OPEN ACCESS – RESEARCH ARTICLE

Genome size variation and incidence of polyploidy in Scrophulariaceae *sensu lato* from the Iberian Peninsula

Mariana Castro[1],*, Sílvia Castro [1] and João Loureiro[1]

[1]CFE, Centre for Functional Ecology, Department of Life Sciences, University of Coimbra, PO Box 3046, Coimbra, 3001-401, Portugal.

 *Corresponding author

Corresponding author's e-mail address: m1castro@portugalmail.pt

ABSTRACT

Background and aims: In the last decade, genomic studies using DNA markers have strongly influenced the current phylogeny of Angiosperms. Genome size and ploidy level have contributed to this discussion being considered important characters in biosystematics, ecology and population biology. Despite the recent increase in studies related with genome size evolution and polyploidy incidence, in Scrophulariaceae only a few works are available. In this context, we assessed the value of genome size, mostly as a taxonomic marker, and the role of polyploidy as a process of genesis and maintenance of plant diversity in Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* in Iberian Peninsula.

Methodology: Large scale analyses of genome size and ploidy level variation across Iberian Peninsula were performed using flow cytometry. One hundred sixty two populations of 59 distinct taxa were analysed. A bibliographic review on chromosome counts was also performed.

Principal results: From the 59 sampled taxa, 51 represent first estimates of genome size. The majority of the Scrophulariaceae species presented very small to small genome sizes (2C ≤ 7.0 pg). Furthermore, in most of the analysed genera it was possible to use this character to separate several taxa, independently if these genera were homoploid or heteroploid. Also, some genome related phenomena were detected, such as intraspecific variation of genome size in some genera and the possible occurrence of dysploidy in *Verbascum* spp. With respect to polyploidy, despite a few new DNA ploidy levels have been detected in *Veronica*, no multiple cytotypes have been found in any taxa.

Conclusions: This work contributed with important basic scientific knowledge on genome size and polyploid incidence in the Scrophulariaceae, providing important background information for subsequent studies, with several perspectives for future studies being opened.

INTRODUCTION

The knowledge of the genome has been increasingly important in many areas of plant research, including taxonomy and biosystematics, ecology and population biology. Genomes represent a distinct and legitimate level of organization, with unique and particular evolutionary histories. Genome size is one of its intrinsic characteristics, being considered a constant species-specific character that can help to explain relationships between species (Gregory 2001). As shown by Bennett and Leitch (2010), genome size is still unknown for about 97.5% of angiosperm species. Despite the small representation of estimates it is already possible to find a large variation in genome size among different taxonomic groups. This highlights the relevance of genome size as a taxonomic and/or ecological marker in particular plant groups. Also, the variation in amount of DNA content (or lack of it) has been a central focus on evolutionary biology, and one important tool to know the structure of genetic information, its evolution and function, and to understand the biological basis of the diversity and its adaptive value in ecological, evolutionary and taxonomic interpretations (Gregory 2005b, Greilhuber *et al.* 2010).

Nowadays, genomes are considered to be highly dynamic and their evolution are considered to be a bidirectional process, with its size resulting from a dynamic balance between expansion and contraction forces (Bennett and Leitch 2005). Generally, polyploidy is one of the mechanisms that may lead to increases in genome size. In homoploid plants (i.e., species with the same number of chromosomes), genome expansion is due to amplification and

insertion of transposable genetic elements (different amounts of noncoding, repetitive DNA sequences; Vitte and Bennetzen 2006) and evolution and amplification of satellite repeats (variation in the number and the proportion of minisatellites and microsatellites; Lim *et al.* 2006). Relatively to the loss of genome size, it is associated with deletional mechanisms like unequal intra-strand homologous recombination, illegitimate recombination and/or higher rate of nucleotide deletion over insertion (Bennetzen *et al.* 2005).

In biosystematics, ecology and evolution, genome size has been important as a tool to discriminate taxa and resolve complex low-level taxonomies, to distinguish groups with phenotypic similarities, with a low number of distinct morphological characters, with continuous morphological variations and/or groups prone to inter-specific hybridization or with complex evolutionary histories (e.g., allopolyploids). Also, several studies tried to predict the correlation of genomes size with several phenotypic, physiological and/or ecological characteristics (the nucleotypic effect) and to understand the dynamics of genome evolution (studying inter- and intraspecific variation "patterns" in genome size) (Loureiro *et al.* 2010).

As traditionally circumscribed (e.g., von Wettstein, 1891), the Scrophulariaceae is the largest family within the order Lamiales and has a worldwide distribution. However, recent molecular studies using DNA sequences of plastid genes revealed at least five distinct monophyletic groups leading to the disintegration of the traditional classification of Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* in, at least, 6 families (Olmstead *et al.* 2001). Members

of the classical Scrophulariaceae are currently found in Scropulariaceae *sensu stricto*, Plantaginaceae, Orobanchaceae (the latter two contain most of the taxa that have moved), Stilbaceae, Phrymaceae and Linderniaceae (Olmstead *et al.* 2001, APG II 2003). In Iberian Peninsula, Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* is represented by 323 species distributed in 33 genera (Benedí *et al.* 2009). Most species are ruderal and can be easily found in disturbed lands; still, there are several species listed in the red lists, and thus in need of special protection (e.g., *Anarrhinum longipedicellatum*).

Considering that there is almost no available information on genome size for any taxa of this family (but see Albach and Greilhuber 2004), that there are several records in the literature pointing to the possible existence of polyploids within and between species of Scrophulariaceae (e.g., *Antirrhinum*, *Digitalis* and *Veronica*) and that, in case polyploids are found, many taxa present large attractive flowers, ideal for reproductive isolation studies, it would be important to obtain background information on genome evolution and polyploid incidence in the Scrophulariaceae through a large-scale cytogenetic-based study.

Therefore, the main objectives of the present study were to assess the value of genome size as a taxonomic marker and the role of polyploidy as a process of genesis and maintenance of plant diversity in Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* in Iberian Peninsula. For that we: 1) assessed chromosome numbers, genome size and polyploidy incidence in Scrophulariaceae taxa from Iberian Peninsula through an exhaustive review of the bibliographic literature; 2) estimated the

genome size of a diverse array of taxa from several key genera; and 3) assessed cytotype diversity through large-scale screenings in natural populations.

METHODS

Plant material

Plant samples from 59 taxa of the Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* were collected from several field locations in Portugal and Spain. Seeds from some taxa were kindly provided by *Index Semina* of several Iberian research institutions [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**].

Field collections were carried out during the flowering season (March to August) of the studied taxa. In each population, leaves and/or seeds from up to 30 individuals were collected and stored in hermetic plastic bags. Samples were kept at 4ºC in a refrigerator until analysis (usually, not more than two days). Voucher specimens were also collected for plant identification and were kept in the Herbarium of the University of Coimbra (COI).

Seeds from Scrophulariaceae taxa and from reference standards were sown in plastic cuvettes filled with commercial peat. Plastic cuvettes were put in a greenhouse operating at 20 ± 2 ºC and with a photoperiod of 16h/8h (light/dark) and a light intensity of 530 ± 2 $\mu mol.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$.

Bibliographic review

An extensive bibliographic review on chromosome counts, localities and genome size of the studied species was carried out. For chromosome information and localities the following bibliography or online databases were used: Flora Iberica (Benedí et al. 2009), Tropicos[®] (**Website 1**), Anthos (Aedo and Castroviejo, 2005), BioDiversity4all (Ribeiro *et al.* 2011; for localities only) and M. Queirós printed files database available at the Department of Life Sciences, University of Coimbra. For genome size information, the Plant DNA C-values Database (Bennett and Leitch 2010) was the main source of information.

Genome size and ploidy level estimations

Flow cytometric (FCM) analyses of genome size and ploidy level were carried out using leaves from field collected or seed germinated plants. Nuclear suspensions were prepared according to Galbraith *et al.* (1983), by chopping approximately 50 mg of plant material of the sample species and 50 mg of leaves of the internal reference standard (when possible and justifiable, the same reference standard was used for all the taxa of each genus and prior to this study their genome size was recalibrated using *Pisum sativum* "Ctirad" as the primary standard [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**]) with a sharp razor blade in a glass Petri dish containing 1 mL of WPB buffer (0.2 M Tris.HCl, 4 mM $MgCl_2.6H_2O$, 1% Triton X-100, 2 mM EDTA $Na_2.2H_2O$, 86 mM NaCl, 10 mM metabisulfite, 1% PVP-10, pH adjusted to 7.5 and stored at 4ºC; Loureiro *et al.* 2007b). For each taxon/population, after the first sample, if necessary the chopping intensity and amount of plant material was adjusted in order to

have a rate of 20-50 nuclei/s in subsequent replicates. In samples with a large amount of cytosolic compounds, the chopping intensity was reduced to avoid their release from the cells and, thus prevent or minimize their negative effect on nuclear fluorescence (Loureiro *et al.* 2006). Nuclear suspensions were then filtered through an 50 µm nylon filter and 50 µg.mL^{-1} of propidium iodide (PI, Fluka, Buchs, Switzerland) and 50 µg.mL^{-1} of RNAse (Fluka, Buchs, Switzerland) were added to sample tubes to stain the DNA and avoid staining of double stranded RNA, respectively. Samples were analysed within a 5 min period in a Partec CyFlow Space flow cytometer (Partec GmbH, Görlitz, Germany) equipped with a 532 nm green solid-state laser, operating at 30 mW. Integral fluorescence and fluorescence height and width emitted from nuclei were collected through a 620 nm band-pass interference filter. For each taxon, the amplifier system was set to a constant voltage and gain. Each day, prior to analysis, the instrument stability and linearity was checked either with fluorescent beads or using PI stained nuclei isolated from *Pisum sativum* "Ctirad". The analyses were only started when CV values were below 2%. If this was not achieved both a cleaning procedure and an adjustment of the position of the flow chamber with respect to the incident laser were made until the optimal CV values were obtained.

Results were acquired using the Partec FloMax software (v. 2.5) in the form of six graphics: fluorescence pulse integral in linear scale (FL); forward light scatter (FS) vs. side light scatter (SS), both in logarithmic (log) scale; FL vs. time; FL vs. fluorescence pulse height; FL vs. FS in log scale and FL vs. SS in log scale (For an example of data acquisition see **[ADDITIONAL**

INFORMATION]). In most samples, in the latter graphic, a polygonal region was defined to include only intact nuclei, which was subsequently used to gate all the other graphics. At least 1,300 nuclei in both sample's and standard's G1 peaks were analysed per sample (Suda *et al.* 2007). Genome size estimates were only considered when the CV values of G1 peaks were below 5%. Samples with higher CV values were discarded and a new sample was prepared. For some taxa with high amounts of cytosolic compounds it was not possible to achieve such CV values, and thus a higher CV threshold was considered acceptable (8%).

In each population, ploidy level and genome size was obtained for 3 individuals. For the remaining individuals, only ploidy level information was gathered. For those individuals, the pooled sample strategy (5-6 individuals plus the reference standard) was followed.

Ploidy level analyses consisted of determining the DNA index (ratio between the mean FL of sample's and standard's G_1 nuclei), with the assumed DNA ploidy level being in most cases the one more commonly found in the literature (Suda *et al.* 2007). The holoploid genome size in pg (2C; *sensu* Greilhuber *et al.* 2005) of each individual was estimated by multiplying the DNA index by the nuclear DNA content of the reference standard. The monoploid genome size (1Cx; *sensu* Greilhuber *et al.* 2005) of all species was also calculated by dividing the holoploid genome size (2C) by the supposed ploidy level of each taxa in mass values (pg).

Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics of genome size were calculated for each species (mean, standard deviation of the mean and coefficient of variation of the mean). For genera with more than one species, box plots with mean and standard deviation of the mean were computed.

Differences in genome size among families considering the newly established circumscriptions (i.e., Scrophulariaceae *s.s.*, Orobanchaceae and Plantaginaceae) were assessed using a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA on ranks (normal distribution data and homoscedasticity was not achieved even after data transformation). For genus with more than one sampled species (*Anarrhinum*, *Antirrhinum*, *Digitalis*, *Linaria*, *Misopates*, *Pedicularis*, *Scrophularia*, *Verbascum* and *Veronica*) differences in nuclear DNA content within and between species were evaluated. For variables that were normal distribution data and homoscedastic, a *t*-test or a one-way ANOVA was followed. In *Linaria* spp. and *Veronica* spp., data transformations ($\log_{10}$ and square root, respectively) had to be used to achieve normal distribution dataand homoscedasticity. In *Scrophularia* sp., due to failure in achieving homoscedasticity, even after data transformation, a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA on ranks was used. When statistically significant differences were detected, either a multiple comparison Tukey-Kramer test (for parametric data) or the Dunn's method (for non-parametric data) was applied to determine which groups presented significantly different values. In *Veronica* spp., a linear regression analysis and a Pearson correlation were performed between mean nuclear DNA content and

chromosome numbers of each taxon. All statistical analyses were made using SPSS software (IBM Corporation, Somers, NY, USA).

RESULTS

The bibliographic review on chromosome counts of 116 Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* taxa present in Iberian Peninsula, revealed that 28 taxa presented more than one value of chromosome numbers, despite that only in 10 taxa (8.6% of the total) this may represent different ploidy levels (e.g., *Digitalis purpurea* subsp. *purpurea* and *Odontites vernus*, both with $2x$ and $4x$; *Veronica cymbalaria* and *V. hederifolia*, both with $2x$ and $3x$). For the remaining taxa, usually differences of 2 or more chromosomes are reported, but never an additional full set of chromosomes [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**].

The use of FCM enabled to perform a large scale analysis of 17 genera of Scrophulariaceae *s.l.*, comprising 59 species and a total of 162 populations (**Table 1**). From the 59 sampled species, 51 are first estimations of genome size (86%, **Table 1**). With a few exceptions (e.g., *Veronica micrantha*) the overall quality of the results, as given by the CV values of G_1 peaks and by the background debris, was good, with mean CV values below 5% being achieved in most taxa (**Figure 1**).

Among the species sampled, a genome size variation of 21.6-fold was found, with the lowest mean value being obtained for *Verbascum simplex* (2C = 0.74 ± 0.02 pg) and the highest one for *Melampyrum pratense* subsp. *latifolium* (2C = 15.69 ± 0.19 pg). Still, according with the genome size categories defined

by Leitch *et al*. (1998), 89.8 % of the taxa have a very small genome (2C ≤ 2.8 pg), 8.5 % have a small genome (2.8 pg < 2C ≤ 7.0 pg) and 1.7 % have an intermediate genome (7.0 pg < 2C ≤ 28.0 pg). No species with large (28.0 pg < 2C ≤ 70.0 pg) and very large (2C > 70.0 pg) genome sizes were detected (**Figure 2**). No significant differences in genome size were obtained among families considering the newly established taxonomy (Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA: H_2 = 5.47, P = 0.065).

A detailed analysis of the variation of genome size within each genus, revealed that no statistically significant differences were detected in genome size among sampled taxa of *Anarrhinum* (ANOVA: F_2 = 1.51, P = 0.230), *Anthirrhinum* (ANOVA: F_4 = 2.39, P = 0.082) and *Misopates* (*t*-test: t = 0.01, P = 0.991). In all the other sampled genera, statistically significant differences were observed (see details of the tests in **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**; **Figure 3**), with genome size being an important character to separate at least two taxa within each genus.

In *Scrophularia*, *Verbascum* and *Veronica* genome size differences were due to different numbers of chromosomes among taxa. Also, despite many *Scrophularia* species were not statistically different, due to dissimilar and non-overlapping values of genome size, it was possible to use this character to separate several species (e.g., *S. nodosa*, *S. frutescens*, *S. hederifolia*, *S. lyrata*; Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA: H_8 = 62.72, P < 0.001; **Figure 3A**). In *Verbascum*, despite it was possible to statistically distinguish *V. virgatum* from all the other analysed taxa, the remaining ones had very similar genome sizes

(ANOVA: F_5 = 374.31, P < 0.001; **Figure 3B**). In *Veronica*, with the exception of *V. officinalis* and *V. micrantha*, all the other analysed taxa were significantly different in genome size (ANOVA: F_8 = 1677.4, P < 0.001; **Figure 3C**); the linear regression analysis between chromosome numbers and genome size, revealed a positive correlation between these characters, with a relatively high R^2 value of 0.7229 (**Figure 3D**); a Pearson correlation analysis confirmed this result (correlation coefficient of 0.85, P < 0.05).

In the case of *Digitalis*, *Linaria* and *Pedicularis*, according with the literature, all the analysed taxa within each genus present the same number of chromosomes (56, 14 and 16, respectively, [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**]). However, regardless of that, statistically significant differences in genome size were detected [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**], being possible to separate the analysed species of *Digitalis* (ANOVA: F_2 = 129.93, P < 0.001; **Figure 3E**) and *Pedicularis*. In *Linaria*, *L. triornithophora* presented a statistically distinguishable higher genome size than the remaining species (ANOVA, F_8 = 750.99, P < 0.001; 2C = 2.66 pg; **Figure 3F**); however, the other species presented dissimilar but close 2C values of genome size ranging from 1.05 to 1.32 pg, not all distinguishable statistically (**Figure 3F**).

In taxa where more populations were collected, the incidence of intraspecific variation of genome size was evaluated. In *Digitalis purpurea* subsp. *purpurea* a DNA range of 1.76 to 2.06 pg/2C (n = 10 populations) was obtained [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**]. Still, in all populations except population

MC92 the estimates were homogenous (CV < 2.0 %). In this population a CV value of 5.6 % was obtained, reflecting three dissimilar genome size estimates (1.80, 1.91 and 2.02 pg/2C). These results at population level reflected the scenario obtained for this taxon, with 3 main groups of estimates differing of approximately 0.11 pg being obtained between populations [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**]. In *Linaria* spp., usually low CV values of genome size (< 3.0 %) were obtained among populations of the same taxa. Still, in *L. triornithophora* and *L. spartea* higher CV values were found [**see ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**]. In *Scrophularia* and *Verbascum*, some heterogeneity in genome size values was found within some species (e.g., *S. grandiflora*), with both differences among and within populations being detected (data not shown). In *Verbascum*, some heterogeneity in genome size estimates was observed, with 7 out 15 populations of different taxa presenting genome size CV values higher than 3.5%, mostly due to within population variability and/or to instrument related variability. In *Veronica*, all species and populations presented homogeneous genome size estimations.

Concerning the incidence of polyploidy in Scrophulariaceae, contrarily to what was expected, at least for some taxa, no different cytotypes were detected among any of the 162 surveyed populations in any of the 59 taxa. Still, as referred above, within some genera (e.g., *Veronica*, *Verbascum*) there were species with different DNA ploidy levels (*sensu* Suda *et al.* 2006). In the particular case of *Veronica*, according with the 1Cx analysis presented in **Figure 3D**, four novel DNA ploidy levels were assumed, namely 6*x*

populations in *V. chamaedrys* subsp. *chamaedrys* and *V. hederifolia*, and 4*x* populations in *V. officinalis* and *V. micrantha* (**Table 1**).

DISCUSSION

The amount of DNA per chromosome set is known to be a fairly constant characteristic of a species. Therefore, since the past decade an increasing interest on genome size studies and its significance has been observed, with many studies focused on using genome size as a taxonomic marker and on finding correlations between ecological and environmental variables and this character. However, there are still many families being neglected, including Scrophulariaceae, for which the present study contributed with more data than that available so far. Furthermore, due to the importance of polyploidy events on the genesis of new entities, it is important to evaluate how common these events are in nature. The detailed bibliographic analyses of polyploidy incidence in this family seemed to point out that at least some taxa could present different cytotypes. However, the absence of more than one cytotype in all the analysed species revealed that polyploidy apparently is not among the main mechanisms of current speciation in Scrophulariaceae, at least in this region.

After molecular studies using DNA sequences of plastid genes, genera belonging to Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* were reorganized into six different families (Olmstead *et al.* 2001). A comparison of genome size taking in consideration this new classification did not reveal any pattern. This result was expected, as genome size estimations obtained in Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* fell almost

exclusively in the very small and small genome size categories (Leitch *et al.* 1998), presenting a relatively low variation.

As already observed in many genera (e.g., *Helleborus* spp., Zonneveld *et al.* 2003) genome size can be used as an extra taxonomic character for discriminating between closely related taxa. Species belonging to *Bartsia*, *Nothobartsia* and *Parentucellia* share a close evolutionary history and some morphological similarities. This has been reflected in different generic circumscriptions, with *Nothobarsia asperrima*, having been formerly included in the *Bartsia* genus as *Bartsia asperrima* (Benedi *et al.* 2009). The same situation repeats with species belonging to *Odontites* and *Odontitella* (Benedi *et al.* 2009). All the analysed species, and thus genera in particular circumscriptions, had non-overlapping genome sizes, and thus in case any doubt would arise in species identification, using genome estimates the assignment to a taxonomic category would be straightforward. In a similar study, Loureiro and co-authors were able to distinguish two genera of Ulmaceae, *Ulmus* and *Celtis* (Loureiro *et al.* 2007c).

A survey of the Plant DNA C-values database (Bennett and Leitch 2010) revealed a high incidence of intra-generic variation in genome size in homoploid species. At least two-fold variation in monoploid genome size was recorded for more than one third of the genera for which there was sufficient coverage of homoploid species (Suda *et al.* 2006). Genera where detailed studies on genome size variation where already performed include *Hydrangea* (Cerbah *et al.* 2001), *Artemisia* (Torrel and Vallès 2001), *Elytrigia* (Mahelka *et*

al. 2005) and *Curcuma* (Leong-Škorničková *et al.* 2007), among others. In the case of Scrophulariaceae, contrasting results were obtained among the studied genera: while in a few (*Anarrhinum*, *Antirrhinum* and *Misopates*), genome size was an unsuitable character for taxonomic purposes, as all the estimates were very homogeneous among species; in the other analysed genera, genome size could be used for taxa delimitation and for analyses of interspecific variation, especially in the homoploid taxa *Digitalis*, *Pedicularis* and *Linaria*.

In the particular case of *Digitalis*, all the analysed species had different genome sizes, and, this data supports recent taxonomic changes in this genus: traditionally, *Digitalis mariana* was considered one sub-species of *Digitalis purpurea* and has been recently elevated to the species level (Benedi *et al.* 2009). Indeed, this new species presents a genome size significantly lower than that of *Digitalis purpurea* subsp. *purpurea*. It will be very interesting to apply FCM to all the species in the genus and evaluate if it continues to be possible to discriminate these homoploid taxa using genome size.

In *Linaria*, with exception of *L. triornitophora*, who presented a higher genome size value, all the other species presented more similar genome sizes; still, due to the high quality of the obtained estimates, it was possible to use this character to separate some taxa. However, two commonly confused taxa, *L. polygalifolia* subsp. *polygalifolia* and *L. supina*, presented the same genome size and thus, unfortunately, could not be distinguished using this character. A rough analysis considering the subgeneric level, seems to point out that

members of section Pelisserianae present the highest values of genome size, while those from section Versicolores present the lowest. Still, this can be due to the reduced number of species analysed in those sections, as evident by the larger heterogeneity in genome size observed in section Supinae, the section to which most of the analysed species belong. Another approach could be to consider that the analysed individuals of *L. triornitophora* present the double number of chromosomes than all the other analysed taxa. Still, future studies using classical chromosome counts need to be done to confirm this possibility.

In *Veronica*, *Scrophularia* and *Verbascum*, most of the observed differences in genome size were related with different chromosome numbers. Still, considering that obtaining good microscopic plates for counting chromosome numbers in all the analysed species would take a long time, the value of genome size estimates is undeniable also in these cases. Using this character, it was possible to distinguish all the analysed taxa of *Veronica*, with exception of *V. micrantha* and *V. officinalis*. In a comparison with the only genome size study focused in this genus, some of our estimates are very similar to those of Albach and Greilhuber (2004) (e.g., *V. peregrina* subsp. *peregrina*), while others are clearly different (e.g., *V. chamaedrys* subsp. *chamaedrys* with 3.72 pg/2C in this study vs. 2.98 pg/2C in the literature, and *V. arvensis* with 0.91 pg/2C in this study vs. 0.66 pg/2C in the literature). Some of these differences could be easily justified by different ploidy levels, as is possibly the case of *V. chamaedrys* and *V. hederifolia* where hexaploidy was assumed in our case instead of the reported tetraploidy (Albach and

Greilhuber 2004). Still, in the case of *V. arvensis* the large difference that we observed may be related to the use of different techniques and methodologies. Indeed most of the estimates reported by Albach and Greilhuber (2004) were obtained using Feulgen densitometry, including that of *V. arvensis*. Despite that Doležel *et al*. (1998) showed a close agreement between both methods, there are numerous cases in the literature where estimates obtained using both techniques do not correspond. For example, Loureiro *et al*. (2007) using FCM obtained a 2C value of 5.08 pg DNA for *Coriandrum sativum*, while Das and Mallick (1989) using Feulgen microdensitometry obtained 2C values ranging between 7.65 and 9.55 pg/2C. These differences may be related with the many critical points of the Feulgen technique (e.g., fixation, slide preparation and storage, acid hydrolysis), which are not always followed and that may influence the obtained estimations (Greilhuber, 1988). Still, particularities of the FCM methodology, as the use of different reference standards, sample preparation and staining protocols (Doležel *et al*. 1998), may also contribute for these differences. Also, following the linear regression between chromosome numbers and genome size, it seems that the analysed individuals of *V. micrantha* and *V. officinalis* are tetraploid and not diploid, as reported in the literature. Also, in the case of *V. officinalis*, there are some previous reports of 36 chromosomes with two base chromosome numbers, 9 and 18, being reported (Benedi *et al*. 2009), indicating some confusion to what ploidy level the set of 36 chromosomes corresponds. However, as these are the first estimates of genome size, classic karyological analyses should be performed in the future to fully confirm these assumptions.

In *Scrophularia*, several species had apparently different genome sizes, but those differences revealed to be not statistically significant (most likely due to the use of a non-parametric statistical test). In this genus, the species with the highest number of chromosomes, *S. auriculata* subsp. *auriculata*, is not the one with the larger value of genome size. Considering the number of chromosomes that this species presents (78-88 chromosomes) it is certain that several polyploidy events occurred in the past and, as happened in other species (e.g., *Nicotiana* sp., Leitch *et al.* 2008), these phenomena may have been accompanied by genome downsizing. It is assumed that DNA loss during polyploidization may be a selection mechanism to lessen genetic instability or the phenotypic effects of having a larger nucleus and cell size (Leitch *et al.* 2008).

Finally, in *Verbascum*, if we exclude the tetraploid *V. virgatum* with approximately the double value of genome size of the remaining species, the other taxa presented very similar genome sizes. Still, all these species present different chromosome numbers (i.e., 30, 32, 36 chromosomes; Benedi *et al.* 2009). This may be due to a phenomenon called dysploidy, i.e., the increase or decrease of one, or a few chromosomes. The decrease in chromosome numbers appears not to be unusual (Martel *et al.* 2004, Hidalgo *et al.* 2007) and is commonly attributed to the fusion of two or more chromosomes. In principle, this would not affect the genome size in any way. Based on chromosome number variation, descendant dysploidy has been suggested for several genera of Iridaceae (Goldblatt and Takei 1997). For

example, in *Iris* subgenus *Xiphium*, it was proposed that if the ancestral base number was x = 9, and *I. boissieri* (n = 18) represented a polyploidy event, descending dysploidy may explain the remaining chromosome numbers (n = 17, 16, 15, 14). In a similar way, in *Verbascum*, chromosome fusions may explain a decrease in the number of chromosomes from 36, to the remaining chromosomes numbers that are reported in the literature, without variation in genome size. Molecular cytogenetic techniques as fluorescence in situ hybridization could be used in the future to clarify this hypothesis.

The analysis of intraspecific variation revealed some variation in genome size among individuals of the same species, both among and within populations. While some authors argue for a large plasticity of nuclear genome, others claim for a more stable genome size within species. In recent years several reports that followed best practices confirmed the existence of this phenomenon (see Šmarda and Bureš 2010 for a review). In the case there is a true intraspecific variation, chromosomal differences (aneuploidy and supernumerary B-chromosomes,) and polymorphisms in A chromosomes (heterochromatic knobs and differential deletion of transposable element remnants) (Gregory 2005a) may explain the differences that were reported. In particular, it is worth highlighting the differences observed in the genome size estimates among individuals of *Digitalis purpurea* subsp. *purpurea*. In this subspecies, three groups differing of about 0.11 pg were observed. Despite some geographical relation could be found regarding these three genome size groups, with the higher genome sizes being found when heading north of Portugal and Galicia, it is worth noticing that all the three groups were

detected in one of the populations (MC92). In the literature, two chromosome numbers, 48 and 56, are known (Benedi *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, the possibility of presenting B chromosomes is documented for this species (Regnart 1934). A joint effect of these events may contribute for the intraspecific variation observed in this subspecies, similarly to what was reported by Sharbel *et al.* (2004) in *Boechera holboellii*.

CONCLUSIONS and FORWARD LOOK

In conclusion, this work contributed with important basic scientific knowledge on genome size and polyploid incidence in the Scrophulariaceae, providing important background information for subsequent studies, namely taxonomic studies in some interesting groups and focused on the ecological significance of genome size and polyploidy and their importance in plant diversification in this region. Indeed, regarding genome size evolution, several doors were open, with intraspecific variation of genome size and dysploidy being among the most interesting detected phenomena to be explored in the future.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The following **[ADDITIONAL INFORMATION]** is available in the on-line version of this article -

File 1. Table. Lists the plant material of Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* analysed in this study.

File 2. Table. Resumes the bibliographic review on chromosome counts and distribution within Iberian Peninsula.

File 3. Table. Lists the results of the statistical analyses performed in this study.

File 4. Table. Lists the genome size estimations in the taxa studied of *Digitalis*.

File 5. Table. Lists the genome size estimations in the taxa studied of *Linaria*.

File 6. Table. Lists the reference standards used in this study and their genome sizes.

File 7. Figure. Exemplifies how flow cytometric data were acquired.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

CONTRIBUTIONS BY AUTHORS

João Loureiro and Sílvia Castro conceived the initial idea. Mariana Castro performed the bibliographic review. Mariana Castro, João Loureiro and Sílvia Castro coordinated sampling and flow cytometric estimations. Mariana Castro and João Loureiro analysed data and organized it in figures and tables. Mariana Castro wrote the first draft of the manuscript. João Loureiro and Sílvia Castro edited the final version of the manuscript.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LITERATURE CITED

Aedo C, Castroviejo S. 2005. Anthos. Sistema de información sobre las plantas de España. **http://www.anthos.es/**; searched 10 August 2011.

Albach DC, Greilhuber J. 2004. Genome size variation and evolution in *Veronica. Annals of Botany* **94**:897-911.

Benedi C, Rico E, Guemes J, Herrero A. 2009. Plantaginaceae-Scrophulariaceae. In: Castroviejo et al. (eds.). Flora Iberica Vol. 13, Real Jardin Botanico, Madrid, pp. 44-434.

Bennett MD, Leitch IJ. 2005. Nuclear DNA amounts in angiosperms: progress, problems and prospects. *Annals of Botany* **95**:45–90.

Bennett MD, Leitch IJ. 2010 . Plant DNA C-values Database (release 7.0, Dec. 2010). **http://data.kew.org/cvalues/**; searched 10 August 2011.

Bennetzen JL, Ma JX, Devos K. 2005. Mechanisms of recent genome size variation in flowering plants. *Annals of Botany* **95**:127–132.

Cerbah M, Mortreau E, Brown S, Siljak-Yakovlev S, Bertrand H, Lambert C. 2001. Genome size variation and species relationships in the genus *Hydrangea. Theoretical and Applied Genetics* **103**:45-51.

Das A, Mallick R. 1989. Variation in 4C DNA content and chromosome characteristics in different varieties of *Coriandrum sativum* L. *Cytologia* **54**:609-616.

Doležel J, Sgorbati S, Lucretti S. 1992. Comparison of three DNA fluorochromes for flow cytometric estimation of nuclear DNA content in plants. *Physiologia Plantarum* **85**:625-631.

Doležel J, Doleželová M, Novák F. 1994. Flow cytometric estimation of nuclear DNA amount in diploid bananas (*Musa acuminata* and *M. balbisiana*). *Biologia Plantarum* **36**:351-357.

Doležel J, Geilhuber J, Lucretti S, Meister A, Lysak M, Nardi L, Obermayer R. 1998. Plant genome size estimation by flow cytometry: inter-laboratory comparison. *Annals of Botany* **82**:17-26.

Galbraith DW, Harkins KR, Maddox JM, Ayres NM, Sharma DP, Firoozabady E. 1983. Rapid flow cytometric analysis of the cell cycle in intact plant tissues. *Science* **220**:1049-1051.

Goldblatt P, Takei M. 1997. Chromosome cytology of Iridaceae – patterns of variation, determination of ancestral base numbers, and modes of karyotype change. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* **4**:285–304.

Gregory TR. 2001. Coincidence, coevolution, or causation? DNA content, cell size, and the Cvalue enigma. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **76**:65–101.

Gregory TR. 2005a. The C-value enigma in plants and animals: a review of parallels and an appeal for partnership. *Annals of Botany* **95**:133–46.

Gregory TR. 2005b. Synergy between sequence and size in large-scale genomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **6**:699–708.

Greilhuber J, Doležel J, Leitch I, Loureiro J, Suda J. 2010. Genome size. *Journal of Botany* **2010**: 4 pages.

Greilhuber J, Doležel J, Lysak MA, Bennett MD. 2005. The origin, evolution and proposed stabilization of the terms 'genome size' and 'C-value' to describe nuclear DNA contents. *Annals of Botany* **95**:255–60.

Greilhuber J, Temsch E, Loureiro J. 2007. Nuclear DNA Content Measurement. In: Doležel J, Greilhuber J, Suda J, eds. *Flow cytometry with plant cells.* Wiley VCH, Weinheim 67–101.

Greilhuber J. 1988. Self tanning - a new and important source of stoichiometric error in cytophotometric determination of nuclear DNA content in plants. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **158**:87-96.

Hidalgo O, Garcia-Jacas N, Garnatje T, Susanna A, Siljak-Yakovlev S. 2007. Karyological evolution in *Rhaponticum* Vaill. (Asteraceae, Cardueae) and related genera. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **53**:193–201.

Leitch IJ, Chase MW, Bennett MD. 1998. Phylogenetic analysis of DNA C-values provides evidence for a small ancestral genome size in flowering plants. *Annals of Botany* **82**:85-94.

Leitch IJ, Hanson L, Lim KY, Kovarik A, Chase MW, Clarkson JJ, Leitch AR. 2008. The ups and downs of genome size evolution in polyploid species of Nicotiana (Solanaceae). Annals of Botany **101**:805–814.

Leong-Škorničkova J, Šida O, Jarolimová V, Sabu M, Fer T, Travniček P, Suda J. 2007. Chromosome numbers and genome size variation in Indian species of *Curcuma* (Zingiberaceae). *Annals of Botany* **100**:505–526.

Lim KY, Kovarik A, Matyasek R, Chase MW, Knapp S, McCarthy E, Clarkson JJ, Leitch AR. 2006. Comparative genomics and repetitive

sequence divergence in the species of diploid *Nicotiana* section *Alatae. Plant Journal* **48**:907–919.

Loureiro J, Rodriguez E, Doležel J, Santos C. 2006. Flow cytometric and microscopic analysis of the effect of tannic acid on plant nuclei and estimation of DNA content. *Annals of Botany* **98**:515-527.

Loureiro J, Rodriguez E, Doležel J, Santos C. 2007b. Two new nuclear isolation buffers for plant DNA flow cytometry: A test with 37 species. *Annals of Botany* **100**:875-888.

Loureiro J, Rodriguez E, Gomes A, Santos C. 2007c. Genome size estimations on *Ulmus minor* Mill., *Ulmus glabra* Huds., and *Celtis australis* L. using flow cytometry. *Plant Biology* **9**:541-544.

Lysák M, Doležel J. 1998. Estimation of nuclear DNA content in *Sesleria* (Poaceae). *Caryologia* **52**:123-132.

Mahelka V, Suda J, Jarolimová V, Travniček P, Krahulec F. 2005. Genome size discriminates between closely related *taxa Elytrigia repens* and *E. intermedia* (Poaceae: Triticeae) and their hybrid. *Folia Geobotanica* **40**:367–384.

Martel E, Poncet V, Lamy F, Siljak-Yakovlev S, Lejeune B, Sarr A. 2004. Chromosome evolution of *Pennisetum* species (Poaceae): implications of ITS phylogeny. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **249**:139–149.

Olmstead RG, de Pamphilis CW, Wolfe AF, Young ND, Elisons WJ, Reeves PA. 2001. Disintegration of the Scrophulariaceae. *American Journal of Botany* **88**:348-361.

Regnart HC. 1934. Studies of hybrids in the genus *Digitalis. Department of Botany and Genetics, Armstrong College, University of Durham, Newcastle-upon-Tyne* pp 145-153

Ribeiro F, Ferreira LT, Tiago P, Dix M. 2011. BioDiversity4all. A Biodiversidade para todos – Portugal. **http://www.biodiversity4all.org/**. searched 23 June 2011.

Sharbel TF, Voigt ML, Mitchell-Olds T, Kantama L, de Jong H. 2004. Is the aneuploid chromosome in an apomictic *Boechera holboellii* a genuine B chromosome? *Cytogenetics and Genome Research* **106:**173–183.

Šmarda P, Bureš P. 2010. Understanding intraspecific variation in genome size in plants. *Preslia* **82-1**: 41-61.

Suda J, Krahulcova A, Travnicek P, Krahulec F. 2006. Ploidy level versus DNA ploidy level: an appeal for consistent terminology. *Taxon* **55**:447-450.

Suda J, Kron P, Husband BC, Travniček P. 2007. Flow cytometry and ploidy: applications in plant systematics, ecology and evolutionary biology. In: Doležel J, Greilhuber J, Suda J, eds. *Flow cytometry with plant cells.* Wiley VCH, Weinheim 103–130.

The Angiosperm Phylogeny Group. 2003. An update of the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group classification for the orders and families of flowering plants: APG II. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* **141:**399–436.

Tiersch, TR, Chandler RW, Wachtel SS, Elias S. 1989. Reference standards for flow cytometry and application in comparative studies of nuclear DNA content. *Cytometry* **10:**706-710. **Torrell M, Valles J. 2001.** Genome size in 21 *Artemisia* L. species (*Asteraceae*, *Anthemideae*): systematic, evolutionary, and ecological implications. *Genome* **44**:231–238.

Vitte C and Bennetzen JL. 2006. Analysis of retrotransposon structural diversity uncovers properties and propensities in angiosperm genome evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA* **103**:17638–17643.

von Wettstein R. 1891. Scrophulariaceae. In: Engler A, Prantl K (eds.), Die Naturlichen Pflanzenfamilien, **4**, 39–107.

Website 1. Tropicos.org. Missouri Botanical Garden. **http://www.tropicos.org**; searched 10 August 2011.

Zonneveld BJM. 2001. Nuclear DNA contents of all species of *Helleborus* (Ranunculaceae) discriminate between species and sectional divisions. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* **229**:125-130.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Flow cytometric histograms of relative PI fluorescence intensity obtained after simultaneous analysis of nuclei isolated from the internal reference standard and from the Scrophulariaceae species. (A) G_1 peaks of *Anarrhinum longipedicellatum* and *Solanum lycopersicum*; (B) G_1 peaks of *Antirrhinum onubense* and *S. lycopersicum*; (C) G_1 peaks of *Digitalis purpurea* subsp. *purpurea* and *Pisum sativum*; (D) G_1 peaks of *Linaria spartea* and *S. lycopersicum*; (E) G_1 peaks of *Misopates orontium* and *S. lycopersicum*; (F) G_1 peaks of *Odontite vernus* and *S. lycopersicum*; (G) G_1 peaks of *Scrophularia sambucifolia* and *P. sativum*; (H) G_1 peaks of *Verbascum simplex* and *S. lycopersicum*; (I) G_1 peaks *Veronica persica* and *S. lycopersicum*. In histograms A, B, D-F, H and I it is possible to observe the G_2 peak of the internal reference standard; additionally, in F it is also possible to observe the G_2 peak of *O. vernus* (third peak). Also, please note the overall good quality of the histograms, as defined by the narrow G_0/G_1 peaks and by the low amount of background debris.

Figure 2. Distribution of genome size according with genome categories (1 pg difference). Colours represent the categories defined by Leitch *et al.* (1998).

Figure 3. Genome size variation (mean and standard deviation of the mean) in Scrophulariaceae genera. (A) *Scrophularia* spp. (Sn, *S. nodosa*; Sf, *S. frutescens*; Sa, *S. auriculata* subsp. *auriculata*; Ssa, *S. sambucifolia* subsp. *sambucifolia*; Sg, *S. grandiflora*; Ssc, *S. scorodonia*; Ss, *S. sublyrata*; Sh, *S. herminii*; Sl, *S. lyrata*); (B) *Verbascum* spp. (Vsp, *V. simplex*; Vle, *V.*

levanticum; Vli, *V. litigiosum*; Vsi, *V. sinuatum*; Vp, *V. pulverulentum*; Vv, *V. virgatum*); (C) *Veronica* spp. (Vpo, *V. polita*; Var, *V. arvensis*; Vac, *V. acinifolia*; Vp, *V. persica*; Vpe, *V. peregrina* subsp. *peregrina*; Vo, *V. officinalis*; Vm, *V. micrantha*; Vc, *V. chamaedrys* subsp.*chamaedrys*; Vh, *V. hederifolia*); (D) linear regression between mean nuclear DNA content and chromosome number of *Veronica* spp. (linear regression equation and R^2 coefficient are also provided); (E) *Digitalis* spp. (Dm, *D. mariana*; Dpp, *D. purpurea* subsp. *purpurea*, Dt, *D. thapsi*); (F) *Linaria* spp. (La, *L. amethystea* subsp. *amethystea*; Ls, *L. spartea*; Li, *L. incarnata*; Ld, *L. diffusa*; Lsa, *L. saxatilis*; Lae, *L. aeruginea* subsp. *aeruginea*; Lsu, *L. supina*; Lp, *L. polygalifolia* subsp. *polygalifolia*; Lt, *L. triornithophora*. Different letters represent groups that are significantly different ($P < 0.05$).

Table 1. Nuclear DNA content estimations in the studied taxa of Scrophulariaceae *s.l.* The values are given as mean and standard deviation of the mean of the holoploid genome size (2C, pg) of individuals of each species. For each species, the monoploid genome size (1Cx) in mass values (pg), the mean coefficient variation (CV, %) of G_0/G_1 peaks, the supposed ploidy level ([2]), the reference standard used to estimate the genome size (standard), the number of individuals analysed for genome size (n G.s.), the total number of analysed individuals (n total), the total number of analysed populations (n Pop.) and the origin of plant material (POP, natural populations; IS, *index seminum*) are also given. Also, for each species, previous genome size estimations and original references are provided ([A] Mowforth, 1986; [B] Nagl and Fusenig, 1979; [C] Albach and Greilhuber, 2004; [D] Bennett, 1972). In bold are highlighted the new DNA ploidy levels that were assumed in this study. [1] 1 pg = 978 Mbp (Doležel et al., 2003). [3] R, *Raphanus sativus* "Saxa"; S, *Solanum lycopersicum* "Stupické"; G, *Glycine max* "Polanka", B, *Bellis perenis*, Z, Zea mays "CE-777"; P, *Pisum sativum* ."Ctirad".

| Taxon | Family *s.s.* | Genome size (2C, pg) | | Genome size (1Cx, pg[1]) | FL CV (%) | Ploidy level[2] | R.s.[3] | n G.s. | n total | n Pop. | Origin | Previous estimations |
		Mean ± SD	CV (%)									
Anarrhinum bellidifolium	Plantaginaceae	1.13 ± 0.03	3.1	0.56	3.68	2n=2x	S	32	157	11	POP+IS	First estimation
Anarrhinum duriminium	Plantaginaceae	1.11 ± 0.02	2.2	0.56	5.61	2n=2x	S	12	35	3	POP+IS	First estimation
Anarrhinum longipedicelatum	Plantaginaceae	1.12 ± 0.02	1.4	0.57	4.05	2n=2x	S	7	40	3	POP	First estimation
Antirrhinum cirrhigerum	Plantaginaceae	1.21 ± 0.01	0.8	0.59	5.95	2n=2x	S	3	30	1	IS	First estimation
Antirrhinum graniticum	Plantaginaceae	1.18 ± 0.05	3.9	0.59	5.06	2n=2x	S	3	30	1	IS	First estimation
Antirrhinum linkianum	Plantaginaceae	1.23 ± 0.03	2.7	0.61	4.66	2n=2x	S	17	66	7	POP+IS	First estimation

Antirrhinum meonanthum	Plantaginaceae	1.20	-	0.61	5.36	2n=2*x*	S	1	1	1	IS	First estimation
Antirrhinum onubense	Plantaginaceae	1.18 ± 0.01	1.1	0.61	4.15	2n=2*x*	S	3	20	1	POP	First estimation
Bartsia trixago	Orobanchaceae	1.85 ± 0.08	4.1	0.93	3.91	2n=2*x*	G/S	17	103	6	POP+IS	First estimation
Chaenorhinum origanifolium	Plantaginaceae	1.13 ± 0.02	1.3	0.57	3.47	2n=2*x*	S	9	61	3	POP	First estimation
Cymbalaria muralis subsp. *muralis*	Plantaginaceae	0.99 ± 0.02	2.5	0.49	5.12	2n=2*x*	S	9	48	3	POP	First estimation
Digitalis mariana subsp. *heywoodii*	Plantaginaceae	1.12	-	0.56	6.77	2n=2*x*	S	1	1	1	IS	First estimation
Digitalis purpurea subsp. *purpurea*	Plantaginaceae	1.87 ± 0.05	2.6	0.94	3.64	2n=2*x*	B/P	19	168	11	POP+IS	2C = 2.45 pg[A]
Digitalis thapsi	Plantaginaceae	2.08	-	1.04	5.90	2n=2*x*	Z	1	1	1	IS	First estimation
Euphrasia minimus	Orobanchaceae	1.29 ± 0.02	1.3	0.65	3.02	2n=2*x*	S	3	30	1	POP	First estimation
Kickxia spuria subsp. *integrifolia*	Plantaginaceae	1.64 ± 0.02	1.2	0.82	3.44	2n=2*x*	S	4	17	1	IS	First estimation
Linaria aeruginea subsp. *aeruginea*	Plantaginaceae	1.29 ± 0.01	0.9	0.64	3.83	2n=2*x*	S	2	5	1	POP	First estimation
Linaria amethystea subsp. *amethystea*	Plantaginaceae	1.05 ± 0.01	0.6	0.53	3.67	2n=2*x*	S	3	30	1	POP	First estimation
Linaria diffusa	Plantaginaceae	1.15 ± 0.00	0.4	0.57	2.97	2n=2*x*	S	2	15	1	POP	First estimation
Linaria incarnata	Plantaginaceae	1.13 ± 0.00	0.3	0.56	3.31	2n=2*x*	S	2	15	1	POP	First estimation
Linaria polygalifolia subsp. *polygalifolia*	Plantaginaceae	1.32 ± 0.04	2.7	0.66	4.17	2n=2*x*	S	12	70	4	POP	First estimation
Linaria saxatilis	Plantaginaceae	1.21	-	0.60	6.12	2n=2*x*	S	1	1	1	IS	First estimation
Linaria spartea	Plantaginaceae	1.11 ± 0.05	4.1	0.55	4.05	2n=2*x*	S	29	149	9	POP+IS	First estimation
Linaria supina	Plantaginaceae	1.30 ± 0.03	2.7	0.65	3.76	2n=2*x*	S	9	57	3	POP	First estimation
Linaria thriornithophora	Plantaginaceae	2.66 ± 0.08	3.0	1.33	3.03	2n=2*x*	S	14	98	5	POP	First estimation
Melampyrum pratense subsp. *latifolium*	Orobanchaceae	15.69 ± 0.19	1.2	7.84	3.27	2n=2*x*	P	6	46	2	POP	First estimation
Misopates calycinum	Plantaginaceae	0.88 ± 0.04	4.4	0.44	4.04	2n=2*x*	S	3	26	1	POP	First estimation
Misopates orontium	Plantaginaceae	0.88 ± 0.04	4.3	0.44	4.91	2n=2*x*	S	19	97	7	POP	First estimation
Northobartsia asperrima	Orobanchaceae	1.55 ± 0.02	1.3	0.77	3.58	2n=2*x*	S	3	27	1	POP	First estimation
Odontite vernus	Orobanchaceae	1.16 ± 0.02	1.8	0.58	4.05	2n=2*x*	S	3	30	1	POP	First estimation

Odontitella virgata	Orobanchaceae	4.27 ± 0.02	0.5	2.13	2.93	2n=2x	G/S	6	60	2	POP	First estimation
Parentucellia viscosa	Orobanchaceae	2.72 ± 0.06	2.0	1.36	2.83	2n=2x	S	6	24	3	POP	First estimation
Pedicularis sylvatica subsp. *lusitanica*	Orobanchaceae	5.95 ± 0.15	2.5	2.97	2.42	2n=2x	S	8	29	3	POP	First estimation
Pedicularis sylvatica subsp. *sylvatica*	Orobanchaceae	5.61 ± 0.02	0.3	2.81	3.15	2n=2x	S	2	2	1	POP	First estimation
Rhinanthus minor	Orobanchaceae	2.81 ± 0.08	2.8	1.40	5.26	2n=2x	P	3	20	1	POP	2C = 7.9 pg[B]
Scrophularia auriculata subsp. *auriculata*	Scrophulariaceae	1.79 ± 0.01	1.6	0.90	3.98	2n=2x	P	8	8	1	IS	First estimation
Scrophularia frutenscens	Scrophulariaceae	1.34 ± 0.03	2.5	0.67	5.55	2n=2x	P	7	34	3	POP+IS	First estimation
Scrophularia grandiflora	Scrophulariaceae	1.94 ± 0.07	6.6	0.97	4.13	2n=2x	B/G/P	19	51	6	POP+IS	First estimation
Scrophularia herminii	Scrophulariaceae	2.56 ± 0.07	2.7	1.28	6.15	2n=2x	P	3	16	1	IS	First estimation
Scrophularia lyrata	Scrophulariaceae	3.19 ± 0.05	0.7	1.60	4.54	2n=2x	P	3	15	1	POP	First estimation
Scrophularia nodosa	Scrophulariaceae	1.19 ± 0.01	0.6	0.60	6.71	2n=2x	P	2	2	1	IS	First estimation
Scrophularia sambucifolia subsp. *sambucifolia*	Scrophulariaceae	1.86 ± 0.04	2.0	0.93	4.33	2n=2x	P	5	5	1	POP	First estimation
Scrophularia scorodonia	Scrophulariaceae	2.11 ± 0.05	2.2	1.06	4.57	2n=2x	B/G/P	19	106	7	POP+IS	First estimation
Scrophularia sublyrata	Scrophulariaceae	2.22 ± 0.12	5.5	1.11	5.95	2n=2x	B	5	15	2	POP	First estimation
Verbascum levanticum	Scrophulariaceae	0.75 ± 0.02	2.9	0.38	5.57	2n=2x	R	3	16	1	POP	First estimation
Verbascum litigiosum	Scrophulariaceae	0.76 ± 0.03	4.2	0.38	3.48	2n=2x	S	3	30	1	POP	First estimation
Verbascum pulverulentum	Scrophulariaceae	0.78 ± 0.02	2.2	0.39	4.15	2n=2x	S	3	30	1	POP	First estimation
Verbascum simplex	Scrophulariaceae	0.74 ± 0.02	2.8	0.37	3.70	2n=2x	S	12	70	4	POP	First estimation
Verbascum sinuatum	Scrophulariaceae	0.77 ± 0.04	4.7	0.39	5.08	2n=2x	S	17	121	6	POP+IS	First estimation
Verbascum virgatum	Scrophulariaceae	1.44 ± 0.02	1.5	0.36	3.51	**2n=4x**	S	4	11	2	POP+IS	First estimation
Veronica acinifolia	Plantaginaceae	1.24 ± 0.01	0.7	0.62	3.73	2n=2x	S	3	3	1	POP	First estimation
Veronica arvensis	Plantaginaceae	0.91 ± 0.01	1.6	0.46	3.92	2n=2x	S/R	9	58	3	POP	2C = 0.66 pg[C]
Veronica chamaedrys* subsp. *chamaedrys	Plantaginaceae	3.72 ± 0.02	0.6	0.62	3.70	**2n=6x**	G/S	3	30	1	POP	2C = 2.98 pg[C,D]
Veronica hederifolia	Plantaginaceae	4.16 ± 0.08	2.0	0.69	2.84	**2n=6x**	B	3	8	1	POP	2C = 2.82 pg[C]

Veronica micrantha	Plantaginaceae	2.15 ± 0.04	1.7	0.54	7.56	**2n=4x**	P	3	17	1	IS	First estimation
Veronica officinalis	Plantaginaceae	2.10 ± 0.06	2.9	0.53	3.98	**2n=4x**	B/P	12	51	4	POP	First estimation
Veronica peregrina **subsp. peregrina**	Plantaginaceae	1.96 ± 0.06	2.9	0.49	4.02	**2n=4x**	B	3	8	1	POP	2C = 1.90 pg[C]
Veronica persica	Plantaginaceae	1.40 ± 0.03	2.4	0.35	4.70	2n=4x	S	24	105	7	POP	2C = 1.55 pg[C,D]
Veronica polita	Plantaginaceae	0.77 ± 0.01	1.5	0.39	4.61	2n=2x	S	6	18	2	POP	2C = 0.84 pg[C]