

Substantial Hybridisation Between Wild Boars (*Sus scrofa scrofa*) and East Balkan Pigs (*Sus scrofa f. domestica*) in Natural Environment As a Result of Semi-wild Rearing in Bulgaria

IVAN STOJANOV NIKOLOV¹, BERNHARD CHRISTIAN STOECKLE²,
GEORGI MARKOV³, RALPH KUEHN^{1,4}

¹Molecular Zoology Unit, Chair of Zoology, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany

²Aquatic Systems Biology Unit, Department of Ecology and Ecosystem Management, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany

³Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystems Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

⁴Department of Fish, Wildlife and Conservation Ecology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, United States of America

Supplementary Online Material (SOM)




Figure S1. *Bsp*HI – RFLP derived from 428 bp PCR products of wild boars (lanes 2 and 4), pure East Balkan pigs, and domestic pigs, respectively (5, 6, and 7); wild boars and East Balkan pigs that have been identified as a hybrid (lanes 1 and 3); M denotes the 100 bp-DNA ladder length standard




Figure S2. Graph of delta K values to determine the ideal number of clusters present in Bulgarian wild boars (WBB), East Balkan pigs (EBP), and commercial pig breed (CPB) using ten microsatellite loci and the Evanno method (Evanno et al. 2005) implemented in the Structure Harvester program

Table S1. Characterization of 10 microsatellite loci used in the study: the chromosome on which the marker can be found (Chr.), expected (H_e) and observed heterozygosity (H_o), total number of alleles found (N_{al}), allelic richness (A_r), and result of the test for Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HW) for wild boar groups (the south group SWG and the north group NWG), East Balkan pigs (EBP), and commercial pig breeds (CPB)

Locus	Chr.	SWG					NWG					EBP					CPB				
		H_e	H_o	N_{al}	A_r	HW	H_e	H_o	N	A_r	HW	H_e	H_o	N_{al}	A_r	HW	H_e	H_o	N_{al}	A_r	HW
<i>TNFB</i> ^a	7	0.769	0.767	9	8.08		0.605	0.635	12	7.11		0.860	0.696	10	10.00		0.857	0.857	8	7.93	
<i>SWa936</i> ^a	15	0.789	0.824	10	7.69		0.821	0.745	10	7.64		0.750	0.565	7	7.00		0.808	0.667	7	6.87	
<i>CGA</i> ^a	1	0.933	0.854	28	17.61		0.912	0.840	30	18.04	***	0.944	0.826	19	19.00	***	0.890	0.861	14	12.82	
<i>Sw72</i> ^a	3	0.686	0.500	5	4.18		0.617	0.540	4	3.76		0.734	0.652	6	6.00		0.503	0.583	5	4.51	
<i>Sw24</i> ^a	17	0.767	0.670	9	7.30		0.739	0.631	10	5.78	***	0.844	0.783	8	8.00		0.836	0.917	10	8.98	
<i>IGFI</i> ^a	5	0.770	0.563	8	6.29		0.780	0.585	10	7.31		0.814	0.522	6	6.00	***	0.756	0.500	7	6.23	***
<i>SWr17</i> ^b	X/Y	0.566	0.398	4	3.96		0.329	0.326	8	4.04		0.273	0.261	3	3.00		0.403	0.389	5	4.74	
<i>SW949</i> ^b	X/Y	0.860	0.745	14	10.42	***	0.826	0.661	16	10.18	***	0.749	0.870	9	9.00		0.607	0.657	6	5.20	
<i>S0090</i> ^a	12	0.772	0.612	9	7.60	***	0.797	0.654	8	6.72		0.735	0.565	6	6.00		0.603	0.389	5	4.96	***
<i>S0215</i> ^a	13	0.358	0.369	8	4.87		0.545	0.529	9	6.42		0.086	0.087	3	3.00		0.155	0.167	2	2.00	
Average	–	0.73	0.63	10.40	7.80	–	0.70	0.61	11.70	7.70	–	0.68	0.58	7.70	7.70	–	0.64	0.60	6.90	6.42	–

(a) Lowden et al. 2002; (b) Rohrer et al. 1994; *** $P < 0.001$

Table S2. Computed F_{ST} values (Weir and Cockerham 1984) between the two wild boar groups (the south group SWG and the north group NWG), East Balkan pigs (EBP), and commercial pig breeds (CPB)

	SWG	NWG	EBP	CPB
SWG	–			
NWG	0.038	–		
EBP	0.040	0.053	–	
CPB	0.081	0.104	0.070	–