,
1982). These subspecies may come into contact in some part(s) of
their range, and there is the presumption that gene flow would occur whenever
populations come into contact. If gene flow is occurring, this begs the
question of how well subspecies relationships can be resolved in a
strictly bifurcating phylogenetic framework (reviewed in Phillimore and
Owens, 2006), especially with highly conserved genetic markers such as
UCGs (Harey et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2014). Although we could not
resolve all subspecies relationships, we were pleasantly surprised by the
concordance of well-resolved geographic structure within most poly-
typic species across all analyses. For example, although the relationships
among the eight O. gujanensis subspecies differed slightly between the
ML and SVDquartets trees (Supplementary Fig. S3), all analyses resolved
three groups consistent with the major geologic provinces of the region
(Silva et al., 2019): a Central American / northeastern Colombian group
(O. g. castigatus and O. g. marmoratus); a group from west of the Negro
and Madeira rivers in the Amazonian forest land basins (O. g. buckleyi, O.
guianensis, O. g. rufogularis, and O. g. pachyrhynchos); and a group from
east of the Negro and Madeira rivers in the Guiana and Brazilian shields (O. g.
leucopogon and O. g. simoni) (Supplementary Fig. S3). We observed a
similar pattern in Dactyloxyx thoracicus, for which we sampled nine of
the eleven mostly allopatric subspecies, and our analyses consistently
resolved the three taxa found north of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec (D. t.
devius, D. t. melodus, and D. t. pettingilli) as sister to a group comprising
two pairs of geographically adjacent sister taxa found south of the
Isthmus: D. t. chiapensis + D. t. dolichonyx from Chiapas; D. t. sharpei + D.
t. paymeri from the Yucatan peninsula; and D. t. fuscus + D. t. convorei from
Honduras (Supplementary Fig. S3). In contrast to these patterns, our
results also highlighted several polytypic species with little
discernible structure across analyses, such as among the five subspecies of
Oreortyx pictus or Callipepla california, suggesting a review of
subspecies designations in these species is warranted. With the benefit of
near-comprehensive taxonomic sampling and broader sampling of the
genome, our results also provide clearer resolution of the evolutionary
units within odontophorids, and they highlight the taxonomic imbalance
between groups that have been split at the species-level (e.g.,
Odontophorus) versus those that have been split at the subspecies-level
(e.g., Colinus).

The power of thousands of genome-wide loci to resolve geographic
structure among shallow evolutionary lineages is exemplified in our results
for Colinus. The three species of bobwhites in the genus Colinus
epitomize many of the extremes and challenges of odontophorid
diversity and taxonomy: together, these three species comprise 44
subspecies described by differences in male plumage, half of which belong
to C. virginianus (Dickinson and Remsen, 2013). The evolutionary
relationships among subspecies within Colinus remain largely unclear
(Ellsworth et al., 1989; Eo et al., 2009; Evans et al., 2009; Williford et al.,
2016, 2014), potentially due to the recent origin of this genus (~5 MA;
Hosner et al., 2015; Williford et al., 2016) and the limited power of the
few genetic markers surveyed in prior studies. In contrast to these pre-
vious studies, we found strong evidence of geographic population
structure within all three species.

Across all analyses, our results suggest the nineteen subspecies of
C. cristatus compose three well-supported clades, consistent with previ-
ous analyses of mitochondrial data (Williford et al., 2016): (1) the six-
subspecies leucopogon group from Central America; (2) the nine-
subspecies cristatus group ranging from eastern Panama to the west
slope of the Eastern Cordillera and the Caribbean slope of Colombia and
Venezuela; and (3) the four-subspecies sonnini group ranging from the
east slope of the Eastern Cordillera to the Guiana Shield. In contrast to a
previous mitochondrial analysis, which resolved the sonnini group as
sister to leucopogon + cristatus (Williford et al., 2016), our complete and
subclade ML and SVDquartet analyses suggest the leucopogon group is
sister to the remaining subspecies that comprise the sonnini + cristatus
group (Fig. 4E-H). Species limits within Colinus have long been debated
(see Johnsgard, 1988), and although these data are insufficient to make
taxonomic recommendations for this complex group, we note that
dating analyses estimate the deepest divergences within C. cristatus are
consistent with the timing of divergence between C. nigrogularis and C.
virginianus (~2.5 MYA; Williford et al., 2016), suggesting species
limits have been applied inconsistently across the genus.

Our results also shed new light on the contentious relationships
within C. virginianus, the most polytypic odontophorid. Historically, 24
subspecies of C. virginianus have been described by male plumage
(Carroll, 2019), of which 22 are currently recognized (Dickinson and
Remsen, 2013), and we collected genomic sequence data from 19 of
them. We did not include samples of C. v. marilandicus and C. v.
mxicanus, because these subspecies are often synonymized within C. v.
virginianus, and we did not include samples of C. v. nelsoni, which is often
synonymized within C. v. insignis (Carroll, 2019). Due to its significance
as a game bird in the U.S. and Mexico, C. virginianus is one of the most
intensively studied bird species (Guthery, 1997), yet previous efforts to
understand the relationships among subspecies have yielded equivocal
results (Ellsworth et al., 1989; Eo et al., 2009; Evans et al., 2009; Wil-
liford et al., 2016, 2014), often finding little evidence of genetic struc-
ture. Two possible explanations for findings of panmixia within
C. virginianus are its recent Pleistocene origin (~1.5 MYA; Hosner et al.,
2015; Williford et al., 2016) and the long history of human-mediated
translocations within this species (Whitt et al., 2017). Previous studies
have also relied on few genetic markers, which may be insufficiently
powerful to resolve shallow genetic structure (Zarra et al., 2016). This is
the first study to use thousands of nuclear loci to assess the relationships
within C. virginianus, and despite shallow divergences, we recover
consistent, well-supported geographic structure across all analyses
(Fig. 4E-H, Supplementary Fig. S3).

Both our ML and SVDquartets trees using UCGs recover the deepest
divergence within C. virginianus to be along Mexico’s Transvolcanic Belt,
a known biogeographic barrier for birds and other terrestrial taxa
(Marshall and Liebherr, 2000; Morrone, 2010), with eight subspecies
forming a northern clade and eleven subspecies forming a southern
clade. In contrast to the bold white facial patterning typical of
C. virginianus males in the northern part of their range, seven subspecies
of C. virginianus males have nearly to completely black heads and
throats, including six subspecies from Oaxaca and Chiapas (aritecios,
coyoleos, harrisoni, insignis, nelsoni, and salvini) and the isolated Sonoran
desert subspecies C. v. ridgwayi, prompting speculation that all black-
throated subspecies are closely related (Aldrich, 1946). However, our
results suggest that C. v. ridgwayi is most closely related to a group of
subspecies from Texas and northern Mexico (Fig. 4E-H, Supplementary
Fig. S3), consistent with previous findings of shared mitochondrial haplotypes among these populations (Williford et al., 2016). Although
our analyses could not resolve all relationships within the southern
clade, they do confirm that black- and white-throated subspecies do not
form reciprocally monophyletic clades (Fig. 4E-H, Supplementary
Fig. S3), suggesting that black throat color may have been gained or lost
multiple times within C. virginianus. Although our results provide greater
resolution than previous studies of C. virginianus, the lack of resolution
among subspecies within clades defined by major geographic bound-
aries suggests that the validity of many subspecies warrants further
investigation.

Our results across Colinus demonstrate both the power and
limitations of phylogenomics for resolving subspecies relationships. By sampling thousands of genome-wide loci from just a single individual per subspecies, we found strong evidence of geographic structure and differentiation among groups of subspecies where previous studies sampling fewer markers have not, highlighting the need for greater sampling of the genome at a finer population scale to disentangle the complex evolutionary history of this genus and inform possible taxonomic revisions.

5. Conclusions

We demonstrate the power of UCE phylogenomics to resolve relationships ranging from family-level to below species-level using comprehensive taxonomic sampling of historical museum specimens. While placements of most historical samples were concordant between concatenated and coalescent analyses, we showed that discordant topologies were artifacts of poor sample quality and could be largely resolved by inferring trees using subsets of only those taxa in discordant clades. Within odontophorids, our results affirm previous findings at the genus-level and provide new resolution of species-level relationships, which are largely concordant with current taxonomy. At the subspecies-level, we demonstrate that UCE phylogenomics can resolve consistent, well-supported geographic structure across analyses in most polytypic species, and we highlight the need for increased population-level sampling in several key species complexes, especially within *Odontophorus* and *Colinus*.
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