

Cross-species screening of microsatellite markers for individual identification of snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea* and Wilson's storm petrel *Oceanites oceanicus* in Antarctica

Anant Pande¹, Nidhi Rawat², Kuppusamy Sivakumar¹, Sambandan Sathyakumar¹, Vinod B Mathur³, Samrat Mondol^{Corresp.}²

¹ Endangered Species Management, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

² Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

³ Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author: Samrat Mondol
Email address: samrat@wii.gov.in

Seabirds are important indicators of marine ecosystems health. Species within the order Procellariiformes are most abundant seabird species group distributed from warm tropical to cold temperate regions including Antarctica. There is a paucity of information on basic biology of pelagic seabird species nesting on the Antarctic continents and long-term studies are required to gather data on their population demography, genetics and other ecological parameters. Under the 'Biology and Environmental Sciences' component of the Indian Antarctic programme, long-term monitoring of Antarctic biodiversity is being conducted. In this paper, we describe results of cross-species screening of a panel of 12 and 10 microsatellite markers in two relatively little studied seabird species in Antarctica, the snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea* and the Wilson's storm petrel *Oceanites oceanicus*, respectively. These loci showed high amplification success and moderate levels of polymorphism in snow petrel (mean no. of alleles 7.08 ± 3.01 and mean observed heterozygosity 0.35 ± 0.23), but low polymorphism in Wilson's storm petrel (mean no. of alleles 3.9 ± 1.3 and mean observed heterozygosity 0.28 ± 0.18). The results demonstrate that these panels can unambiguously identify individuals of both species (cumulative PID_{sibs} for snow petrel is 3.7×10^{-03} and Wilson's storm petrel is 1.9×10^{-02}) from field-collected samples. This work forms a baseline for undertaking long-term genetic research of these Antarctic seabird species and provides critical insights into their population genetics.

**Cross-species screening of microsatellite markers for individual identification of snow petrel
Pagodroma nivea and Wilson's storm petrel *Oceanites oceanicus* in Antarctica**

Running head: Individual identification of two Antarctic seabird species

Anant Pande^{*1}, Nidhi Rawat^{*2}, Kuppusamy Sivakumar¹, Sambandan Sathyakumar¹, Vinod B. Mathur³, Samrat Mondol^{#2}

¹Endangered Species Management, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

²Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

³Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

**equal contribution*

[#] Corresponding author: Samrat Mondol, Assistant Professor, Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India,

Email: samrat@wii.gov.in

ABSTRACT

Seabirds are important indicators of marine ecosystems health. Species within the order Procellariiformes are most abundant seabird species group distributed from warm tropical to cold temperate regions including Antarctica. There is a paucity of information on basic biology of pelagic seabird species nesting on the Antarctic continents and long-term studies are required to gather data on their population demography, genetics and other ecological parameters. Under the ‘Biology and Environmental Sciences’ component of the Indian Antarctic programme, long-term monitoring of Antarctic biodiversity is being conducted. In this paper, we describe results of cross-species screening of a panel of 12 and 10 microsatellite markers in two relatively little studied seabird species in Antarctica, the snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea* and the Wilson’s storm petrel *Oceanites oceanicus*, respectively. These loci showed high amplification success and moderate levels of polymorphism in snow petrel (mean no. of alleles 7.08 ± 3.01 and mean observed heterozygosity 0.35 ± 0.23), but low polymorphism in Wilson’s storm petrel (mean no. of alleles 3.9 ± 1.3 and mean observed heterozygosity 0.28 ± 0.18). The results demonstrate that these panels can unambiguously identify individuals of both species (cumulative PID_{sibs} for snow petrel is 3.7×10^{-03} and Wilson’s storm petrel is 1.9×10^{-02}) from field-collected samples. This work forms a baseline for undertaking long-term genetic research of these Antarctic seabird species and provides critical insights into their population genetics.

50

51 INTRODUCTION

52 As top predators, seabirds maintain structure of marine food webs, regulate island and marine
 53 ecosystem processes and act as indicators of marine ecosystem health (Lascelles *et al.*, 2012;
 54 Paleczny *et al.*, 2015). Their ability to fly over large distances, extreme life history strategies
 55 (monogamy, slow reproduction, late sexual maturity), natal philopatry, high visibility and
 56 dependence on land for breeding makes it essential to conduct long-term population level studies
 57 (Piatt, Sydeman & Wiese, 2007) for better understanding of their biology. Recent studies focusing
 58 on seabird population monitoring have highlighted the threatened status of seabirds across the
 59 globe (Croxall *et al.*, 2012), especially in the Southern Ocean where seabird populations have
 60 declined substantially over last few decades (Paleczny *et al.*, 2015). This has led to
 61 interdisciplinary approaches to understand seabird population dynamics to aid their conservation
 62 and management across their distribution range (Croxall *et al.*, 2012; Taylor and Friesen, 2012).

63 Seabirds within the order Procellariiformes comprising petrels, shearwaters, albatrosses, storm
 64 petrels and diving petrels represent one of the most widely distributed and abundant avifauna
 65 (Warham, 1996). Despite their broad distribution and large population sizes, long-term ecological
 66 and genetic data exists for few of these species across the globe. In addition to several ecological
 67 studies on Procellariiforms (Croxall *et al.* 2012), some recent studies have used genetic data to
 68 address important biological parameters such as relatedness, population structure, past population
 69 demography (e.g. see Gómez-Díaz, González-Solís & Peinado, 2009 for Cory's shearwater; Welch
 70 *et al.*, 2012 for Hawaiian petrel) for species distributed in tropical and Arctic marine ecosystems.
 71 Research on the biology of Procellariiforms is relatively limited in the Southern Ocean ecosystem,
 72 especially in Antarctica because of its remoteness and associated logistical difficulties. Despite

site-specific monitoring of some Procellariiforms on sub-Antarctic islands (e.g. Brown *et al.*, 2015 for giant petrels; Quillfeldt *et al.*, 2017 for Antarctic prion, thin-billed prion and blue petrel) and Antarctic coast (e.g. Barbraud & Weimerskirch, 2001 for snow petrel; Barbraud & Weimerskirch, 2006 for multiple species; Techow *et al.*, 2010 for giant petrels), long-term ecological as well as genetic research is sparse. Nunn and Stanley (1998) reported the phylogenetic relationships among Procellariiforms using a neighbour-joining approach, but within each family, detailed population genetic information is lacking. Prior studies have used Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphisms (RFLP) and allozymes to investigate genetic variation and extra-pair paternity in snow petrel as well as some other Procellariiforms (Jouventin and Viot, 1985; Viot, Jouventin & Bried, 1993; Lorensten *et al.*, 2000, Quillfeldt *et al.*, 2001) in Antarctica.

As part of the ‘Biology and Environmental Sciences’ component of the Indian Antarctic Program, we conducted comprehensive ecological surveys between 2009-2016 to understand seabird and marine mammal ecology around the Indian Antarctic research stations (Pande *et al.* 2017). Currently this programme is focused on generating baseline genetic data of breeding seabird species found around Indian area of operations in Antarctica, especially on snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea* and Wilson’s storm petrel *Oceanites oceanicus*. The snow petrel is endemic to Antarctica and Southern Ocean with breeding distribution along Antarctic coast including some inland mountains and few sub-Antarctic islands (Croxall *et al.*, 1995). On the other hand, the Wilson’s storm petrel has a much wider breeding distribution from Cape Horn to the Kerguelen Islands and coastal Antarctica and migrates to the mid-latitudes of the north Atlantic, north Indian and Pacific Oceans during non-breeding period (BirdLife International, 2017). Effective monitoring of these species in the Indian Antarctic sector will require systematic information on their distribution, current population status and genetic parameters. In this paper, we report results from cross-species

screening of microsatellite markers for individual identification of snow petrel and Wilson's storm petrel in Antarctica. These tested microsatellite panels will provide valuable tools for estimating levels of genetic variation, relatedness, and genetic signals of population demography, in both species across their ranges.

METHODS

Study Area

We carried out sampling at Larsemann Hills, Prydz Bay and Schirmacher Oasis, Central Dronning Maudland (Figure 1); close to permanent Indian research stations in Antarctica *Bharati* (Larsemann Hills) and *Maitri* (Schirmacher Oasis). Distance between these two study areas is about 2,500 km. Larsemann Hills (69° 20'S to 69° 30'S; 75° 55'E to 76° 30'E), are a group of islands in Prydz Bay located on the Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land of east Antarctica. This island group comprises of variously sized islands and peninsulas, located halfway between the eastern extremity of the Amery Ice Shelf and the southern boundary of the Vestfold Hills. Schirmacher Oasis, Central Dronning Maudland (70° 44' to 70° 46' S and 11° 22' to 11° 54' E) is situated on the Princess Astrid coast about 120 km from the Fimbul ice shelf. Four species of seabirds (Adelie penguin *Pygoscelis adeliae*, southpolar skua *Stercorarius maccormickii*, snow petrel and Wilson's storm petrel) breed in the ice-free areas of Larsemann Hills whereas only the south polar skua breeds at Schirmacher Oasis (Pande et al. 2017).

Field Sampling

We conducted sampling for this study as part of the 'Antarctic Wildlife Monitoring Programme' under the Indian Scientific Expedition to Antarctica (Expedition nos. 33, 34 and 35)' during the austral summers (November-March) of 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16. We adopted an

opportunistic genetic sampling approach under the seabird nest monitoring protocol (see Pande *et al.*, 2017) for snow petrel sample collection. First, we selected previously marked nest sites with breeding snow petrel individuals for genetic sampling. Subsequently, we conducted both non-destructive (buccal swabs and blood smears) and non-invasive (hatched eggshells and abandoned eggs) sampling to collect biological materials from the monitored nesting sites. During non-destructive sampling of snow petrel individuals, we carefully hand-captured birds at their nest cavities and collected buccal swabs or blood samples. We collected blood samples from bird's brachial vein using 0.1 ml sterilized syringe needles and stored in EDTA vacutainer tubes. We collected buccal epithelial tissue by gently rotating a sterilized cotton-tipped swab against the inner cheek of the bird (Handel *et al.*, 2006). All individuals were released within 60 seconds of capture. Wherever available, we also collected hatched eggshells, shed adult feathers and abandoned eggs from the nests. In addition, we also conducted opportunistic muscle tissue sampling of snow petrel carcasses from wherever they were found. These carcasses were mostly from birds predated by south polar skua or found naturally dead due to other unidentified causes. We did not find any nesting sites of snow petrels at Schirmacher Oasis during our field surveys, and thus opportunistic sampling of carcasses for muscle tissue was conducted.

Similarly, we collected Wilson's storm petrel samples from monitored nesting sites at Larsemann Hills. All genetic samples of Wilson's storm petrel were collected opportunistically through carcass muscle tissue collection as capturing them was not possible due to their narrow nest cavities. No Wilson's storm petrel samples were collected from Schirmacher Oasis. We stored the samples collected at field sites at -20° C at respective Indian Antarctic research stations before being brought to Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun for further laboratory analysis. The details of sampling locations are provided in Supplementary File 1.

141 **Primer selection**

142 As there are no species-specific microsatellite markers published for snow petrel, we screened a
 143 panel of cross-species markers for individual identification of snow petrels. We selected 15
 144 microsatellite markers developed for Hawaiian petrel *Pterodroma sandwichensis* (Nine markers,
 145 Welch and Fleischer 2011) and white-chinned petrel *Procellaria aequinoctialis* (Six markers,
 146 Techow and O’Ryan 2004). These markers were selected based on their polymorphic information
 147 content (number of alleles as well as expected heterozygosity) in the aforementioned species. We
 148 also tested this panel of 15 microsatellite loci for individual identification of Wilson’s Storm Petrel
 149 samples.

150 **DNA extraction and primer standardization**

151 We used muscle tissue samples of snow petrel and Wilson’s storm petrel for initial standardization
 152 and validation of microsatellite panel. Genomic DNA was extracted in duplicate from all tissue
 153 samples using commercially available DNeasy Tissue kit (QIAGEN Inc.) using a modified
 154 approach. In brief, all samples were macerated with sterile blades independently, followed by
 155 overnight complete tissue digestion with 25 µl proteinase-K. Post-digestion, extraction was
 156 performed using Qiagen animal tissue spin column protocol. DNA was eluted twice with 100 µL
 157 of 1X TE and stored in -20°C until further processing. Each set of 11 extractions was accompanied
 158 with one extraction control to monitor possible contamination.

159 We conducted all initial PCR standardizations using muscle tissue DNA samples. We carried out
 160 amplifications for each primer in 10 µL reaction volumes containing 4 µL Qiagen Multiplex PCR
 161 buffer mix (Qiagen Inc.), 0.2 µM labeled forward primer, 0.2 µM reverse primer, 4 µM BSA and
 162 2 µL of 1:10 diluted DNA extract. The temperature regime included an initial denaturation (94 °C

for 15 min); 35 cycles of denaturation (94 °C for 30 seconds), annealing (53 or 57 °C for 45 seconds) and extension (72 °C for 45 seconds); followed by a final extension (72 °C for 30 min). Post-temperature standardization, primers with identical annealing temperatures was optimized for multiplex reactions with the same samples of both species (see Table 1). Subsequently, all test samples were amplified with standardized parameters. During all amplifications, both extraction controls and PCR negative controls (one PCR negative every set of amplifications) were included to monitor any possible contamination. PCR products were visualized in 2% agarose gels, and genotyped using LIZ500 size standard in an automated ABI3500XL genetic analyzer. Microsatellite alleles were scored using program GENEMARKER (SOFTGENETICS Inc.) and allele bins for each locus were created from the data generated. We randomly re-genotyped 15% of each locus from different samples to check for reliable genotypes and estimated genotyping error rates.

Data analysis

We calculated average amplification success as the percent positive PCR for each locus, as described by Broquet, Ménard & Petit (2007). We quantified allelic dropout and false allele rates manually as the number of dropouts or false alleles over the total number of amplifications, respectively (Broquet, Ménard & Petit, 2007). We also calculated the Probability of Identity for siblings (PID_{sibs}), the probability of two individuals drawn from a population sharing the same genotype at multiple loci and the theoretical Probability of Identity or $PID_{unbiased}$ (Waits, Taberlet & Luikart, 2001) using program GIMLET (Valière, 2002). We tested the frequency of null alleles in our data set using FREENA (Chapuis & Estoup, 2007) whereas summary statistics, tests for deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium and pairwise linkage disequilibrium were calculated for each locus using program ARLEQUIN v.3.1 (Excoffier, Guillaume & Schneider, 2005).

Results and discussion

We genotyped a total of 55 snow petrel and 24 Wilson's storm petrel samples to test and standardize the selected microsatellite markers. Snow petrel samples were selected from blood (n = 1), buccal swab (n = 2), carcass muscle tissue (n = 24) and hatched eggshells (n = 28) to test amplification success from different types of biological samples. Wilson's storm petrel samples were all from muscle tissue of individual carcasses collected in the field.

Of the 15 loci tested during the initial standardization, 12 loci showed amplification for snow petrel (loci Ptero2, Ptero6 and Ptero10 did not amplify), whereas only 10 loci successfully amplified for Wilson's storm petrel (loci Paequ2, Ptero2, Ptero6, Ptero8 and Ptero10 did not amplify) (Table 1). Subsequently, these panels of 12 and 10 loci were tested with all snow petrel and Wilson's storm petrel samples, respectively. Overall, the amplification success ranged between 96.4 - 100% for snow petrel and 91.7 - 100% for Wilson's storm petrel; and allelic dropout rates were 0 – 3.6% and 0 – 8.3% for snow petrel and Wilson's storm petrel respectively (see Table 1 for more details). For snow petrel, the loci varied from highly polymorphic (Paequ03- 12 alleles, H_o 0.68) to less polymorphic (Paequ13- 4 alleles, H_o 0.07), whereas for Wilson's storm petrel the loci were moderately polymorphic (Ptero07- 6 alleles, H_o 0.76) to less polymorphic (Paequ13- 2 alleles, H_o 0.08) (Table 1). Two loci in snow petrel (Ptero01 and Ptero09) and three loci in Wilson's storm petrel (Ptero04, Ptero09 and Paequ07) were found to deviate from the Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium, and thus were removed from any further analysis. There was no evidence for a strong linkage disequilibrium between any pair of loci (details in Supplementary Files 2 and 3). PID_{sibs} and $PID_{unbiased}$ values were found to be 3.71×10^{-03} and 8.89×10^{-07} for snow petrel, and 1.94×10^{-02} and 9.25×10^{-05} for WSP, respectively. Locus-wise and average values for observed and expected heterozygosity, number of alleles and allelic size ranges are presented in Table 1. The

frequency of null alleles across the loci was observed to be low in both the study species (snow petrel - 0.11 ± 0.09 and Wilson's storm petrel - 0.15 ± 0.07 , respectively; see Supplementary File 4).

This paper is the first attempt to use nuclear microsatellite markers to individually identify both snow petrel and Wilson's storm petrel in Antarctica, and the final panel described here provide unambiguous individual identification from both species in our study area. Testing the markers on various types of biological materials (tissue, blood, buccal swab and hatched eggshells) showed high amplification success, but further tests with non-invasive samples (for example, shed feathers) is required for long-term studies. Both $PID_{unbiased}$ and PID_{sibs} values are also sufficient enough for population genetic studies considering low population sizes of snow petrel (800-1000 individuals) and Wilson's storm petrel (<200 individuals) in the study area (Pande et al. 2017, Pande et al. unpublished report). However, it is important to point out that in case of Wilson's storm petrel the PID_{sibs} value of 1.9×10^{-2} may not be sufficiently robust enough for large populations based on suggestions of earlier studies (Waits et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2005), where such low value could potentially lead to higher misidentification rates. Future studies should consider testing additional cross-specific markers previously developed for prion species (*Pachyptila* sp.) but also tested in Wilson's storm petrel (Moodley *et al.* 2015) to create a comprehensive panel for studying large populations of the species.

Conclusion

Molecular genetic analysis has become crucial in understanding levels of genetic differentiation, hybridisation and extinction risk in seabird populations (Taylor and Friesen, 2012). In critical ecosystems such as Antarctica, individual-level genetic data can be a valuable tool to study evolution, adaptation, past events of diversifications and extinctions for wide-ranging seabirds. Moreover, genetic datasets on species of pelagic seabirds such as snow petrel and Wilson's storm

petrel are generally lacking in comparison with charismatic species such as penguins. In this study, we could establish the efficacy of cross-species markers in individual identification of these two common Antarctic seabird species. In the future, we aim to build upon the long-term genetic research under the ‘Antarctica Wildlife Monitoring Programme’ by increasing spatio-temporal sampling efforts to understand the population structure, relatedness and other aspects and provide insights to seabird behaviour (monogamy, extra-pair paternity etc.) and evolution. This detailed genetic research will also aid in long-term ecological monitoring and conservation management of breeding seabird populations of Antarctica.

Permits and ethical clearances

All samples were collected under the ‘Biology and Environmental Sciences’ component (Letter no: NCAOR/ANT/ASPA/2014-15/01) of the Indian Scientific Expeditions to Antarctica with appropriate approvals from the Environment Officer, Committee for Environmental Protection (Antarctic Treaty Secretariat), National Centre for Antarctic and Ocean Research, Earth System Science Organisation, Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India, Goa, India.

Acknowledgements

We thank the National Centre for Antarctic and Ocean Research, Ministry of Earth Sciences for providing all logistic support during the Indian Scientific Expeditions to Antarctica. We are grateful to respective expedition leaders and team member volunteers of 33rd, 34th & 35th Indian Scientific Expeditions to Antarctica for their assistance during field work. We thank A. Madhanraj, and MEERCAT lab members for their help in laboratory and Srinivas for his inputs on data analysis. We sincerely thank Wildlife Forensics and Conservation Genetics Cell, CAMPA Cell,

Research Coordinator and Dean, Wildlife Institute of India for their support. Our sincere thanks to all the reviewers of the earlier version of manuscript.

Figure legend

Figure 1: Seabird sampling locations in Antarctica. A) Schirmacher oasis, site of *Maitri* station B) Larsemann hills, site of *Bharati* station (Photo Credit: Anant Pande).

Table legend

Table 1:

Characterization of microsatellite loci genotyped in a) Snow Petrel and b) Wilsons’s Storm Petrel individual samples from Antarctica

References

- Barbraud C, Weimerskirch H. 2001. Contrasting effects of the extent of sea-ice on the breeding performance of an Antarctic top predator , the snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea*. *Journal of Avian Biology* 32: 297–302.
- Barbraud C, Weimerskirch H. 2006. Antarctic birds breed later in response to climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103: 6248–51.
- BirdLife International. 2017. Species factsheet: *Oceanites oceanicus*. Available at <http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/factsheet/22698436> (accessed 17 November 2017).
- Broquet T, Ménard N, Petit E. 2007. Noninvasive population genetics: A review of sample source, diet, fragment length and microsatellite motif effects on amplification success and genotyping error rates. *Conservation Genetics* 8: 249–260.
- Brown RM, Techow NMSM, Wood AG, Phillips, RA. 2015. Hybridization and back-Crossing in giant petrels (*Macronectes giganteus* and *M. halli*) at Bird Island, South Georgia, and a summary of hybridization in seabirds. *Plos One*, 10: e0121688. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0121688.
- Chapuis MP, Estoup A. 2007. Microsatellite null alleles and estimation of population differentiation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 24: 621–631.
- Croxall JP, Steele WK, McInnes SJ, Prince PA. 1995. Breeding distribution of the snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea*. *Marine Ornithology* 23: 69–99.
- Croxall JP, Butchart SHM, Lascelles B, Stattersfield AJ, Sullivan B, Symes A, Taylor P. 2012. Seabird conservation status, threats and priority actions : a global assessment. *Bird Conservation International* 22: 1–34.

- Excoffier L, Guillaume L, Schneider S. 2005. Arlequin (version 3.0): An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics Online* 1: 47-50.
- Gómez-Díaz E, González-Solís J, Peinado MA. 2009. Population structure in a highly pelagic seabird, the Cory's shearwater *Calonectris diomedea*: An examination of genetics, morphology and ecology. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 382:197–209.
- Handel CM, Pajot LM, Talbot SL, Sage GK. 2006. Use of buccal swabs for sampling DNA from nestling and adult birds. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34(4): 1094-1100.
- Jouventin P, Viot CR. 1985. Morphological and genetic variability of Snow Petrels *Pagodroma nivea*. *Ibis* 127: 430–441.
- Lascelles BG, Langham GM, Ronconi RA, Reid JB. 2012. From hotspots to site protection: Identifying Marine Protected Areas for seabirds around the globe. *Biological Conservation* 156: 5–14.
- Lorensten S, Amundsen T, Anthonisen K, Lifjeld J. 2000. Molecular evidence for extrapair paternity and female-female pairs in Antarctic Petrels. *The Auk*, 117:1042–1047.
- Miller CR., Joyce P, Waits LP. 2005. A new method for estimating the size of small populations from genetic mark–recapture data. *Molecular ecology* 14(7): 1991-2005.
- Moodley Y, Masello JF, Cole TL, Calderon L, Munimanda GK, Thali MR, Alderman R, Cuthbert RJ, Marin M, Massaro M, Navarro J, Phillips RA, Ryan PG, Suazo CG, Cherel Y, Weimerskirch H, Quillfeldt P. 2015. Evolutionary factors affecting the cross-species utility of newly developed microsatellite markers in seabirds. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 15: 1046–1058 DOI: 10.1111/1755-0998.12372
- Nunn GB, Stanley SE. 1998. Body size effects and rates of cytochrome b evolution in tube-nosed seabirds. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 15: 1360–1371.
- Paleczny M, Hammill E, Karpouzi V, Pauly D. 2015. Population trend of the World's monitored seabirds, 1950-2010. *Plos One* 10:e0129342. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0129342.
- Pande A, Sivakumar K, Sathyakumar S, Kumar RS, Johnson JA, Mondol S, Mathur VB. 2017. Monitoring wildlife and their habitats in the Southern Ocean and around Indian research stations in Antarctica. *Proceedings of the Indian National Science Academy* 83: 483–496.
- Piatt JF, Sydeman WJ, Wiese F. 2007. Introduction: A modern role for seabirds as indicators. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 352: 199–204.
- Quillfeldt P, Moodley Y, Weimerskirch H, Cherel Y, Delord K, Phillips RA, Navarro J, Calderón L, Masello JF. 2017. Does genetic structure reflect differences in non-breeding movements? A case study in small, highly mobile seabirds. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 17: 1-11.
- Quillfeldt P, Schmoll T, Peter HU, Epplen JT, Lubjuhn T. 2001. Genetic Monogamy in Wilson's storm-petrel. *The Auk* 118:242.
- Taylor SA, Friesen VL. 2012. Use of molecular genetics for understanding seabird evolution, ecology and conservation. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 451: 285–304.

- Techow, NMSM, O’Ryan C. 2004. Characterization of microsatellite loci in White-chinned petrel (*Procellaria aequinoctialis*) and cross-amplification in six other procellariiform species. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 33–35.
- Techow NMSM, O’Ryan C, Phillips RA, Gales R, Marin M, Patterson-Fraser D, Quintana F, Ritz MS, Thompson DR, Wanless RM, Weimerskirch H, Ryan PG. 2010. Speciation and phylogeography of giant petrels *Macronectes*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 54: 472–487.
- Valière, N. 2002. GIMLET: a computer program for analysing genetic individual identification data. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 377–379.
- Viot CR, Jouventin P, Bried J. 1993. Population genetics of southern seabirds. *Marine Ornithology* 21: 1-5.
- Waits L, Taberlet P, Luikart G. 2001. Estimating the probability of identity among genotypes in natural populations: cautions and guidelines. *Molecular Ecology* 10: 249–256.
- Warham J. 1996. *The behaviour, population biology and physiology of the Petrels*. Academic Press.
- Welch AJ, Fleischer RC. 2011. Polymorphic microsatellite markers for the endangered Hawaiian Petrel (*Pterodroma sandwichensis*). *Conservation Genetics Resources* 3: 581–584. DOI:10.1007/s12686-011-9409-4
- Welch AJ, Fleischer RC, James HF, Wile AE, Ostrom PH, Adams J, Duvall F, Holmes N, Hu D, Penniman J, Swindle KA. 2012. Population divergence and gene flow in an endangered and highly mobile seabird. *Heredity* 109: 19–28 DOI:10.1038/hdy.2012.7.

Table 1(on next page)

Characterization of microsatellite loci genotyped in snow petrel and Wilsons's storm petrel individuals from Antarctica

1

2 **Table 1. Characterization of microsatellite loci genotyped in a) Snow Petrel and b) Wilsons's Storm Petrel individual samples from Antarctica**

Sp	Locus	Primer Sequences 5' – 3'	Repeat nature	Repeat motif	Dye	PSR (bp)	Ta °C	Na	Ho	He	Allelic Range	PID _{unbiased} cumulative	PID _{sibs} cumulative	AS (%)	AD O (%)	P
a) Snow Petrel (n=55)	Ptero08 ^a	F: GCACCTGCTGGTGATGAGTC R: AGGGAAAAGGAACCATCCAG	Tetra	(AAGG) ₈	VIC	181- 221	53	11	0.49	0.73	52	8.03 x 10 ⁻⁰²	4.1 x 10 ⁻⁰¹	96.4	0	S
	Paequ03 ^b	F:TGTGGG TGCAGTAGAGCA R:CAATAAGAAGATCAGCAGAACA GAC	Di	(GA) ₁₉	VIC	219- 243	53	12	0.68	0.72	24	7.63 x 10 ⁻⁰³	1.71 x 10 ⁻⁰¹	98.2	0	S
	Ptero07 ^a	F:TTAAAAATCGGTCCAATAGTCG R:GCACAGAGTTGACCGTGTTG	Tetra	(AAAG) ₈	FA M	177- 217	53	8	0.53	0.66	48	1.12 x 10 ⁻⁰³	7.89 x 10 ⁻⁰²	98.2	3.6	S
	Ptero04 ^a	F:TGCATTGTTTCTGTCCAACTC R:GGCTGGAATGCATAGTACCA C	Di	(CA) ₁₃	FA M	117- 147	53	11	0.67	0.63	32	1.81 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	3.78 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	0	S
	Paequ10 ^b	F:GAAGCTGCACTGGAAGT R:CATGTGGTAAGAATCCAGATG	Di	(CA) ₈	NE D	159- 183	53	7	0.20	0.56	12	3.79 x 10 ⁻⁰⁵	1.99 x 10 ⁻⁰²	98.2	0	S
	Paequ13 ^b	F:GACCTGCAGCAATAGCACGAC R:TGCCTTCATCAGAATCCTCCTG	Di	(GT) ₉	PET	144- 150	57	4	0.07	0.44	6	1.27 x 10 ⁻⁰⁵	1.23 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	0	S
	Paequ07 ^b	F:TGCAGACCTGACTTTCACAGCT C R:CCTCCAAACATCCAGCCATC	Di	(GT) ₁₂	FA M	314- 320	57	3	0.30	0.40	6	4.83 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶	7.92 x 10 ⁻⁰³	100	0	S
	Paequ02 ^b	F: GCC TAC TCC ATC TTA ATT GTG R: GGTTCATACAGTTTCCTAGGTC	Di	(CA) ₂ TT(CA) ₁₀	PET	180- 200	53	7	0.03	0.30	30	2.32 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶	5.74 x 10 ⁻⁰³	98.2	1.8	S
	Ptero03 ^b	F:TGTGTACAGCATGTGCTTGAG R:GCTGAATGGCAGTTTCTTCC	Di	(CA) ₉	FA M	165- 177	53	4	0.10	0.23	22	1.36 x 10 ⁻⁰⁶	4.50 x 10 ⁻⁰³	100	0	S
	Paequ08 ^b	F: TATTCTGAGACTTGCGTTATCC R: GTGATCCATTAGTTG ATGTCTACTG	Di	(CA) ₁₁	PET	215- 223	53	4	0.16	0.18	8	8.89 x 10 ⁻⁰⁷	3.71 x 10 ⁻⁰³	100	0	S
b)	*Ptero09 ^a	F:GCAAATACCAGTCTTCCAAAGG R:TTTAAGATAAAGATGTTTGAGA ACCAC	Tetra	(AAGG) ₈	FA M	161- 189	57	9	0.67	0.72	28	-	-	100	0	S
	*Ptero01 ^a	F:GAAAACAACTCCCCACAAC R:TCCGTGACACCTGCTGTATG	Di	(CA) ₇	PET	82-104	53	5	0.33	0.32	24	-	-	98.2	0	S
	Mean(SD)							7.08 (3.01)	0.35 (0.23)	0.49 (0.19)	24.5 (14.5)					
b)	Ptero07 ^a	F:TTAAAAATCGGTCCAATAGTCG R:GCACAGAGTTGACCGTGTTG	Tetra	(AAAG) ₈	FA M	177- 217	53	6	0.42	0.76	40	7.67 x 10 ⁻⁰²	3.95 x 10 ⁻⁰¹	100	0	S
	Paequ10 ^b	F:GAAGCTGCACTGGAAGT R:CATGTGGTAAGAATCCAGATG	Di	(CA) ₈	NE D	181- 191	53	4	0.38	0.64	10	1.39 x 10 ⁻⁰²	1.91 x 10 ⁻⁰¹	100	0	S
	Paequ13 ^b	F:GACCTGCAGCAATAGCACGAC R:TGCCTTCATCAGAATCCTCCTG	Di	(GT) ₉	PET	146- 148	57	2	0.08	0.5	2	4.59 x 10 ⁻⁰³	1.13 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	8.3	S
	Paequ08 ^b	F:TATTCTGAGACTTGCGTTATCC R:GTGATCCATTAGTTGATGTCTA	Di	(CA) ₁₁	PET	219- 227	51	3	0.21	0.47	8	1.58 x 10 ⁻⁰³	6.91 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	0	S

	CTG														
Ptero01 ^a	F:GAAAACAACTCCCCACAAC R:TCCGTCAGACCTGCTGTATG	Di	(CA) ₇	PET	165-177	53	4	0.17	0.44	12	5.56 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	4.28 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	0	S
Paequ03 ^b	F: TGTGGGTGCAGTAGAGCA R: CAATAAGAAGATCAGCAGAACAG AC	Di	(GA) ₁₉	VIC	219-235	53	5	0.21	0.39	16	2.04 x 10 ⁻⁰⁴	2.79 x 10 ⁻⁰²	100	0	S
Ptero03 ^a	F:TGTGTACAGCATGTGCTTGAG R:GCTGAATGGCAGTTTCTTCC	Di	(CA) ₉	FA M	88-104	57	2	0.17	0.35	16	9.25 x 10 ⁻⁰⁵	1.94 x 10 ⁻⁰²	91.7	0	S
*Paequ07 ^b	F:TGCAGACCTGACTTTCACAGCT C R:CCTCCAAACATCCAGCCATC	Di	(GT) ₁₂	FA M	312-318	51	3	0.08	0.16	6	-	-	100	4.2	S
*Ptero09 ^a	F:GCAAATACCAGTCTTCCAAAGG R:TTTAAGATAAAGATGTTTGAGA ACCAC	Tetra	(AAGG) ₈	FA M	173-185	61	6	0.67	0.55	16	-	-	91.7	0	S
*Ptero04 ^a	F:TGCATTGTTTCTGTCCAAACTC R:GGCTGGAATGCATAGTACCAA C	Di	(CA) ₁₃	FA M	127-139	57	4	0.38	0.52	12	-	-	100	0	S
Mean(SD)							3.9 (1.3)	0.28(0.18)	0.48(0.15)	13.8 (9.7)					

*Locus deviating from Hardy Weinberg Equilibrium; Sp – Species; PSR – Product Size Range; Ta – Annealing temperature; Na – Number of Alleles; Ho – Observed Heterozygosity; He – Expected Heterozygosity; PID – Probability of Identification; AS – Amplification Success; ADO – Allelic Dropout; ^aWelch and Fleischer 2011, ^b Techow and O’Ryan 2004

Figure 1

Seabird sampling locations in Antarctica.

A) Schirmacher oasis, site of *Maitri* station B) Larsemann hills, site of *Bharati* station (Photo Credit: Anant Pande).

