Assessment of population structure in Hungarian otter populations

István Lehoczky, Desiré L. Dalton,[*] József Lanszki, Zoltán Sallai, M. Thabang Madisha, Lisa J. Nupen, and Antoinette Kotzé

Centre for Farm Animal Gene Conservation, Isaszegi út 200, Gödöllő H-2100, Hungary (LI)
National Zoological Gardens of South Africa, P.O. Box 754, Pretoria 0001, South Africa (DLD, MTM, LJN, AK)
Genetics Department, University of the Free State, P.O. Box 339, Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa (DLD, AK)
Kaposvár University, Department of Nature Conservation, P.O. Box 16, Kaposvár 7401, Hungary (JL)
Hortobágy National Park Directorate, P.O. Box 216, Debrecen 4002, Hungary (ZS)

* Correspondent: desire@nzg.ac.za

The Eurasian otter (*Lutra lutra*) is widely distributed in Europe and has been down-listed from Vulnerable to Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List in 2004 following successful conservation interventions. River otter recoveries were driven by active and passive protection of wetlands and a decrease in environmental pollutants. In Hungary, although otter populations have been stable in recent decades, there is little information available regarding genetic diversity, population genetic or phylogeographic structure, and potential barriers affecting gene flow. This study, therefore, aimed to determine genetic diversity and structure across the range of this species in Hungary. To achieve this, we analyzed 255 tissue samples collected since 2002, mainly from road-kill incidents, in various regions of Hungary. We found a relatively high level of genetic diversity in Hungarian otter populations (expected heterozygosity: 0.69–0.74; mean number of alleles per locus: 6.8–7.7). At a regional level, we identified 2 distinct genetic clusters corresponding to 2 river basins (Danube and Tisza). We also identified isolation by distance and patterns of genetic differentiation that appear to reflect population divergence of otters that are spatially restricted to one of these 2 river basins. Our results show the strong influence of river networks on population structure and genetic divergence in otters and provide a framework for the development of conservation management plans for otters in Hungary.

Key words: Eurasian otter, genetic diversity, Hungary, *Lutra lutra*, microsatellites

The Eurasian otter (*Lutra lutra*; hereafter otter) has the widest distribution of all otter species as it occurs throughout Europe, Asia, and certain parts of Africa (Reuther 1993; Kruuk 2006; Ki et al. 2010). Human activities in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in population declines and fragmentation across major parts of Europe (West 1975; Macdonald and Mason 1976). This could have resulted in the loss of genetic diversity and increased genetic differentiation among populations through genetic drift (Frankham et al. 2002) which in turn could have resulted in inbreeding and reduced adaptive potential (Dallas et al. 2002). The decrease of the otter in Europe can be attributed to habitat loss (Randi 2003; Kruuk 2006), intentional killing by entrapment or poisoning (as otters are seen as a threat to agriculture—Poledníková et al. 2010), road accidents (Mason and Macdonald 1994), and water pollution (Mason and Macdonald 1994; Poledníková et al. 2010). Widespread chemical contamination was the result of illegal waste disposal as well as mining and other industrial effluents. Beginning in the early 1980s, legislation was put in place to protect the otter (a flagship species) in almost all European countries (Stanton et al. 2008; Mucci et al. 2010). Population assessments in the 1990s indicated population recovery and growth in western Europe, suggesting that their decline was transient (Mason and Macdonald 2004; Kruuk 2006). This led to their down-listing on the IUCN Red List from Vulnerable to Near Threatened (Ruiz-Olmo et al. 2008).

In Hungary, otter populations have been considered stable, with slight declines only reported east of the Danube due to pollution since about the 1970s (Nechay 1980; Heltai et al. 2012). However, pollution has dramatically decreased since the 1990s, including a reduction in the amounts of industrial and agricultural pollutants in the environment and the levels of heavy metals (lead, cadmium, mercury, copper, and zinc) found in the liver tissue of otters (Lanszki et al. 2009a). Although populations are considered stable, regional fluctuations and differences have been reported (Faragó 2009; Heltai et al. 2012).

Numbers of otters in Hungary are estimated to be on the order of 1,000–10,000 animals (Lanszki et al. 2008, 2010). Lower densities of otters have been reported in mountains and in dry plain areas (in the Kiskunság region) with little wetland habitat. During this time period, the distribution range of otters in Hungary has remained wide (Heltai et al. 2012; approximately 72,000 km^2 or 77.5% of Hungary). On the basis of field surveys (Heltai et al. 2012) and local molecular genetics analyses (Lanszki et al. 2008, 2010) of Hungarian populations, it has been suggested that otter populations are currently increasing (Heltai et al. 2012).

Mucci et al. (2010) carried out the most extensive genetic analysis of Eurasian otters in Europe. Although samples from Hungary were included in that study, sample numbers were too low to adequately quantify genetic diversity and structure across the region. Thus, we report here on genetic diversity and structure of otter (*Lutra lutra*) populations in Hungary. Using 10 polymorphic microsatellite data, we examine the existence of spatial genetic structure in national parks and river catchment areas and test for isolation by distance along river basins to examine their influence on gene flow among populations. We hypothesize that 1) genetic variability will be high, due to stable large effective population sizes and that 2) populations will show high genetic connectivity at local scales, but that physical and/or nonphysical barriers to gene flow will have resulted in regional-scale population structure. Results from this study will provide guidelines and support future conservation management plans.

Materials and Methods

Study area and sampling.—The whole territory of Hungary belongs to the Middle Danube Basin catchment area and includes 3 Sub-River Basins (Tisza River Basin, Pannonian Central Danube Basin, and Drava Basin; Fig. 1, numbered 1, 2, and 3, respectively). The Pannonian Central Danube Basin covers approximately 40% of the country and it is bordered by the foothills of the Alps roughly along the border between Hungary and Austria to the west, the Drava Basin to the south, and the Tisza Basin to the east. The Tisza River Basin is the largest subbasin in the Danube River Basin. The Hungarian part of the Tisza basin covers 50% of the country. The Drava River is the 4th longest Danube tributary. The Hungarian part of the Drava basin covers approximately 10% of the country (Schmedtje 2005). The 3 river basins are connected and theoretically fully accessible to otters. Otter carcasses were collected by the staff

Fig. 1.—Sampling locations included in this study are shown with white circles within 1) the Tisza River Basin, 2) the Danube River Basin, and 3) the Drava River Basin. Abbreviations of the national park directorates (NPDs) of Hungary are: Balaton-felvidéki (BFNPD), Bükki (BNPD), Aggteleki (ANPD), Duna-Dráva (DDNPD), Duna-Ipoly (DINPD), Fertő-Hanság (FHNPD), Hortobágyi (HNPD), Kiskunsági (KNPD), Körös-Maros (KMNPD), Őrségi (ŐNPD). The NPDs are situated in different river basins as follows: ANPD, HNPD, and KMNDP in the Tisza River Basin; BFNPD, DINPD, ŐNPD, and FHNPD in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin; DDNPD partly in the Drava River Basin and partly in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin; the KNPD and BNPD partly in the Tisza River Basin and partly in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin.

of the 10 national park directorates (NPDs) of Hungary (Fig. 1) opportunistically mainly from road kills (90%) and from other resources (Lanszki et al. 2009a) to study the ecology of the species, with the permission of Ministry of Environment and Waters. Tissue samples for DNA analysis ($n = 255$ mainly from kidney or muscle) were collected from the above-mentioned carcasses originating from the entire country (Fig. 1) and representing localities within 10 NPDs of Hungary: Aggteleki (ANPD), Balaton-felvidéki (BFNPD), Bükki (BNPD), Duna-Dráva (DDNPD), Duna-Ipoly (DINPD), Fertő-Hanság (FHNPD), Hortobágyi (HNPD), Kiskunsági (KNPD), Körös-Maros (KMNPD), and Őrségi (ŐNPD). The NPDs are situated in the different river basins as follows: ANPD, HNPD, and KMNDP in the Tisza River Basin; BFNPD, DINPD, ŐNPD, and FHNDP in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin; DDNDP partly in the Drava River Basin and partly in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin; the KNPD and BNPD partly in the Tisza River Basin and partly in the Pannonian Central Danube Basin. For this study, we grouped samples originating from 2 Northeastern NPDs (ANPD and BNPD), where otter are rare and habitats are poor for the species (Heltai et al. 2012).

DNA analysis.—DNA was extracted using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) following the extraction protocol as outlined by the manufacturer. A total of 10 cross-species autosomal microsatellites markers (Dallas and Piertney 1998) were used to genotype all individuals. Amplification was carried out using a 15 µl reaction volume and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was conducted with Promega GoTaq Flexi DNA polymerase (Promega Corporation, Madison, Wisconsin), which has a 1× buffer containing 10 mM Tris–HCl (pH 9.0), 50 mM potassium chloride (KCl), and 0.1% Triton X100. The final reaction conditions were as follows: $1 \times$ PCR buffer, 1.5–2.5 mM $MgCl_2$, 200 micromoles (µM) of each 2′deoxynucleotide triphosphate (dNTP), 10 pmol of each of the forward and reverse primer, 1 unit (U) *Taq* DNA polymerase, and 10–20 ng genomic DNA template. The conditions for PCR amplification were as follows: 5 min at 95°C initial denaturation, 30 cycles for 30 s at 95°C, 30 s at 50–65°C, and 30 s at 72°C, followed by extension at 72°C for 20 min. The PCR was carried out in a BOECO TC-PRO Thermal Cycler (Boeckel + Co., Hamburg, Germany). PCR products were pooled together and run against a Genescan 500 LIZ (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, California) internal size standard on a 3130 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, California). Samples were visualized using GeneMapper version 4.0 software (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, California) and bins were assigned to alleles and calls were then checked by eye.

Analysis of genetic diversity in the total population.—MICRO-CHECKER version 2.2.3 (Van Oosterhout et al. 2004) was used to detect possible genotyping errors, allele dropout, and nonamplified alleles (null alleles). This software package can estimate the frequency of null alleles and can adjust the data set to account for the presence of null alleles. Mean number of alleles per locus (A), observed heterozygosities (H_o), expected heterozygosities (H_e), and deviations from

Hardy–Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE) proportions were calculated using GenAlEx (Peakall and Smouse 2006). Linkage disequilibrium between pairs of microsatellite loci was evaluated using GenAlEx (Peakall and Smouse 2012) according to the method of Black and Kraftsur (1985). Associated probability values were corrected for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni adjustment for a significance level of 0.05.

Population structure.—To identify genetically cohesive clusters, Bayesian cluster analysis was implemented in STRUCTURE version 2.3.3 (Pritchard et al. 2000). The genetic relationship between populations and individual assignments of otters and samples of unknown location was inferred via a Bayesian clustering analysis using the statistical program STRUCTURE version 2.3.3 (Pritchard et al. 2000). The program was run without prior population information (option USEPOPINFO = 0, no LOCPRIOR). STRUCTURE was run for 10 replicates from $K = 1$–11, with a run-length of 1 million repetitions of Markov chain Monte Carlo, following the burn-in period of 100,000 iterations. For each K, we calculated the mean posterior probability over its runs. We then used this mean value to estimate the posterior probability of each K using the formula given by Pritchard and Wen (2003). We used the ΔK method of Evanno et al. (2005) using STRUCTURE HARVESTER (Earl and VonHoldt 2012) to determine the most likely value of K. Values of average proportion of membership (q_I) over 10 runs were used to assign individuals to subpopulations; individuals were assigned to a single population when q_I was greater than 0.70 or less than 0.3 (Latch et al. 2008).

Alleles in Space (AIS—Miller 2005) were used to explore spatial genetic structure by the interpolation of landscape shape. This procedure first generates a Delaunay triangulation-based connectivity network among the sample localities and then calculates the genetic distances between them. The results were plotted over a spatial grid of 50×50 that covered the sampling area, and the surface heights were calculated based on raw and residual genetic distances.

Global fixation indices, standardized fixation indices, and Jost's estimate of population differentiation (D_{est}—Jost 2008) were calculated in GenAlEx version 6.5 (Peakall and Smouse 2012) with 10,000 bootstrap replicates and 10,000 pairwise permutations. Population genetic variance was further analyzed by analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) performed by the method of Excoffier et al. (1992) using GenAlEx version 6.5 (Peakall and Smouse 2012). In order to identify a significant isolation by distance effect, a Mantel test was performed on average pairwise genetic distances (Nei's D) and average pairwise geographic distances between each NDP. In order to determine isolation by distance spatial pattern analysis of genetic diversity, we plotted and regressed average coefficients using SpaGeDi version 1.4 (Hardy and Vekemans 2002).

RESULTS

All loci were polymorphic with the number of alleles per locus ranging between 3 and 11 with a mean of 5 alleles per locus. Global tests of all sampled areas indicated a significant

deviation from HWE ($P < 0.000$) due to a reduction in observed heterozygosity at 4 loci, namely LUT453, LUT457, LUT782, and LUT818, suggesting the existence of structure within the Hungarian otter populations as a result of the Wahlund effect (Wahlund 1928). Linkage disequilibrium was not detected for any of the markers tested. In addition, null alleles were not observed by MICRO-CHECKER. Expected heterozygosity within all populations (H_e) was 0.709 (Table 1); observed heterozygosity (H_o) was 0.669 and the number of alleles was 7.25.

Population structure and isolation by distance.—Posterior probabilities (Ln) using Bayesian admixture analysis were calculated for $K = 1$–11 with $K = 2$ being identified as the most likely K based on Evanno's ΔK method. STRUCTURE analyses with and without USEPOPINFO and POPFLAG options provided similar results (data not shown). Clear breaks are present at q_1 or $q_2 \geq 0.7$. The majority of individuals ($n = 224$, 88%) were assigned to either the eastern part of Hungary (cluster 1) or the western part of Hungary (cluster 2). The 2 clusters correspond to the Tisza and Danube/Drava river basins and are hereafter referred to as "Danube" and "Tisza" (Figs. 2A and 2B). A total of 18 individuals were potentially admixed (individuals with q_1 values between 0.3 and 0.7). In addition, a total of 11 individuals were identified as migrants (e.g., an individual with $q_1 > 0.7$ found in the region dominated by cluster 2). These admixed and potentially migrant individuals were more common in border areas between the Danube and Tisza river tributaries (Figs. 2A and 2B). Seven migrants (63%) occurred within 150 km of areas dominated by the other genetic cluster and 13 admixed individual (65%) were within 110 km of the river tributaries. Thus, regions closer together seemed to share migrants more often. These results suggest that there may be geographical structure to genetic variation, specifically an isolation by distance relationship between the 2 river basins. We found evidence for isolation by distance with the Mantel test ($R_{xy} = 0.247$, $P < 0.001$). Consistently, spatial genetic structure was found with SPAGeDI 1.4c which indicated a significant correlation between pairwise genetic distance and geographic distance ($R^2 = 0.8332$; Fig. 3). Our genetic landscape shape interpolation analysis produced surface plots that support the STRUCTURE and isolation by distance (Fig. 4). A "ridge," indicating the greatest genetic distance, was observed in an east versus west orientation approximately at the midpoint of the otters range.

Genetic diversity within populations.—The Danube population had 3 markers out of HWE, namely LUT457, LUT615, and LUT782. The Tisza population exhibited a significant deviation from HWE due to disequilibrium at 1 locus (LUT818). In both populations, a weak deviation from HWE was observed (Danube: $F_{IS} = 0.059$; Tisza: $F_{IS} = 0.057$). The level of genetic diversity was similar in both the Tisza and Danube populations. H_o ranged from 0.643 (Danube) to 0.695 (Tisza), H_e values varied from 0.685 (Danube) to 0.734 (Tisza) and number of alleles was 6.8 in Danube and 7.7 in Tisza. Genetic differentiation of populations was also indicated through the presence of a relatively high number of private alleles. Unique alleles were observed in the Danube population ($n = 9$) and Tisza population ($n = 17$). Most of the unique alleles were detected at low frequency (0.004–0.096). Based on the results of AIS and STRUCTURE, 2 populations were defined and analyzed using the spatially explicit methods described above (fixation indices, standardized fixation indices, and Jost's D). The 2 populations identified represent eastern (Tisza) and western (Danube/Drava) river basins. F_{ST}-based AMOVA showed that 7% of the variation was distributed among river basins and another 7% among individuals. Genetic differentiation was low but significant among the 2 populations (AMOVA $F_{ST} = 0.069$, $F'_{ST} = 0.24$; Jost's $D_{est} = 0.19$; $G_{st} = 0.037$, all $P < 0.001$), supporting the existence of population substructure (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Analyses of a collection of otter samples from Hungary with a set of 10 microsatellite markers revealed moderate to high genetic variability (H_e: 0.69–0.73; N_a: 6.8–7.7), concordant with other published studies (Dallas et al. 1999, 2002; Arrendal et al. 2004; Hajkova et al. 2007). In Britain, H_e values varied from 0.26 to 0.72 and number of alleles varied from 2.1 to 5.3 (Dallas et al. 2002). In Europe, H_e values range from 0.37 to 0.71 with the number of alleles ranging from 2.5 to 6.8 (Mucci et al. 2010). Levels of genetic diversity vary greatly between different regions; heterozygosity and number of alleles were lowest in isolated populations from Denmark and Italy and highest in northern European otter populations (i.e., Latvia, Belarus, Finland, and Sweden). Lower levels of genetic diversity in European otter populations have been attributed to recent events such as climate change or anthropogenic population declines rather than historical bottlenecks due to founder events (Beaumont 1999; Mucci et al. 2010). As genetic diversity in Hungarian otters analyzed here is considered moderate to high, these populations may not have experienced dramatic declines or at least declines of a magnitude that would lead to loss of diversity. The results of this study thus support the observation that Hungarian otter populations have has been largely stable with large effective population sizes (Heltai et al. 2012).

Table 1.—Genetic variation estimates: N_a = mean number of alleles per locus; N_e = number of effective alleles; H_o = observed heterozygosity; and H_e = expected heterozygosity for samples situated in the Tisza and Danube River Basins. *SE* indicated in parentheses.

| Samples	Sample size	H_o	H_e	N_a	N_e
Danube	136	0.643 (0.02)	0.685 (0.02)	6.8 (0.04)	3.348 (0.3)
Tisza	118	0.695 (0.03)	0.734 (0.02)	7.7 (0.86)	3.926 (0.26)
Total	254	0.669 (0.02)	0.709 (0.02)	7.25 (0.46)	3.637 (0.2)

Fig. 2.—A) Distribution of cluster assignment percentages (in pie-charts) among Hungarian otter populations (*Lutra lutra*) for *K* = 2. Colored pie charts show the average cluster membership of individuals in each predefined population (NPDs). B) Bayesian assignment probabilities for *K* = 2. Each individual is represented by a vertical line, which is partitioned into *K* colored segments representing estimated membership fractions in *K* clusters. Black vertical lines separate individuals into different predefined populations. Arrows indicate locality on map of individuals. Solid and dotted lines indicate cutoff values $q_i \geq 0.7$ or ≤ 0.3. Sample numbers in blue and orange boxes indicate migrants and sample numbers without boxes indicate admixed individuals. NPDs = national park directorates.

Population structure and assignment.—Our data indicated that the otter population in Hungary is not a single panmictic population but is distinctly divided into 2 genetically defined

groups. STRUCTURE analysis identified 2 populations that broadly correspond to the western Danube and eastern Tisza river basins. Deviation from HWE in both populations was

Fig. 3.—SPAGeDi test for comparisons indicating correlation between mean genetic distance and geographic distance (km) between clusters (predefined population [NPDs]). Population names are coded according to the dominant cluster membership of that population based on the STRUCTURE analysis. NPDs = national park directorates.

Fig. 4.—Genetic landscape shape interpolation analysis using a 50×50 grid. X- and Y-axis correspond to the geographic locations examined in this study. Surface heights were calculated based on raw genetic distances (A) and residual genetic distance (B) between sampling localities.

Table 2.—Estimates of population differentiation (± *SE*) based on 2 river basins and their associated national park directorates ("Danube" = BF, DI, ON, FH, DD; "Tisza" = BN, H, KM, K). All $P < 0.001$.

G_{st}	G'_{stN}	G'_{stH}	G''_{st}	D_{est}
0.037 ± 0.007	0.071 ± 0.013	0.217 ± 0.043	0.245 ± 0.046	0.188 ± 0.039

moderate and thus is not considered to be due to inbreeding but may be due to additional cryptic subdivision (Wahlund 1928). In addition, admixed individuals were observed in regions of expected contact suggesting that there is still a small amount of migration and gene flow between the 2 populations. Otter population subdivision has been reported in several regions of Europe as well as in the United States in North American river otters (*Lontra canadensis*). In certain cases, the barrier to gene flow can be determined. In Alaska, otters are genetically differentiated due to sex-biased dispersal (Blundell et al. 2002) and in Louisiana, population subdivision between coastal and inland otters was attributed to variation in breeding seasonality due to fluctuations in prey abundance (Latch et al. 2008). Janssens et al. (2008) reported that steep and dry landscapes resulted in genetic structure of European otters in southern France. However, in many cases, barriers to gene flow could not be determined (Dallas et al. 2002; Mucci et al. 2010).

In this study, consistent sampling provided a framework to identify possible barriers and their influence on genetic structure across the range of Hungarian otters. The presence of physical barriers to gene flow does not preclude an additional effect of nonphysical barriers, such as female philopatry. A recent study of otters in southern Portugal found evidence that female philopatry acts as a nonphysical barrier to gene flow that has resulted in fine-scale genetic structure in an interconnected river system (Quaglietta et al. 2013). Additionally, previous molecular studies have found patterns of isolation by distance among otter populations (e.g., Cassens et al. 2000; Dallas et al. 2002; Mucci et al. 2010). The genetic structure of the Hungarian otter population is clearly dominated by 2 patterns: isolation by distance and a partial dispersal barrier between the 2 river basins (Tisza and Danube). Gene flow between the Tisza and Danube otter populations is higher in sample sites that are geographically proximate and could be mediated by dispersal of males. Given that otters are so dependent upon an aquatic environment, dispersal over land is most likely avoided, resulting in genetic divergence between river basins. In addition, genetic landscape shape interpolation analysis indicated that genetic distances were shallower in the western part of the country than in the east. This result could be due to variations in otter densities throughout the region. Field surveys has indicated that the highest numbers of otter populations are found on the western part of the country (Kemenes 1991) where there are many fish ponds with dense vegetation resulting in higher food availability.

However, in addition to geographic distance, the species does seem to be spatially restricted to one of the 2 river basins. Hungary is rich in surface waters and wetlands which form suitable habitat for otters (Heltai et al. 2012); however, these are not uniformly distributed and available across the entire country. Specifically, the genetic delineation observed in this study between the eastern and western regions corresponds to the so-called Danube–Tisza Fluvial—a sand-based hilly area that runs in a north-south direction between the Pannonian Central Danube Basin and the Tisza Basin. The Danube–Tisza Fluvial consists of sediment from the Quaternary period and was classified by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) as semidesert. In the last 100 years, the average yearly rainfall in this area has decreased by 80 mm, probably due to climate change (Levinsky et al. 2007) and the level of ground water has dropped several meters largely due to river regulations. At the beginning of the last century, there were approximately 600 natural lakes in this area (Konecsny 2011). The majority of these lakes disappeared over the past century leaving a dry region that likely presents a partial barrier to movement for otters. To our knowledge, this is the only wetland species that has been reported to be affected by this barrier. In addition, threats that may exist to otters between the Danube and Tisza Rivers include habitat loss via removal of vegetation along the small watercourses, reduction in food resources due to drainage of wetlands, and human disturbances (Lanszki et al. 2009b; Dövényi 2010). The shallow but significant genetic subdivision found in the present study may represent a long-term pattern of 2 subpopulations evolving within river basins, but connected by gene flow, or could be the result of decreasing genetic connectivity between 1 historically large, genetically interconnected population inhabiting both river basins. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between these 2 hypotheses without incorporating historical samples.

The population differentiation emphasizes the importance of conservation of the rich and connected network of water-related habitats and supports the restoration of wetland habitats. Our results emphasize that even a widely distributed top predator like the otter can face barriers to movement that limit genetic connectivity but such barriers may not be evident from simple mapping of the species' distribution. These results have significant implications for conservation and management of the species within Hungary and can be used for management plans to retain the distinct genetic diversity present in each subpopulation.

LITERATURE CITED

ARRENDAL, J., C.W. WALKER, A.K. SUNDQVIST, L. HELLBORG, AND C. VILA. 2004. Genetic evaluation of an otter translocation program. Conservation Genetics 5:79–88.

BEAUMONT, M. A. 1999. Detecting population expansion and decline using icrosatellites. Genetics 153:2013–2029.

BLACK, W. C., AND E. S. KRAFTSUR. 1985. A FORTRAN programme for the calculation and analysis of two-locus linkage disequilibrium coefficients. Theoretical and Applied Genetics 70:491–496.

BLUNDELL, G. M., M. BEN-DAVID, P. GROVES, R. T. BOWYER, AND E. GEFFEN. 2002. Characteristics of sex-biased dispersal and gene flow in coastal river otters: implications for natural recolonization of extirpated populations. Molecular Ecology 11:289–303.

CASSENS, I., R. TIEDEMANN, F. SUCHENTRUNK, AND G. B. HARTL. 2000. Mitochondrial DNA variation in the European otter (*Lutra lutra*) and the use of spatial autocorrelation analysis in conservation. Journal of Heredity 91:31–35.

DALLAS, J. F. F. MARSHALL, S. B. PIERTNEY, P. J. BACON, AND P. A. RACEY. 2002. Spatially restricted gene flow and reduced microsatellite polymorphism in the Eurasian otter *Lutra lutra* in Britain. Conservation Genetics 3:15–28.

DALLAS, J. F., AND S. B. PIERTNEY. 1998. Microsatellite primers for the Eurasian otter. Molecular Ecology 7:1247–1251.

DÖVÉNYI, Z. 2010. Inventory of micro regions in Hungary. MTA Geographical Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary:1–876 [in Hungarian].

EARL, D. A., AND B. M. VONHOLDT. 2012. Structure Harvester: a website and program for visualizing STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method. Conservation Genetics Resources 4:359–361.

EVANNO, G., S. REGNAUT, AND J. GOUDET. 2005. Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software structure: a simulation study. Molecular Ecology 14:2611–2620.

EXCOFFIER, L., P. E. SMOUSE, AND J. M. QUATTRO. 1992. Analysis of molecular variance inferred from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: application to human mitochondrial DNA restriction data. Genetics 131:479–491.

FARAGÓ, S. 2009. Hunting statistics of historical Hungary 1879–1913. University of West Hungary Press, Sopron, Hungary:1–455 [in Hungarian].

FRANKHAM, R., D. A. BRISCOE, AND J. D. BALLOU. 2002. Introduction to conservation genetics. Cambridge University Press, New York.

HAJKOVA, P., C. PERTOLDI, B. ZEMANOVA, K. ROCHE, B. HAJEK, J. BRYJA, AND J. ZIMA. 2007. Genetic structure and evidence for recent population decline in Eurasian otter populations in the Czech and Slovak Republics: implications for conservation. Journal of Zoology 272:1–9.

HARDY, O. J., AND VEKEMANS, X. 2002. SpaGeDi: a versatile computer program to analyse spatial genetic structure at the individual or population levels. Molecular Ecology Notes 2:618–620.

HELTAI, M., É. A. BAUER-HAÁZ, R. LEHOCZKI, AND J. LANSZKI. 2012. Changes in the occurrence and population trend of the Eurasian otter (*Lutra lutra*) in Hungary between 1990 and 2006. North-Western Journal of Zoology 8:112–118.

JANSSENS, X., ET AL. 2008. Genetic pattern of the recent recovery of European otters in southern France. Ecography 31:176–186

JOST, L. 2008. G_{st} and its relatives do not measure differentiation. Molecular Ecology 17:4015–4026.

KEMENES, I. 1991. Otter distribution, status and conservation problems in Hungary. IUCN Otter Specialist Group Bulletin 6: 20–23.

KI, J. S., D. S. HWANG, T. J. PARK, S. H. HAN, AND J. S. LEE. 2010. A comparative analysis of the complete mitochondrial genome of the Eurasian otter, *Lutra lutra* (Carnivora: Mustelidae). Molecular Biology Reports 37:1943–55.

KONECSNY, K. 2011. A víz mint erőforrás és kockázat. Eszterházy Károly Főiskola (Eszterházy Károly University of Applied Sciences), Eger, Hungary:1–130 [in Hungarian].

KRUUK, H. 2006. Otters: ecology, behaviour and conservation. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom.

LANSZKI, J., A. HIDAS, K. SZENTES, I. RÉVAY, I. LEHOCZKY, AND S. WEISS. 2008. Relative spraint density and genetic structure of otter (*Lutra lutra*) along the Drava River in Hungary. Mammalian Biology 73:40–47.

LANSZKI, J., E. OROSZ, AND L. SUGÁR. 2009a. Metal levels in tissues of Eurasian otters (*Lutra lutra*) from Hungary: variation with sex, age, condition and location. Chemosphere 74:741–743.

LANSZKI, J., L. G. SZÉLES, AND G. YOXON. 2009b. Diet composition of otters (*Lutra lutra*) living on small watercourses in south-western Hungary. Acta Zoologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 55:293–306.

LANSZKI, J., ET AL. 2010. Genetic structure of otter (*Lutra lutra*) populations from two fishpond systems in Hungary. Mammalian Biology 75:447–450.

LATCH, E. K., D. G. SCOGNAMILO, J. A. FIKE, M. J. CHAMBERLAIN, AND O. E. RHODES. 2008. Deciphering ecological barriers to North American River Otter (*Lontra canadensis*) gene flow in the Louisiana Landscape. Journal of Heredity 99:265–274.

LEVINSKY, I. F. SKOV, J.C. SVENNING, AND C. RAHBEK. 2007. Potential impacts of climate change on the distributions and diversity patterns of European mammals. Biodiversity and Conservation 16:3803–3816.

MACDONALD, S., AND C. F. MASON. 1976. The status of the otter (*Lutra lutra* L.) in Norfolk. Biological Conservation 9:199–124.

MASON, C. F., AND S. M. MACDONALD. 1994. PCBs and organochlorine pesticide residues in otters (*Lutra lutra*) and in otter spraints from SW England and their likely impact on populations. Science of the Total Environment 144:305–312.

MASON, C. F., AND S. M. MACDONALD. 2004. Growth in otter (*Lutra lutra*) populations in the UK as shown by long-term monitoring. Ambio 33:148–152.

MILLER, M. P. 2005. Alleles in space (AIS): computer software for the joint analysis of inter-individual spatial and genetic information. Journal of Heredity 96:722–724.

MUCCI, N., ET AL. 2010. Genetic diversity and landscape genetic structure of otter (*Lutra lutra*) populations in Europe. Conservation Genetics 11:583–599.

NECHAY, G. 1980. Die situation de s Fischotters in Ungarn. Pp. 215–221 in Der Fischotter in Europa (C. Reuther and A. Festetics, eds.). Univertität Göttingen, Göttingen.

PEAKALL, R., AND P. E. SMOUSE. 2006. GenAlEx 6: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research. Molecular Ecology Notes 6:288–295.

PEAKALL, R., AND P. E. SMOUSE. 2012. GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. Bioinformatics 28:2537–2539.

POLEDNÍKOVÁ, K., J. VĚTROVCOVÁ, L. POLEDNÍK, AND V. HLAVÁČ. 2010. Carbofuran - a new and effective method of illegal killing of otters (*Lutra lutra*) in the Czech Republic. IUCN/SCC Otter Specialist Group Bulletin 27:137–146.

PRITCHARD, J. K., M. STEPHENS, AND P. DONNELLY. 2000. Inference of population structure using multilocus genotypes. Genetics 155:945–959.

PRITCHARD, J. K., W. WEN, AND D. FALUSH. 2003. Documentation for STRUCTURE software: version 2. http://pritch.bsd.uchicago.edu/structure.html. Accessed 01 December 2013.

QUAGLIETTA, L., V. C. FONSECA, P. HÁJKOVÁ, A. MIRA, AND L. BOITANI. 2013. Fine-scale population genetic structure and short-range sex-biased dispersal in a solitary carnivore, Lutra lutra. Journal of Mammalogy 94:561–571.

RANDI, E. 2003. Conservation genetics of carnivores in Italy. Comptes Rendus Biologies 326:54–60.

RUIZ-OLMO, J., ET AL. 2008. Lutra lutra. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2014.2. www.iucnredlist.org. Accessed 16 January 2014.

RUETHER, C. 1993. *Lutra lutra* (Linnaeus, 1758) – Fischotter. Pp. 907–961 in Handbuch der Säugetiere Europas (J. Neithammer and F. Krapp, eds.). Aula Verlag, Wiesbaden, Germany.

SCHMEDTJE, U. (ED.). 2005. The Danube River Basin District. ICPDR – International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River, Vienna, Austria:1–26.

STANTON, D. W. G., G. I. HOBBS, E. A. CHADWICK, F. M. SLATER, AND M. W. BRUFORD. 2008. Mitochondrial genetic diversity and structure of the European otter (*Lutra lutra*) in Britain. Conservation Genetics 10:733–737.

VAN OOSTERHOUT, C., W. F. HUTCHINSON, D. P. M. WILLS, AND P. SHIPLEY. 2004. MICRO-CHECKER: software for identifying and correcting genotyping errors in microsatellite data. Molecular Ecology Resources 4:535–538.

WAHLUND, S. 1928. Zusammersetung von Populationen und Korrelation-sercheinungen von Standpunkt der Verebungslehre aus betrachtet. Hereditas 11:65–106.

WEST, R. B. 1975. The Suffolk otter survey. Suffolk Natural History 16:378–388.