

Table 1. Effective population size (N_e) and observed mean heterozygosity and number of alleles (in parentheses where applicable) for genetic markers surveyed in island foxes (2, 3, 5)

	N_e	Allozymes	Minisatellites	Microsatellites	n	DRB	DQB	FH2202	CFA12-4	CFA12-13
San Miguel	163	0.008 (1.1)	0.13	0.11 (1.78)	25.8	0.00 (2)	0.00 (1)	0.43 (6)	0.33 (2)	0.50 (4)
Santa Rosa	955	0.055 (1.2)	0.34	0.21 (2.56)	29.0	0.16 (2)	0.00 (1)	0.59 (8)	0.50 (7)	0.44 (4)
Santa Cruz	984	0.041 (1.1)	0.19	0.22 (2.39)	22.8	0.14 (2)	0.21 (2)	0.65 (6)	0.64 (5)	0.46 (3)
San Nicolas	247	0.000 (1.0)	0.00	0.00 (1.00)	26.6	0.36 (2)	0.00 (1)	0.62 (3)	0.57 (3)	0.33 (2)
Santa Catalina	979	0.000 (1.0)	0.45	0.36 (2.61)	29.0	0.36 (3)	0.55 (4)	0.63 (8)	0.24 (5)	0.37 (3)
San Clemente	551	0.013 (1.1)	0.25	0.26 (2.11)	19.0	0.00 (1)	0.00 (1)	0.68 (5)	0.50 (4)	0.60 (3)

N_e was estimated from population census sizes (3). Mean sample size (n) is indicated for the MHC assays.

conformation polymorphism (SSCP) (14). Only predistemper outbreak individuals from Santa Catalina Island were used in this study. We used published PCR primers and protocols (15, 16) to amplify 267-bp (DRB) and 142-bp (DQB) fragments that were visualized by end-labeling one primer with ^{32}P (17) followed by separation on 5%-acrylamide gels (with 5% glycerol vol/vol) for 5–9 h at room temperature. Gels were transferred to Whatman paper, dried, and exposed to autoradiographic film for 12–48 h. Unique alleles were reamplified and sequenced for each gel according to Sunnucks *et al.* (14). Sequencing was performed on a Beckman CEQ2000 as per manufacturer's protocols. Non-synonymous (d_N) and synonymous (d_S) substitution rates were estimated for antigen-binding site (ABS) and non-ABS codons (18) for each locus by using the method of Nei and Gojobori (19) in the program MEGA 2 (20). Sequences have been deposited in GenBank (AY366482–AY366488).

Class II microsatellite loci CFA12-4 (forward, GCA ATG GCA AGA CCT AAA GC; reverse, AGG GAG GAA AGT CTC CGT GT), CFA12-13 (forward, TGG GAG AGT TAG AGG AGG CA; reverse, GCC CAC CAC TCT CAC ACA TG), and FH2202 (21) were typed by using dye-labeled primers on a Beckman CEQ 2000. CFA12-4 is located in the 56.2-kb segment spanned by genes DLA-DQA1 and DLA-DRB1 and is ≈ 18.0 kb from the former in the domestic dog (S.D., unpublished data). CFA12-13 is located in intron 5 of the psm B8 genes in the domestic dog (S.D., unpublished data). FH2202 is located near the DLA-DRB2 pseudogene in the domestic dog (21) and is located in the 216.8-kb region spanned by CFA12-4 and CFA12-13 (S.D., unpublished data). The forward primers were augmented on the 5' end with the addition of an M13 sequence, and a dye-labeled M13 primer was included in the PCR reaction (22). The hybrid forward-M13 primer and the labeled M13 primer were used in limiting concentration in the PCR (2.5 μM each). We performed a two-step PCR, which included an initial 3-min denaturation at 94°C followed by 22 cycles with the following conditions: 94°C for 45 sec, 56°C for 45 sec, and 72°C for 45 sec. An additional eight cycles were performed with an annealing temperature of 53°C, with the same time profiles, and was followed by a 72°C soak for 5 min. PCR products were run with a size standard (Beckman) on the CEQ 2000 following the manufacturer's protocols.

Allelic diversity (number of alleles per locus) and observed heterozygosity were measured for all island populations. Expected heterozygosity, linkage disequilibrium, and F_{ST} were calculated by using the program GENETIX (23). Bonferroni corrections were used to account for multiple comparisons. R_{ST} was computed by using the approach described by Goodman (24) with the program RSTCALC.

Simulations. We conducted forward simulations to establish the intensity of selection (s) needed to maintain the observed heterozygosity at the MHC-linked microsatellite loci and the DRB locus in San Nicolas Island foxes. To estimate the selection coefficient, we first needed to establish the effective size of the

population (N_e) and effective bottleneck size (N_{e-b}) needed to account for the lack of variation observed at 18 microsatellite loci for 29 individuals (5). Following Hoelzel *et al.* (25), we assumed that heterozygosity would have been detected in our sample if at least 1 individual of the 29 sampled was heterozygous on average at one locus. Consequently, the upper threshold of heterozygosity is 0.002 [$1/(29 \cdot 18)$]. This threshold gives a probability of 0.35 ($0.998^{18 \cdot 29}$), for sampling 29 individuals that are all monomorphic at 18 loci. Each microsatellite locus was assumed to evolve in a step-wise manner (26) with a mutation rate of 10^{-2} , 10^{-3} , or 10^{-4} . Mating was random with separate sexes and nonoverlapping generations. To maximize the diversity of starting simulation conditions, initial allele frequencies were set at $1/k$, where k is the mean number of alleles observed for each microsatellite locus across all island fox populations. To allow allele frequencies to equilibrate, populations were allowed to reproduce for 2,000 generations, followed by the introduction of bottleneck events of varying intensity and duration. After the bottleneck, the population increased at an intrinsic rate of increase (r) of 0.28 per generation as observed in island fox populations (G.R., unpublished data) to a final effective population size of 125 and 250. These effective sizes were reached in 10 to 20 generations, depending on the bottleneck size and duration and were 0.25 and 0.50, respectively, of the census population size on San Nicolas Island (3, 27). We assumed 2 years per island fox generation (3). Five hundred simulations were performed. Initial simulations clearly suggested a severe bottleneck (to an effective size of 10 individuals or fewer for one or two generations, followed by ≈ 12 generations of population growth) was necessary to explain near monomorphism at the 18 loci. A severe bottleneck followed by a small number of generations was required to eliminate heterozygosity in the microsatellite loci yet prevent its restoration by mutation. All other less severe demographic scenarios had occurrence frequencies much less than 5% and hence were regarded as implausible. In the one-generation bottleneck scenario, with a mutation rate of 10^{-4} , 16.2% (81 of 500 simulations) of the simulations possessed a mean heterozygosity for the 18 loci lower than 0.002 (Table 2, which is published as supporting information on the PNAS web site). A higher mutation rate, or larger effective bottleneck size (N_{e-b}) or effective size of the population (N_e) yielded $<5\%$ of simulations with this level of heterozygosity.

This extreme scenario is consistent with the recent population crash of island foxes on the east end of Santa Catalina Island where the population was reduced from $>1,000$ to 10 individuals in a single generation due to a canine distemper epidemic in 1999. A similar event may have occurred on San Nicolas Island because fox numbers were low in the 1970s (28) and increased rapidly during the 1980s (29) to 500 individuals by 1988 (2). Considering the epidemic on Santa Catalina Island, and the results of our simulation, we used a single generation bottleneck with effective population size of 5 (half the census population size of 10 on Santa Catalina Island) in our final simulation to assess the intensity of selection.

rating a one- or several-generation population bottleneck as recently as 10–20 generations ago, and that consisted of 10 or fewer individuals, resulted in at least 15% of simulations with levels of heterozygosity consistent with that observed. We explored numerous other less extreme demographic scenarios, but none approached observed levels of variation in >5% of simulations, and hence we regard them as implausible. Further, the possibility of an extreme bottleneck is consistent with that observed on Santa Catalina Island where, in a recent distemper epidemic afflicting 80% of the island area, the fox population declined to only 10 individuals observed alive (12). Given our demographic scenario for San Nicolas Island foxes, we found that periodic selection coefficients for the microsatellite loci as high as 0.5–0.95 are required to maintain heterozygosity values near 0.62 at microsatellite locus FH2202 and 0.36 at the DRB locus (Fig. 2 and *Supporting Text*). These selection coefficients are much larger than those reported in natural (34–36) (range: 0.05–0.15) and human populations (37, 38) (range: 0.19–0.39) for a locus under balancing selection.

Balancing selection at the MHC is predicted to result in lower levels of differentiation among island populations relative to levels based on neutral loci (39). To measure population differentiation, we used R_{ST} and F_{ST} for microsatellite and sequence information, respectively (24). Mean R_{ST} for the unlinked microsatellite loci was 0.72 (0.71–0.74; 95% CI) and significantly higher than 0.53 (0.48–0.58; 95% CI) for MHC-linked microsatellites. Similarly, F_{ST} was elevated for the DRB (0.58) and DQB (0.55); however, these values are comparable to that for allozyme loci (0.56) (2). Balancing selection over evolutionary time periods is expected to maintain corrected ratios of nonsynonymous (replacement) to synonymous (silent) substitutions of greater than one (40). We assessed nonsynonymous (d_N) to synonymous (d_S) substitution ratios in the antigen binding sites (ABS) and found them significantly greater than one for the two class II MHC genes (1.94 and 1.34 for DRB and DQB, respectively) and elevated relative to the non-ABS portions of the gene (0.646 and 0.012 for DRB and DQB, respectively). Consequently, these results provide independent support for the action of balancing selection at the MHC loci that we surveyed.

Conclusions and Conservation Implications. Our empirical and simulation results suggest that intense periodic balancing selection at the MHC may have allowed the persistence of variation in San Nicolas foxes despite strong genetic drift. This result adds significantly to the small number of studies showing evidence for balancing selection as a mechanism to maintain genetic variation (41–45). In effect, periodic selection has rescued genetic variation at the MHC and, potentially, other fitness-related genes. Consequently, San Nicolas Island foxes may not have suffered some of the predicted fitness and kin recognition effects of extreme genetic monomorphism. Such periodic selection may explain the inconsistent relationship between MHC heterozygosity and neutral loci in other species (46). Therefore, although neutral loci may be useful in predicting inbreeding depression and loss of genetic variation due to drift (47), new molecular tools are needed to directly assess the fitness decline of small populations. Either a panel of candidate genes influencing fitness should be considered (48) or loci under selection should be identified directly through genomic scans (49).

Finally, our results rekindle the debate concerning the use of MHC and other fitness-related genes in the management of captive and endangered wild populations. Currently, neutral markers are used exclusively in the absence of pedigree information to minimize inbreeding in small populations. With the discovery of the function and importance of MHC genes in natural populations, it was suggested that maintaining allelic diversity at MHC should be an additional goal of genetic management (50). This notion was debated and largely discredited (51, 52). Our results, and those showing an absence of association between variation in neutral and fitness-related traits in natural populations (53), suggest reconsideration of this idea. Preservation of a diverse array of fitness-related genes (54, 55), along with neutral variation, might be the key to the long-term survival of endangered populations.

We thank S. Edward, P. Hedrick, G. Luikart, P. Morin, C. Taylor, and G. Shin for helpful comments on the manuscript and A. Selaya for technical assistance. This project was funded in part by the National Science Foundation and the Academic Senate of the University of California.

- Collins, P. W. (1982) Master's thesis (Univ. of California, Santa Barbara).
- Gilbert, D., Lehman N., O'Brien, S. J. & Wayne, R. K. (1990) *Nature*, **344**, 764–761.
- Wayne, R. K., George, S. B., Gilbert, D., Collins, P. W., Kovach, S. D., Girman, D. & Lehman, N. (1991) *Evolution* **45**, 1849–1868.
- Collins, P. W. (1991) *J. Ethnobiol.* **11**, 51–81.
- Goldstein, D. B., Roemer, G. W., Smith, D. A., Reich, D. E., Bergman, A. & Wayne, R. K. (1999) *Genetics* **151**, 797–801.
- Risch, N. J. & Devlin, B. (1992) *Science* **255**, 717–720.
- 66 *Federal Register* 5 (2001), pp. 1295–1300.
- Robinson, J., Malik, A., Parham, P., Bodmer, J. G. & Marsh, S. G. (2000) *Tissue Antigens* **55**, 280–287.
- Edwards, S. V. & Hedrick, P. W. (1998) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **13**, 305–311.
- Klein, J. (1986) *Natural History of the Major Histocompatibility Complex* (Wiley, New York).
- Garcelon, D. K., Wayne, R. K. & Gonzales, B. J. (1992) *J. Wildl. Dis.* **28**, 223–229.
- Timm, S. F., Barker, W. D., Johnson, S. A., Sewell, J. H., Sharpe, P. B., Schmidt, G. A. & Garcelon, D. K. (2002) *Island Fox Recovery Efforts on Santa Catalina Island, California* (Inst. for Wildlife Studies, Arcata, CA).
- Roemer, G. W., Smith, D. A., Garcelon, D. K. & Wayne, R. K. (2001) *J. Zool.* **255**, 1–14.
- Sunnucks, P., Wilson, A. C. C., Beheregary, L. B., Zenger, K., French J. & Taylor, A. C. (2000) *Mol. Ecol.* **9**, 1699–1710.
- Wagner, J. L., Burnett, R. C., DeRose, S. A., Francisco L. V., Storb, R. & Ostrander, E. A. (1996) *Transplantation* **62**, 876–877.
- Hoelzel, A. R., Stephens, J. C. & O'Brien, S. J. (1999) *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **16**, 611–618.
- Sambrook, J., Fritsch, E. F. & Maniatis, T. (1989) *Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual* (Cold Spring Harbor Lab. Press, Plainview, NY).
- Brown, J. H. (1993) *Nature* **364**, 33–39.
- Nei, M. & Gojobori, T. (1986) *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **3**, 418–426.
- Kumar, S., Tamura, K., Jakobsen, I. B. & Nei, M. (2001) *Bioinformatics* **17**, 1244–1245.
- Wagner, J. L., Burnett, R. C., Works, J. D. & Storb, R. (1996) *Tissue Antigens* **48**, 554–561.
- Boutin-Ganache I., Raposo, M., Raymond, M. & Descepper, C. F. (2001) *Biotechniques* **31**, 1–3.
- Belkhir, K. (1999) GENETIX, A Windows Program for Population Genetic Analysis (Universite Montpellier II, Montpellier, France), Version 4.04.
- Goodman, S. J. (1997) *Mol. Ecol.* **6**, 881–885.
- Hoelzel, A. R. (1999) *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **68**, 23–39.
- Ohta, T. & Kimura, M. (1973) *Genet. Res.* **22**, 201–204.
- Frankham, R. (1995) *Genet. Res.* **66**, 95–107.
- Laughrin, L. (1980) in *The California Islands: Proceedings of a Multidisciplinary Symposium*, ed. Powers, D. M. (Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, CA.), pp. 745–750.
- Kovach, S. D. & Dow, R. J. (1985) *Annual Report: Island Fox Research on San Nicolas Island* (Dept. of the Navy Pacific Missile Test Center, San Diego, CA.).
- Ellegren, H. (2000) *Trend. Genet.* **16**, 551–558.
- Kimura, M. & Crow, J. F. (1964) *Genetics* **49**, 725–738.
- Hartl, D. L. & Clark A. G. (1997) *Principles of Population Genetics* (Sinauer, Sunderland, MA).
- Maruyama, T. & Nei, M. (1981) *Genetics* **98**, 441–459.
- Satta, Y., O'hUigin, C., Takahata, N. & Klein, J. (1994) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. **91**, 7184–7188.
- Thursz, M. R., Thomas, H. C., Greenwood, B. M. & Hill, A. V. S. (1997) *Nat. Genet.* **17**, 11–12.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. & Bodmer, W. F. (1999) *The Genetics of Human Populations* (Dover, New York).
- Markow, T., Hedrick, P. W., Zuerlin, K., Danilovs, J., Martin, J., Vyvial, T. & Armstrong C. (1993) *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **53**, 943–952.
- Black, F. L. & Hedrick, P. W. (1997) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA* **94**, 12452–12456.

39. Schierup, M. H., Vekemans, X. & Charlesworth, D. (2000) *Genet. Res.* **76**, 51–62.
40. Hughes, A. L. & Nei, M. (1988) *Nature* **352**, 167–170.
41. Van Delden, W. (1982) *Evol. Biol.* **15**, 187–222.
42. Allison, A. C. (1964) *Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Genet.* **29**, 139–149.
43. Richman, A. D. & Kohn, J. R. (1996) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **11**, 479–502.
44. Greaves, J. H., Redfern, R., Ayres, P. B. & Gill, J. E. (1977) *Genet. Res.* **30**, 257–264.
45. Garrigan, D. & Hedrick, P. W. (2003) *Evolution* **57**, 1707–1722.
46. Bernatchez, L. & Landry, C. (2003) *J. Evol. Biol.* **16**, 363–377.
47. Falconer, D. S. & MacKay, T. F. C. (1996) *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics* (Addison–Wesley, London).
48. Purugganan, M. & Gibson, G. (2003) *Mol. Ecol.* **12**, 1109–1112.
49. Schlötterer, C. (2002) *Genetics* **160**, 753–763.
50. Hughes, A. L. (1991) *Conserv. Biol.* **5**, 249–251.
51. Vrijenhoek, R. C. & Leberg, P. L. (1991) *Conserv. Biol.* **5**, 252–254.
52. Miller, P. S. & Hedrick, P. W. (1991) *Conserv. Biol.* **5**, 556–558.
53. Reed, D. H. & Frankham, R. (2001) *Evolution* **55**, 1095–1103.
54. Crandall Bininda-Emonds, O. R. P., Mace, G. M. & Wayne, R. K. (2000) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **15**, 290–295.
55. Luikart, G., England, P. R., Tallmon, D., Jordan, S. & Taberlet, P. (2003) *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **4**, 981–994.