University of Groningen

Genomic and proteomic identification of Late Holocene cetaceans

Biard, Vincent; Gol'din, Pavel; Gladilina, Elena; Vishnyakova, Karina ; McGrath, Krista ;
Vieira, Filipe G.; Wales, Nathan ; Fontaine, Michael Christophe; Speller, Camilla ; Olsen,
Morten Tange

Published in:
Journal of Archaeological Science

DOI:
[10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.07.008)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Biard, V., Gol'din, P., Gladilina, E., Vishnyakova, K., McGrath, K., Vieira, F. G., Wales, N., Fontaine, M. C., Speller, C., & Olsen, M. T. (2017). Genomic and proteomic identification of Late Holocene cetaceans: A Black Sea case study. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 15, 262-271.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.07.008>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Genomic and proteomic identification of Late Holocene remains: Setting baselines for Black Sea odontocetes

Vincent Biard^{a,*}, Pavel Gol'din^b, Elena Gladilina^{b,c}, Karina Vishnyakova^{b,c}, Krista McGrath^d, Filipe G. Vieira^a, Nathan Wales^a, Michael C. Fontaine^e, Camilla Speller^d, Morten Tange Olsen^{a,**}

^a Section for Evolutionary Genomics, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 5-7, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark

^b Schmalhausen Institute of Zoology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 15 Bogdan Khmelnytskyi Street, Kiev 01601, Ukraine

^c Ukrainian Scientific Centre of Ecology of the Sea, 89 Frantsuzsky Blvd., Odessa 65009, Ukraine

^d BioArCh, Department of Archaeology, University of York, Environment Building, York, North Yorkshire YO10 5DD, UK

^e Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences (GELIFES), University of Groningen, PO Box 11103 CC, Groningen, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Species identification
Mixed assemblage
Odontocete
ZooMS
Shotgun sequencing
Sanger sequencing
Mitogenome

ABSTRACT

A critical challenge of the 21st century is to understand and minimise the effects of human activities on biodiversity. Cetaceans are a prime concern in biodiversity research, as many species still suffer from human impacts despite decades of management and conservation efforts. Zooarchaeology constitutes a valuable approach for informing conservation and management decisions by providing baseline information on the past distribution and human uses of species. However, traditional morphological species identification of mixed assemblage bones can be challenging, particularly in the case of cetaceans. To address this issue, we applied and evaluated the performance of three biomolecular approaches – Sanger sequencing, shotgun sequencing and collagen peptide fingerprinting (ZooMS) – for species identification in a mixed assemblage of 800 to 1600 years old odontocete (toothed whale) samples from the site of Chersonesus in Crimea, Ukraine. We found that ZooMS allowed for identification to the taxonomic level for 28 of our 30 samples (> 90%), identifying them as either “porpoise” or “dolphin”, and approximately half of those samples could be further identified to species level with the shotgun sequencing approach. In addition, shotgun sequencing produced several complete ancient odontocete mitogenomes and auxiliary nuclear genomic data for further exploration in a population genetic context. In contrast, both morphological identification and Sanger sequencing lacked taxonomic resolution and/or resulted in misclassification of samples. We found that the combination of ZooMS and shotgun sequencing provides a powerful tool in zooarchaeology, and here allowed for a deeper understanding of past marine resource use and its implication for current management and conservation of Black Sea odontocetes.

1. Introduction

One of the critical challenges of the 21st century is to investigate and reduce the negative effects of human activities on the Earth's biodiversity. To address these issues, detailed baseline information on the ecology and evolution of plant and animal populations and species is required, including information on past abundance, distribution, species life history or phenology, as well as historic and prehistoric human resource use, context and impacts. While this is true for much of Earth's biota, cetaceans constitute an iconic group where many species and populations, despite decades of management and conservation efforts, still suffer from past and present human impacts, such as

overexploitation, habitat alterations, bycatch, and ocean noise (Schipper et al., 2008; Pimm et al., 2014).

Zooarchaeology is particularly suited to provide such baseline information, as this approach documents a broad range of direct material evidences of animals, including their abundance, distribution, diversity, population structure and individual traits, as well as long-term changes of these parameters (Steadman, 1995; Dietl et al., 2015; Hofman et al., 2015). However, in the case of cetaceans, accurate identification of species constitutes a special problem. On many archaeological sites, cetacean assemblages contain multiple species (Mulville, 2002), which are represented by only incomplete fragments of postcranial bones and often are considered to be non-diagnosable by morphological methods

* Correspondence to: V. Biard, 4 Rue Roger Senturene, D103, 33140 Villenave d'Ornon, France.

** Correspondence to: M.T. Olsen, Section for Evolutionary Genomics, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 5-7, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark.

E-mail addresses: vincentbiard33@gmail.com (V. Biard), morten.olsen@snm.ku.dk (M.T. Olsen).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.07.008>

Received 30 March 2017; Received in revised form 4 July 2017; Accepted 8 July 2017
2352-409X/ © 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

(Mulville, 2002; Amundsen et al., 2013). For example, isolated vertebrae of *Delphinus* sp. are hardly discriminated from *Stenella* sp., small *Tursiops* sp. or *Steno* sp. Furthermore, in an assemblage containing kitchen refuse of *Delphinus* sp., *Stenella* sp. and *Tursiops* sp., most of postcranial fragments were unidentified, unlike well informative cranial and, in particular, dental remains (Cooke et al., 2016). In cetaceans, caudal vertebrae (comprising 35–50% of all vertebrae, depending on the species) and vertebral centra with missing processes are especially difficult for diagnostics. This may also be true for other mammalian groups, but many terrestrial mammalian taxa are often represented by a single species in each assemblage or a few species of different size categories and, thus, are more easily discriminated (Dunnell, 1971; Grayson, 1984).

The ability to extract and analyse ancient DNA (aDNA) from subfossil material have greatly contributed to the resolution of this problem (Willerslev and Cooper, 2005), allowing for determining the species identity of e.g. historical whale remains from whaling stations at South Georgia (Lindqvist et al., 2009; Sremba et al., 2010). Moreover, although driven primarily by research in human (Briggs et al., 2009; Rasmussen et al., 2010; Allentoft et al., 2015) and terrestrial megafauna evolution (Gilbert et al., 2008; Lorenzen et al., 2011; Dabney et al., 2013a), several studies have utilized aDNA to assess the evolutionary and demographic history of cetaceans (see Foote et al., 2012a). For instance, McLeod et al. (2012) have examined the demographic history of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) in the Canadian Arctic using mitochondrial DNA fragment, and have revealed a population expansion over the past 30,000 years BP. Similar historic inference have been made from Eastern Atlantic bowhead whales (Foote et al., 2013), as well as common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) (Nichols et al., 2007), killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) (Foote et al., 2009) and North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) (McLeod et al., 2010).

To date, most molecular approaches for ancient cetacean species determination have been based on Sanger sequencing of short fragments of mitochondrial genes such as cytochrome-b (CytB), ribosomal 12S or cytochrome oxidase-I (COI). However, for highly degraded material, sufficient DNA template may not be preserved, or this approach might not yield sufficient coverage and resolution for species distinction – in particular if these are from closely related species (Goldstein and DeSalle, 2011). Moreover, the focus on a single short fragment often limits additional population genetic inference of evolutionary and demographic trajectories, as well as associated historical anthropogenic and climatic impacts. The recent development of peptide mass fingerprinting of bone collagen (ZooMS), where species identification can be accomplished by comparing ancient peptide fingerprints to modern reference databases, allows for analysis of degraded ancient material otherwise suboptimal for DNA analysis (Buckley et al., 2009; Welker et al., 2015). However, due to the relatively slow rate of evolution within the collagen chains, taxonomic resolution is often limited to the genus or even family level. Studies combining analysis of aDNA Sanger sequencing and collagen targeting have successfully been applied to a few diverse assemblages of baleen whales (Buckley et al., 2014; Evans et al., 2016; Speller et al., 2016), however for some species and materials, even the combined use of these methods may not provide sufficient resolution for species identification. By generating massive amounts of data across the genome, short-read DNA “shotgun” sequencing techniques may circumvent the obstacles of aDNA fragmentation and taxonomic resolution, as well as provide additional data for population genetic inference of demography and phylogeography (Leonardi et al., 2016). Thus, the approach has a great potential to become the gold standard for species identification of ancient material. However to date the applicability of shotgun sequencing relative to Sanger sequencing and collagen profiling have not been evaluated.

All three odontocete populations inhabiting the Black Sea, the common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*), the short-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*) and the harbour porpoise

(*Phocoena phocoena*), though of widespread species, are recognized as separate subspecies and of special management and conservation concern. The IUCN has classified the Black Sea harbour porpoise (*P. p. relicta*) and the Black Sea bottlenose dolphin (*T. t. ponticus*) as endangered (Birkun and Frantzis, 2008; Birkun, 2012) and the Black Sea common dolphin (*D. d. ponticus*) as vulnerable (Birkun, 2008). These have all been severely depleted by decades of extensive hunting (Kleinenberg, 1956; Birkun, 2002a), and are now affected by fisheries bycatch and consequences of ctenophore *Mnemiopsis leidyi* invasion, undermining their trophic base (Bushuev, 2000; Vishnyakova and Gol'din, 2015b). The common bottlenose dolphin (Viaud-Martinez et al., 2008; Moura et al., 2013) and short-beaked common dolphin (Amaral et al., 2007) both appear to have colonised the Black Sea a few thousand years ago. Similarly, it has been suggested that a relict harbour porpoise population in the Eastern Mediterranean founded the Black Sea population a few thousand years after the reconnection of the two basins, probably tracking suitable habitats (Fontaine et al., 2012; Fontaine et al., 2014; Fontaine, 2016). Moreover, in contrast to the two other odontocete species present in the basin, the Black Sea harbour porpoise is unique in its isolation to other populations situated in the Atlantic Ocean, around 4000 km apart. Its absence from the Mediterranean Sea, already noted by Aristotle (350 BCE) (Frantzis et al., 2001), might be the consequence of changing oceanic conditions, notably warming temperatures and low productivity of Mediterranean ecosystems (Thunell et al., 1977; Thunell, 1979; Fontaine, 2016). Thus isolated, the Black Sea harbour porpoise has evolved distinct morphological and genetic characteristics (Viaud-Martinez et al., 2007; Galatius and Gol'din, 2011), and additional sub-structuring might even exist among the different water bodies of the Black Sea region (Gol'din, 2004; Gol'din and Vishnyakova, 2016), although this question requires further investigations.

Here we tested the applicability of different species identification methods on a mixed assemblage of odontocete (toothed whale) zooarchaeological remains excavated at the site of Chersonesus on the Black Sea coast of Crimea, Ukraine. Specifically, we i) compared and evaluated the performance of four approaches: morphology, Sanger sequencing, collagen peptide mass fingerprinting (ZooMS), and shotgun sequencing of short-read DNA; and ii) discuss our findings in the context of historic marine resource use, and in relation to setting baselines for contemporary conservation and management schemes in the region. To our knowledge this is one of the first studies to utilize the full extent of recent genomic and proteomic techniques to identify and analyse highly degraded ancient odontocete material. Importantly, although the present focus is on odontocetes, our findings should apply to other organisms and study systems.

2. Materials & methods

2.1. Study site

Chersonesus (also known as Chersonesus Taurica or Tauric Chersonesus = Chersonese) is located on the Black Sea coast in the southern Crimea (Supplementary Fig. S1). It was the greatest city, trade and cultural centre of the northern Black Sea region during the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine ages between 2400 and 600 years BP (Strabo, 1929; Porphyrogenitus, 1993; Carter and Mack, 2003). Founded by Greeks from Asia Minor, it was populated by colonists and visited by traders from various Black Sea and Mediterranean localities, and thus, the archaeology of the city shows a great variety of regional economic and cultural practices (Kadeev, 1970; Kadeev and Sorocean, 1989). In particular, marine fisheries and seafood played an important role in economy and diet of the Chersonesus population, and diverse marine fauna was reported from zooarchaeological evidence, as well as from art representations and some descriptive sources (Semenov-Zuser, 1947; Kadeev, 1970; Højte, 2005; Morales et al., 2007).

Table 1

Odontocete samples and results of the species determination by morphology, CytB Sanger sequencing, shotgun sequencing of mitogenomes and ZooMS. Notice that the three molecular approaches gave overall very similar results, with the exception of samples BS_3 and BS_10.

ID	Year (CE)	Bone	Morphology	Sanger	Shotgun	ZooMS ^a
BS_01	400–530	Mandible	Cetacea sp.	Dolphin sp.	<i>D. delphis</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_02	400–530	Mandible	Cetacea sp.	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_03	275–300	Mandible	<i>D. delphis</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Failed	Carnivora
BS_04	400–530	Mandible	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_05	400–530	Tooth	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_06	400–530	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_07	400–530	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_08	400–530	Epiphysis	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Dolphin sp.	<i>D. delphis</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_09	400–530	Epiphysis	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_10	400–530	Occip. condyle	Cetacea sp.	Dolphin sp.	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_11	400–530	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_12	400–530	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_13	400–530	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_14	400	Teeth	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_15	400	Skull	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	'Porpoise'
BS_16	400	Skull	<i>P. phocoena</i>	<i>P. phocoena</i>	N/A	N/A
BS_17	1000–1200	Vertebra	<i>P. phocoena</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_18	470–500	Tooth	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_19	470–500	Tooth	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_20	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_21	470–500	Epiphysis	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	<i>T. truncatus</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_22	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Failed	<i>D. delphis</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_23	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	<i>D. delphis</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_24	1000–1100	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_25	1000–1100	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Failed	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_26	1000–1100	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_27	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_28	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	Failed	'Dolphin'
BS_29	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	<i>T. truncatus</i>	'Dolphin'
BS_30	470–500	Vertebra	<i>T. truncatus</i>	Dolphin sp.	<i>T. truncatus</i>	'Dolphin'

^a 'Dolphin' includes '*Tursiops truncatus*, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, *Delphinus delphis*, *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*'; 'Porpoise' includes '*Orcinus orca*, *Phocoenoides dalli*, *Phocoena phocoena*, *Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*'; Note that sample BS_16 was not shotgun sequenced or tested using ZooMS.

2.2. Zooarchaeological material

The zooarchaeological material comprised 259 samples of small toothed whales excavated in 2011–2013 from the Kruse basilica and adjoining area in Chersonesus (Ushakov, 2011), consisting of partial skulls and skull fragments, mandibles, ear bones, isolated teeth, sternum bones, humeri, partial vertebrae, epiphyses of vertebral bodies, ribs and rib fragments and pelvic bones. Of these, 30 samples of vertebrae, teeth, mandibles, epiphyses and skull fragments were used for comparison of species identification methods, as representing individuals that were identified as different specimens in terms of morphology, taphonomy and archaeological context (Table 1, Fig. 1A). The samples dates ranged from 1600 to 800 years BP based on the archaeological context, as presented by age-specific ceramics and coins (Ushakov, 2011, 2013; Ushakov et al., 2013); but most of specimens came from the layers dated as 1600–1500 years BP (400–530 CE).

2.3. Morphological species identification

Based on morphological characteristics, the majority of the samples were assigned to species level (Supplementary Table S1). Identification was conducted by comparing the samples with museum collection specimens (Supplementary Fig. S2). Specifically, all three species are well distinguished from their teeth, skull vertices, facial skulls, ear bones, sternum, humerus and pelvic bones (Supplementary Table S2). In addition, bottlenose dolphins are significantly larger than harbour porpoises in all dimensions, independent of ontogenetic age. In contrast to the above distinctions, vertebrae and ribs are less indicative than other bones. Generally, vertebrae of bottlenose dolphins can be identified from their relative large size, and those of common dolphins by their narrow bodies and long spines. However, incomplete vertebrae can generally only be provisionally identified. Here, as for ribs, they

were identified to species only with other associated bones.

2.4. Genetic species identification

2.4.1. DNA extraction

All DNA extractions were conducted in a designated clean laboratory for ancient DNA analysis at the Centre for GeoGenetics, Natural History Museum of Denmark. First, the outer layer of the bone was removed by drilling and bleaching to limit contamination from soil composition. Then, 72 to 420 mg of cleaned bone powder was obtained by drilling the bones inner part or, when drilling was impossible, by grinding of the full samples. Drilling was performed using a Dremel with a rounded drill head, running at < 1000 rpm to minimise heating of the sample. DNA was extracted using a silica-in-solution method (Rohland and Hofreiter, 2007; Dabney et al., 2013a; Allentoft et al., 2015). Extraction blanks were included in each batch to monitor potential contamination. DNA quality and quantity was assessed using High Sensitivity D1000 ScreenTape for 2200 TapeStation (Agilent Technologies) and a Qubit® 2.0 Fluorometer. The former estimates peak molarities of the short-fragment component of the DNA extracts, and is hence expected to provide the most reliable approximation of DNA concentration in our subfossil samples.

2.4.2. Endogenous DNA content

The DNA extracts were tested for the presence and amount of endogenous (odontocete) DNA by real time qPCR using previously designed primers specifically developed for odontocete species identification by targeting a 43 bp region of the CytB gene (Foote et al., 2012b). qPCRs were performed on a Stratagene Mx3000P (Agilent Technologies) and each 25 µL reaction contained 2 µL of DNA, 1 x PCR buffer, 2.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.8 µg/µL BSA, 0.4 µM of each primer, 0.25 µM mixed dNTPs, 1 µL SYBR Green and 0.25 µL AmpliTaq Gold® enzyme

BS_17 and BS_18 to BS_30) to equimolarity based on the 2200 TapeStation profiles and single read sequenced on respectively one lane and a partial lane of the Illumina HiSeq 2000 platform. Moreover, five samples (BS_07, BS_10, BS_11, BS_12 and BS_15) were re-sequenced on a partial lane. The library of the sample BS_16 did not reveal any insert based on the DNA profile and was consequently not sequenced.

Given the lack of nuclear reference genomes for most cetaceans and general low yield of endogenous nuclear DNA from zooarchaeological material, the genetic species determination was done by use of mitochondrial genomic data (mitogenomes). First, sequencing adapters were removed from the de-multiplexed reads and reads shorter than 30 bp were discarded using the program AdapterRemoval 1.5.4 (Lindgreen, 2012). Then, all reads were mapped to reference mitogenomes of the harbour porpoise (Accession number NC005280) and bottlenose dolphin (Accession number KF570325). Full mitogenomes are not available for short-beaked common dolphin so reference data for this species was created by compiling available mtDNA sequence fragments in GenBank (Accession numbers KC312628, AB481388, and EU685091), as well as by mapping the short-read data to the mitogenome of a sister species, the long-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus capensis*) (Accession number NC012061). Mapping was done using the program BWA 0.7.5a–r405 (Li and Durbin, 2009), reads were quality filtered ($Q > 30$) using the program samtools 1.2 (Li et al., 2009), and PCR duplicates were removed using the program Picard (<http://picard.sourceforge.net>) before being imported into Geneious (Kearse et al., 2012). Also, to aid in species identification by phylogenetic matching, we constructed a phylogenetic tree, including all mitogenome references and samples presenting high coverage mitogenomes, using the MrBayes 3.2.2. (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001) plugging in Geneious. The mitogenome reference of the Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale (*Mesoplodon ginkgodens*) (Accession number NC027593) was used as an out-group. Four independent chains for 1,000,000 generations under the General-time-reversible (GTR) model substitution were performed, with a burn-in length of 100,000 generations, and a sampling frequency of 5000 generations.

2.4.5. Taxonomic identification by collagen peptide mass fingerprinting (ZooMS)

The identification of zooarchaeological remains through peptide mass fingerprinting of bone collagen (also known as ZooMS) has been applied in several contexts, including the identification of marine mammals (Buckley et al., 2014; Evans et al., 2016; Speller et al., 2016). We applied ZooMS to 29 of the odontocete samples after they had been processed for ancient DNA analysis (BS_16 was destroyed entirely during DNA analysis). The samples were processed in BioArCh, University of York, using protocols for ancient bone (Buckley et al., 2009). We immersed ca. 10–30 mg of bone in 250 μ L of 0.6 M hydrochloric acid at 4 °C until the samples were demineralised. The samples were centrifuged and the supernatant discarded, before being rinsed in 200 μ L of 0.1 M NaOH to remove humics and other chromophoric compounds. The NaOH was removed, and the samples were rinsed three times in 200 μ L of 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate solution (NH_4HCO_3) pH 8.0 (AmBic). A final 100 μ L of AmBic was then added to the samples, followed by incubation for one hour at 65 °C to gelatinise the collagen; 50 μ L of this supernatant was incubated overnight at 37 °C with 0.4 μ g of trypsin, then acidified to $< \text{pH } 4$ with 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid (TFA), and purified using a 100 μ L C_{18} resin ZipTip® pipette tip (EMD Millipore).

For mass spectrometry, we combined 1 μ L of extract with 1 μ L of matrix (α -cyano-hydroxycinnamic acid) and spotted them in triplicate along with calibration standards onto a Bruker ground steel target plate and ran them on a Bruker ultraflex III MALDI TOF/TOF mass spectrometer, resulting in 90 individual spectra. Spectra were analysed using the mMass software (Strohalm et al., 2008); spectra with low signal to noise ratios, or few to no discrete peaks were eliminated from the dataset. We averaged spectra from replicates of the same sample and

compared them to the list of m/z markers for both marine and non-marine mammals (Buckley and Kansa, 2011; Kirby et al., 2013; Buckley et al., 2014). We assigned taxonomic identifications at the most conservative level of identification (genus, or family level) based on the presence of unambiguous m/z markers (Fig. 1D).

2.5. Population genetic analyses

Finally, we illustrate the additional use of short-read DNA sequence data from ancient odontocetes in a population genetic context by assembling and comparing it with publically available modern sequences from studies on same species and geographical regions. As an example, the ancient Black Sea harbour porpoise sequences were aligned with a 706 bp fragment of the mitochondrial region of 64 modern harbour porpoise from the Black Sea and the Aegean Sea from Fontaine et al. (2012) and a parsimony-based TCS haplotype network was created using PopART ver. 1.7 (Leigh and Bryant, 2015). This species was chosen based on the availability of modern reference data.

3. Results

3.1. Morphological species determination

A total of 30 odontocete samples were analysed, comprising 16 vertebrae, four mandibles, four individual teeth, three epiphyses, two skulls and one occipital condyle (Table 1). Of these, 14 were morphologically identified as bottlenose dolphin remains, 12 were identified as harbour porpoises, one was identified as a short-beaked common dolphin, and three were unidentified.

3.2. Genetic species identification

3.2.1. Endogenous DNA content

The DNA concentrations were between 0.42 ng/ μ L and 68.0 ng/ μ L with an average of 4.96 ng/ μ L, and peak molarities were ranging from 0.15 nmol/L to 42.5 nmol/L, with an average concentration of 10.12 nmol/L (Supplementary Table S3). The average amplification efficiency of the qPCR assay was of $98.1 \pm 1.7\%$, and the melting curves were composed of single peaks for most of the samples, indicating the successful amplification of DNA from subfossil odontocetes. In a few samples, we also observed amplification in both extraction and qPCR blanks. However, these amplifications started after 40 cycles, > 10 cycles after the amplification start of the latest amplified sample, and melting curves revealed qPCR products that were different from the standard (Supplementary Fig. S3). We therefore attributed these amplifications to the formation of primer dimers and to the high number of cycles performed compare to modern DNA template qPCR assays. A Pearson's correlation was run to determine the relationship between the amounts of bone powder and the extract peak molarities and no direct correlation was observed ($r(28) = -0.042$, $P > 0.5$) (Fig. 2A). Rather there seemed to be a weak but non-significant correlation with Ct values ($r(28) = -0.250$, $P > 0.1$) (Fig. 2B), indicating that amount of starting material determines endogenous DNA yield, although it is not statistically significant.

3.2.2. Species identification by Sanger sequencing

In the Sanger sequencing approach, CytB sequence chromatograms were obtained from 28 of the 30 samples. However, the quality of the data was poor and chromatograms difficult to score, leaving uncertainties in the base calls. Moreover, even in the cases where quality was sufficient for reliable base calling, the amplified CytB sequence fragment was found to contain few diagnostic sites to reliably distinguish between bottlenose dolphin and short-beaked common dolphin. Thus, Sanger sequencing data only allowed for species identification of eight harbour porpoises, whereas the remaining 20 samples were classified as Dolphin sp. (Table 1).

Fig. 2. The correlation between amount of starting material (bone powder weight) and (A) peak molarity and (B) normalized qPCR Ct-values. Note that higher peak molarity and lower Ct-values typically signifies higher DNA content.

3.2.3. Species identification by shotgun sequencing

Fourteen of the 29 samples that were shotgun sequenced yielded sufficient short read data for assembling partial and high coverage mitogenomes and species determination (Supplementary Table S4). The identified species included seven harbour porpoises, four short-beaked common dolphins and three bottlenose dolphins (Table 1, Supplementary Fig. S4). For these samples, the proportion of mitogenome recovery and depth of coverage ranged from 72% to 100% (average = 90.2%) and 1.6 to 78.5 (average = 19.4) (Fig. 3), respectively, whereas the remaining 15 samples yielded a very low number of reads (< 120) or insufficient depth of coverage for species identification (Supplementary Table S4).

3.2.4. Species identification by collagen peptide mass fingerprinting (ZooMS)

We used ZooMS to assign broad level taxonomic identifications for all 29 samples tested for both Sanger and shotgun sequencing. Twenty-eight of the samples were confirmed as odontocetes, falling into two broad categories: 21 samples were identified as ‘dolphins’, which

includes bottlenose dolphin, striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*), short-beaked common dolphin, white-beaked dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*); and 7 samples were identified as ‘porpoises’, which includes Dall’s porpoise (*Phocoenoides dalli*) and harbour porpoise, but also white-sided dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus acutus/obliquidentis*) and killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) (Table 1; Fig. 1D; Supplementary Table S5). One sample was identified as a carnivore based on a lack of peptide markers common to cetaceans (e.g. *m/z* value 1079) (Buckley et al., 2014), and the presence of peptides common to the order Carnivora (e.g. *m/z* values 1105; 1453; 2853; 2869) (Buckley et al., 2009; Kirby et al., 2013). The spectra was compared against available peptide markers for both terrestrial and marine carnivores (e.g. seals) (Kirby et al., 2013; Buckley et al., 2014; Buckley et al., 2017); due to the presence of peptide markers 2131 (marker (D)) and particularly 1576 (2t76), the spectra for BS_03 appears to be most consistent with the genus *Canis* (Buckley et al., 2017) (Supplementary Fig. S5).

3.3. Comparison of species identification methods

The three biomolecular methods for species identification – Sanger sequencing, shotgun sequencing and ZooMS – only disagreed for two (BS_03 and BS_10) of the 28 samples where data was obtained from at least two of the molecular methods (Table 1). Specifically, the sample BS_10 – an occipital condyle, and morphologically determined to be Cetacean species – was determined to be a dolphin species by Sanger sequencing, a harbour porpoise by the shotgun sequencing method, and ZooMS identified this as a member of the ‘porpoise’ group, thus agreeing with the shotgun species identification. In the case of BS_03, this sample was morphologically identified as short-beaked common dolphin, but as a harbour porpoise using the *Cytb* sequencing, while the ZooMS identification pointed to a carnivore. Shotgun sequencing did not produce exploitable data for this sample, leaving its identification uncertain.

For the remaining 26 samples, the three molecular approaches agreed, although only shotgun sequencing provided identification at species level. The molecular approaches also revealed multiple errors in identifications from morphology. For instance, species identification was confirmed only for 6 of 11 specimens morphologically identified as harbour porpoises, whereas the others were re-identified as dolphins (BS_08 was re-identified to species level as a short-beaked common dolphin). Moreover, 2 of 13 specimens morphologically identified as bottlenose dolphins, were re-identified as short-beaked common dolphins using biomolecular approaches. Therefore, all the errors in morphology, which were tracked to the species level by genetic analysis involved short-beaked common dolphins and were likely due to mis-identification or omission of this species, and there was no confusion in discrimination between harbour porpoises and bottlenose dolphins.

3.4. Phylogenetic analyses

Four ancient Black Sea harbour porpoises yielded sufficient data for comparison with the mitochondrial control region fragment available for modern data. One transition was observed between the four ancient sequences, segregating them into two distinct haplotypes: BS_09 and BS_14 to one, and BS_11 and BS_15 to the other. Comparison with modern Black Sea sequences reveals that both haplotypes are still present in the modern population, including the southern Crimean waters, with one being the most abundant and central in the star-like topology of network (Fig. 4), indicating a recent population expansion.

4. Discussion

4.1. Species identification in zooarchaeology

Species identification of archaeological materials can be challenging. Morphological identifications can be subject to human error and is

Fig. 3. Mitogenome recovery and sequencing depth of coverage resulting from the shotgun sequencing.

sometimes impossible, being limited by reference to a higher taxon. This is especially common in the case of cetaceans, which are often found in multispecies assemblages, consisting of numerous closely related taxa of similar size. Biomolecular approaches may provide an excellent alternative for confirming a morphological label or resolving uncertainties. Here, we applied and evaluated four approaches to identify material from a mixed assemblage of odontocetes; one morphology-based, one protein-based and two DNA-based. We found that the proteomic ZooMS approach and Sanger sequencing could assign taxonomic grouping (“porpoise” or “dolphin”) to the majority of samples. In contrast, shotgun sequencing only yielded sufficient genetic

information for half of the samples, but for those samples working well, it allowed for identification to species level and provided the first ancient mitogenomes from Black Sea odontocetes, allowing for species level identification and additional population genetic inference.

There are several advantages to a protein-based method such as ZooMS for species identification of subfossil material. First, collagen in particular, is a robust protein, and can generally be recovered from tropical or subtropical archaeological sites where DNA may not be preserved (Welker et al., 2015). Second, ZooMS can identify samples without prior taxonomic knowledge potentially identifying ‘non-target’ species that might fail PCR based approaches such as Sanger sequencing

Fig. 4. Haplotype network among Black Sea harbour porpoise based on the 706 bp mitochondrial sequence.

due to a lack of primer specificity. The main limitation of ZooMS is its level of taxonomic resolution: although all odontocete samples were identified, they could only be assigned to broad taxonomic groups due to the lack of diversity within the collagen sequences of odontocetes and poor resolution within certain areas of the spectrum (Buckley et al., 2014). For instance, species such as killer whales and white-sided dolphin within the Delphinidae family have a peak at mass 1652 grouping them with porpoises, but differ from porpoises and matches other dolphins at masses in the 1500s area of the spectrum. However this area is often poorly resolved, making conclusive identification difficult. Thus, ZooMS classifications may not be correct in systems unlike ours, where we can rule out certain species based on their known taxonomic distributions, habitat preference and absence from the Black Sea. For example, we could quite confidently rule out killer whale, Dall's porpoise, white-beaked dolphin, and white-sided dolphin from the Black Sea, leaving the 'dolphin' group to include the genera *Tursiops*, *Delphinus* and, hypothetically, *Stenella*, and the 'porpoise' group to include only *Phocoena*. More precise taxonomic identifications can occasionally be obtained from the mass spectra, but this requires the successful recovery of multiple diagnostic peptides.

Sanger sequencing has previously been successfully applied for species identification in cetacean mixed assemblages (Lindqvist et al., 2009; Sremba et al., 2010; Evans et al., 2016). Although the primers used here have been successful in a previous study for identifying odontocetes (Foote et al., 2012b), we generally found the chromatograms difficult to interpret, the approach failed to identify samples beyond taxonomic level, and two samples (BS_03 and BS_10) were misclassified. The CytB fragment that we targeted contains 12 and 15 variations sites that differentiate between harbour porpoise and bottlenose dolphin or harbour porpoise and common short-beaked dolphin respectively. The two dolphin species differ at 3 sites, which in our case was insufficient for clear species identification. These obstacles may be overcome by designing new primers and/or targeting larger mitochondrial fragments, as reported for some baleen whale samples (e.g. Yang and Speller, 2006; Evans et al., 2016). However, for highly fragmented ancient DNA, amplification of large PCR products may be problematic, so targeting of short regions are recommended. If such short fragment primers can be designed and highly degraded ancient material can be avoided, Sanger sequencing may provide species identification, but the obtained sequences will likely not provide much data for population genetic inference.

In contrast, having previously been limited by costs and laborious methodology, shotgun sequencing has emerged as an efficient and simple method for generating a large number of short-read sequence data for species identification and population genetic inference from degraded material (Blow et al., 2008). In particular, this method can bypass difficulties occurring using Sanger sequencing, including significant DNA fragmentation, which was an issue in our study. In addition, the ability to recover larger regions of the mitochondrial genome rather than just a short fragment can often provide a more robust taxonomic identification. Still, shotgun sequencing is not without limitations. Specifically, although all of the samples seemed to contain well-preserved collagen, only half of the samples yielded sufficient amounts of sequence data for species identification. The geographical region from which our samples originate is characterised by temperate to arid subtropical climate, and thus typically not considered optimal for preservation of aDNA (Willerslev and Cooper, 2005; Dabney et al., 2013b). Moreover, the samples are likely kitchen refuse and some have certainly been boiled or cooked, probably resulting in some DNA degradation already before burying. As observed here, sequencing success could potentially be improved by increasing the amount of starting material (e.g. bone powder), and for small or valuable samples where material is limited, issues of poor sequence recovery may be solved by re-sequencing troublesome samples, applying capture-enrichment methods (Ávila-Arcos et al., 2011; Ávila-Arcos et al., 2015) or using bioinformatics software capable of handling low depth sequencing data

(Korneliusson et al., 2014).

ZooMS has been suggested as a pre-screening method ahead of more intensive or destructive biomolecular approaches, including PCR-based and shotgun DNA analyses (Von Holstein et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2016; Speller et al., 2016), shotgun proteomics (Welker et al., 2016) or radiocarbon dating (Harvey et al., 2016). As ZooMS is typically less expensive and requires less bone powder than other biomolecular techniques, pre-screening with ZooMS can provide both taxonomic information, as well as an indication of overall biomolecular preservation. In this study, the ZooMS technique provided comparable taxonomic resolution as the Sanger sequencing approach, and could therefore act as a cost-effective pre-screening method ahead of shotgun sequencing. Thus, we recommend using a combination of ZooMS and shotgun sequencing for more effectively resolving uncertainties in species determination. Under such an approach, ZooMS will likely allow for the assignment to a taxonomic level of most or all species, as well as a pre-screen of suitable material that can be shotgun sequenced for further identification to species level and generation of mitogenomic and nuclear data for population genetic inference.

4.2. Marine resource use in ancient Chersonesus

The overall species composition of wild fauna on archaeological sites, and particularly in ancient kitchen refuse, provides numerous insights for the reconstruction of ancient environments, paleoclimatic conditions, catch techniques and seasonality of different hunting and fisheries activities. For example, numerous anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*) remains at the Chersonesus sites are indicative of set net fisheries during the autumn and spring seasonal migration; turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*) is indicative for bottom gill net fisheries, which are the most productive in spring; and tuna (*Thunnus* sp.) is indicative for longline and intensive boat tending activities in warm season. From these perspectives, the identify odontocetes can be either a product of incidental catches in bottom gill nets set for turbot, as it is in present times (Vishnyakova and Gol'din, 2015a), specimens recovered from strandings, or an object of direct hunt from boats in coastal waters, as it appeared in the early 20th century (Kleinenberg, 1956). Of these alternatives, the former idea is well supported by abundant turbot remains in the Kruze basilica. Meanwhile, strandings of common dolphins are relatively rare in Crimea, as well as bycatches in any modern fishery practices in the Black Sea (Birkun, 2002b). On a global scale, bycatch is generally associated with modern types of fisheries, such as pelagic trawling and big purse seine fisheries (Tregenza et al., 1997; Bilgmann et al., 2008), rather than artisanal fisheries. Therefore, stable catches of common odontocetes might have implied boat-based direct hunting. For instance, Black Sea fishermen hunted common dolphins in early 20th century, using a few small boats setting a single purse seine (*alaman*) (Kleinenberg, 1956). Aelian described a similar net for tuna fisheries used in the Roman-era southern Black Sea and mentioned dolphin catches in this context. In an earlier evidence, Strabo (1929) mentioned ancient dolphin catches in the same area in association with tuna and bonito fisheries. Also, Brito and Vieira (2009) found evidence for catches of common dolphins and tuna in medieval Portugal with the same type of trap net (*almadrava*). Additionally, Kadeev (1970) suggested that dolphins could be hunted by Chersonesus fishermen with a harpoon. Our study showed a stable presence of common dolphins in archaeological kitchen refuse assemblages, comprising more than half of the specimens that were identify to "dolphin" by ZooMS and could be further identified to species by shotgun sequencing. These were greatly underestimated by the morphological analyses and, thus, support the idea of diverse odontocete catch practices in the ancient Chersonesus. These practices seem to have affected all the local odontocete species and possibly included, not only common fisheries bycatch products, but also, direct cetacean-focused hunting.

4.3. Implications for management and conservation of Black Sea odontocetes

The geographically isolated Black Sea harbour porpoise, as well as other Black Sea odontocetes, seem to have undergone dramatic population size reductions during the past century as a result of substantial hunting and bycatch peaking between the 1930s and 1950s and killing hundreds of thousands, if not a million, animals (Kleinenberg, 1956; Birkun, 2002a; Fontaine et al., 2012; Fontaine et al., 2014). The extensive fisheries and other anthropogenic disturbances also impacted fish abundance and resulted in an ecosystem regime shift, intrusion of invasive species and economic collapse in the 1970s (Bushuev, 2000; Daskalov, 2002, 2003; Daskalov et al., 2007; Llope et al., 2011). Consequently, the three odontocete species inhabiting the Black Sea have been classified as species under special management and conservation concern.

To supplement management policies, detailed baseline knowledge on past occurrence and human impacts is needed. Although human activities have clearly escalated in recent decades, our species identification of Late Holocene zooarchaeological material indicate that Black Sea odontocetes, similarly to other marine resources, have been impacted by hunting and fisheries bycatch for millennia. For instance, our population genetic analyses of ancient harbour porpoise samples supported previous studies based on modern material (Fontaine et al., 2012), suggesting a long term presence of harbour porpoise in the Black Sea. A more complete understanding of the relative roles of past and present human activities on odontocete demography will require additional zooarchaeological investigations, and upscaling current genetic efforts to include genomic data from both contemporary and ancient samples. In demonstrating the use of biomolecular approaches for species identification, and obtaining the first full mitogenomic and auxiliary nuclear data from ancient Black Sea odontocetes, we have taken the first step.

Data accessibility

Mitochondrial genome sequences are uploaded in GenBank under Accession nos. MF669485–MF669498.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the Dr. Bøje Benzon Foundation and the Section for Evolutionary Genomics at the Natural History Museum of Denmark for their financial support. The authors also thank Sergey Ushakov, Alexey Ivanov and Larisa Sedikova for providing access to the Black Sea samples and the Danish National High-Throughput DNA Sequencing Centre for sequencing the samples.

Authors contribution

V.B., P.G. and M.T.O. designed the research; E.G., K.V. and P.G. collected zooarchaeological samples and processed the morphological analysis; V.B. performed aDNA based laboratory work advised by N.W. and M.T.O.; K.M.G. and C.S. performed protein based laboratory work; V.B., K.M.G., F.G.V., N.W., M.C.F., C.S. and M.T.O. analysed the molecular data; V.B., P.G., C.S. and M.T.O. wrote the manuscript; V.B. and M.T.O. provides funding; all authors commented on previous version of the manuscript and approved the final version.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2017.07.008>.

References

- Allentoft, M.E., Sikora, M., Sjögren, K.-G., et al., 2015. Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia. *Nature* 522, 167–172.
- Amaral, A., Sequeira, M., Martínez-Cedeira, J., Coelho, M., 2007. New insights on population genetic structure of *Delphinus delphis* from the northeast Atlantic and phylogenetic relationships within the genus inferred from two mitochondrial markers. *Mar. Biol.* 151, 1967–1976.
- Amundsen, C., Perdikaris, S., McGovern, T.H., et al., 2013. Fishing booths and fishing strategies in medieval Iceland: an Archaeofauna from the of Akurvík, North-West Iceland. *Environ. Archaeol.* 10, 127–142.
- Ávila-Arcos, M.C., Cappellini, E., Romero-Navarro, J.A., et al., 2011. Application and comparison of large-scale solution-based DNA capture-enrichment methods on ancient DNA. *Sci. Rep.* 1, 74.
- Ávila-Arcos, M.C., Sandoval-Velasco, M., Schroeder, H., et al., 2015. Comparative performance of two whole-genome capture methodologies on ancient DNA Illumina libraries. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 6, 725–734.
- Bilgmann, K., Möller, L., Harcourt, R.G., Gales, R., Beheregaray, L.B., 2008. Common dolphins subject to fisheries impacts in Southern Australia are genetically differentiated: implications for conservation. *Anim. Conserv.* 11, 518–528.
- Birkun Jr., A., 2002a. Cetacean direct killing and live capture in the Black Sea. In: *Cetaceans of the Mediterranean and Black Seas: State of Knowledge and Conservation Strategies. A Report to the ACCOBAMS Secretariat*, Monaco.
- Birkun Jr., A., 2002b. Interactions between cetaceans and fisheries in the Black Sea. In: *Cetaceans of the Mediterranean and Black Seas: State of Knowledge and Conservation Strategies*. 98. pp. 107.
- Birkun Jr., A., 2008. *Delphinus delphis* ssp. *ponticus*. In: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.
- Birkun Jr., A., 2012. *Tursiops truncatus* ssp. *ponticus*. In: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.
- Birkun Jr., A., Frantzis, A., 2008. *Phocoena phocoena* ssp. *relicta*. In: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.
- Blow, M.J., Zhang, T., Woyke, T., et al., 2008. Identification of ancient remains through genomic sequencing. *Genome Res.* 18, 1347–1353.
- Briggs, A.W., Good, J.M., Green, R.E., et al., 2009. Targeted retrieval and analysis of five Neandertal mtDNA genomes. *Science* 325, 318–321.
- Brito, C., Vieira, N., 2009. Historical Accounts About the Occurrence and Capture of Common Dolphins in Portugal Mainland. International Whaling Commission, Scientific Committee. 1–10 (Document IWC - SC/61/SM17).
- Brown, S., Higham, T., Slon, V., et al., 2016. Identification of a new hominin bone from Denisova Cave, Siberia using collagen fingerprinting and mitochondrial DNA analysis. *Sci. Rep.* 6.
- Buckley, M., Kansa, S.W., 2011. Collagen fingerprinting of archaeological bone and teeth remains from Domuztepe, South Eastern Turkey. *Archaeol. Anthropol. Sci.* 3, 271–280.
- Buckley, M., Collins, M., Thomas-Oates, J., Wilson, J.C., 2009. Species identification by analysis of bone collagen using matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionisation time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 23, 3843–3854.
- Buckley, M., Fraser, S., Herman, J., et al., 2014. Species identification of archaeological marine mammals using collagen fingerprinting. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 41, 631–641.
- Buckley, M., Harvey, V.L., Chamberlain, A.T., 2017. Species Identification and Decay Assessment of Late Pleistocene Fragmentary Vertebrate Remains From Pin Hole Cave (Creswell Crags, UK) Using Collagen Fingerprinting. (Boreas).
- Bushuev, S.G., 2000. Depletion of food resources as a factor limiting the number of the Black Sea dolphins. In: *In Ecological Safety of Coastal and Shelf Zones and Comprehensive Use of Shelf Resources*, pp. 437–452 (Russian, Sevastopol).
- Carter, J.C., Mack, G.R., 2003. Crimean Chersonesos: City, Chora, Museum, and Environs University of Texas at Austin Inst. of.
- Cooke, R.G., Wake, T.A., Martínez-Polanco, M.F., et al., 2016. Exploitation of dolphins (Cetacea: Delphinidae) at a 6000 yr old Preceramic site in the Pearl Island archipelago, Panama. *J. Archaeol. Sci. Rep.* 6, 733–756.
- Dabney, J., Knapp, M., Glocke, I., et al., 2013a. Complete mitochondrial genome sequence of a Middle Pleistocene cave bear reconstructed from ultrashort DNA fragments. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 110, 15758–15763.
- Dabney, J., Meyer, M., Pääbo, S., 2013b. Ancient DNA damage. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 5, a012567.
- Daskalov, G.M., 2002. Overfishing drives a trophic cascade in the Black Sea. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 225, 53–63.
- Daskalov, G.M., 2003. Long-term changes in fish abundance and environmental indices in the Black Sea. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 255, 259–270.
- Daskalov, G.M., Grishin, A.N., Rodionov, S., Mihneva, V., 2007. Trophic cascades triggered by overfishing reveal possible mechanisms of ecosystem regime shifts. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 104, 10518–10523.
- Dietl, G.P., Kidwell, S.M., Brenner, M., et al., 2015. Conservation paleobiology: leveraging knowledge of the past to inform conservation and restoration. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 43, 79.
- Dunnell, R.C., 1971. *Systematics in Prehistory*. McMillan, New York and London.
- Evans, S., i Godino, I.B., Álvarez, M., et al., 2016. Using combined biomolecular methods to explore whale exploitation and social aggregation in hunter–gatherer–fisher society in Tierra del Fuego. *J. Archaeol. Sci. Rep.* 6, 757–767.
- Fontaine, M., 2016. Harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*, in the Mediterranean Sea and adjacent regions: biogeographic relicts of the last glacial period. *Adv. Mar. Biol.* 75, 333–358.
- Fontaine, M.C., Snirc, A., Frantzis, A., et al., 2012. History of expansion and anthropogenic collapse in a top marine predator of the Black Sea estimated from genetic

- data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 109, E2569–E2576.
- Fontaine, M.C., Roland, K., Calves, I., et al., 2014. Postglacial climate changes and rise of three ecotypes of harbor porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*, in western Palearctic waters. *Mol. Ecol.* 23, 3306–3321.
- Footte, A.D., Newton, J., Pieltney, S.B., Willerslev, E., Gilbert, M.T.P., 2009. Ecological, morphological and genetic divergence of sympatric North Atlantic killer whale populations. *Mol. Ecol.* 18, 5207–5217.
- Footte, A.D., Hofreiter, M., Morin, P.A., 2012a. Ancient DNA from marine mammals: studying long-lived species over ecological and evolutionary timescales. *Ann. Anat. Anat. Anz.* 194, 112–120.
- Footte, A.D., Thomsen, P.F., Sveegaard, S., et al., 2012b. Investigating the potential use of environmental DNA (eDNA) for genetic monitoring of marine mammals. *PLoS ONE* 7, e41781.
- Footte, A.D., Kaschner, K., Schultze, S.E., et al., 2013. Ancient DNA reveals that bowhead whale lineages survived Late Pleistocene climate change and habitat shifts. *Nat. Commun.* 4, 1677.
- Frantzis, A., Gordon, J., Hassidis, G., Komnenou, A., 2001. The enigma of harbor porpoise presence in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 17, 937–944.
- Galatius, A., Gol'din, P., 2011. Geographic variation of skeletal ontogeny and skull shape in the harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*). *Can. J. Zool.* 89, 869–879.
- Gilbert, M.T.P., Drautz, D.I., Lesk, A.M., et al., 2008. Intraspecific phylogenetic analysis of Siberian woolly mammoths using complete mitochondrial genomes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 105, 8327–8332.
- Gol'din, P., 2004. Growth and body size of the harbour porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena* (Cetacea, Phocoenidae), in the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea. *Vestn. Zool.*
- Gol'din, P., Vishnyakova, K., 2016. Habitat shapes skull profile of small cetaceans: evidence from geographical variation in Black Sea harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena relicta*). *Zoomorphology* 135, 387–393.
- Goldstein, P.Z., DeSalle, R., 2011. Integrating DNA barcode data and taxonomic practice: determination, discovery, and description. *BioEssays* 33, 135–147.
- Grayson, D.K., 1984. Quantitative Zooarchaeology: Topics in the Analysis of Archaeological Faunas. Elsevier.
- Harvey, V.L., Egerton, V.M., Chamberlain, A.T., Manning, P.L., Buckley, M., 2016. Collagen fingerprinting: a new screening technique for radiocarbon dating ancient bone. *PLoS ONE* 11, e0150650.
- Hofman, C.A., Rick, T.C., Fleischer, R.C., Maldonado, J.E., 2015. Conservation archaeogenomics: ancient DNA and biodiversity in the Anthropocene. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30, 540–549.
- Højte, J.M., 2005. The Archaeological Evidence for Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region. 2005. Bekker-Nielsenpp. 133–160.
- Huelsenbeck, J.P., Ronquist, F., 2001. MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics* 17, 754–755.
- Kadeev, V.I., 1970. Essays on the History and Economy of Chersonesos Tauricus in the I–IVth Centuries AD. Izdatelstvo Kharkovskogo Universiteta, Kharkov (Russian).
- Kadeev, V.I., Sorochan, S.B., 1989. Economical Ties of Antique Cities of the Northern Black Sea Region in the 1st Cent. BC – 5th Cent. AD. Izdatelstvo Kharkovskogo Universiteta, Kharkov (Russian).
- Kearse, M., Moir, R., Wilson, A., et al., 2012. Geneious basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 28, 1647–1649.
- Kirby, D.P., Buckley, M., Promise, E., Trauger, S.A., Holdcraft, T.R., 2013. Identification of collagen-based materials in cultural heritage. *Analyst* 138, 4849–4858.
- Kleinenberg, S.E., 1956. Mammals of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov: An Experience of Biological and Fisheries Research. Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow (Russian).
- Korneliusen, T.S., Albrechtsen, A., Nielsen, R., 2014. ANGSD: analysis of next generation sequencing data. *BMC Bioinf.* 15, 356.
- Leigh, J.W., Bryant, D., 2015. Popart: full-feature software for haplotype network construction. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 6, 1110–1116.
- Leonardi, M., Librado, P., Der Sarkissian, C., et al., 2016. Evolutionary patterns and processes: lessons from ancient DNA. *Syst. Biol.* (syw059).
- Li, H., Durbin, R., 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* 25, 1754–1760.
- Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., et al., 2009. The sequence alignment/map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* 25, 2078–2079.
- Lindgreen, S., 2012. AdapterRemoval: easy cleaning of next-generation sequencing reads. *BMC. Res. Notes* 5, 337.
- Lindqvist, C., Probst, A., Martin, A.R., Wiig, Ø., Bachmann, L., 2009. Molecular species identification of historical whale remains from South Georgia. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 25, 229–238.
- Llope, M., Daskalov, G.M., Rouyer, T.A., et al., 2011. Overfishing of top predators eroded the resilience of the Black Sea system regardless of the climate and anthropogenic conditions. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 17, 1251–1265.
- Lorenzen, E.D., Nogués-Bravo, D., Orlando, L., et al., 2011. Species-specific responses of Late Quaternary megafauna to climate and humans. *Nature* 479, 359–364.
- McLeod, B.A., Brown, M.W., Frasier, T.R., White, B.N., 2010. DNA profile of a sixteenth century western North Atlantic right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*). *Conserv. Genet.* 11, 339–345.
- McLeod, B.A., Frasier, T.R., Dyke, A.S., Savelle, J.M., White, B.N., 2012. Examination of ten thousand years of mitochondrial DNA diversity and population demographics in bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) of the Central Canadian Arctic. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 28, E426–E443.
- Morales, A., Antipina, E., Roselló, E., Antipina, A., 2007. An ichthyoarchaeological survey of the ancient fisheries from the Northern Black Sea. *Archaeofauna* 16, 117–172.
- Moura, A.E., Nielsen, S.C., Vilstrup, J.T., et al., 2013. Recent diversification of a marine genus (*Tursiops* spp.) tracks habitat preference and environmental change. *Syst. Biol.* 62, 865–877.
- Mulville, J., 2002. The role of Cetacea in prehistoric and historic Atlantic Scotland. *Int. J. Osteoarchaeol.* 12, 34–48.
- Nichols, C., Herman, J., Gaggiotti, O.E., et al., 2007. Genetic isolation of a now extinct population of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 274, 1611–1616.
- Pfaffl, M., 2001. A new mathematical model for relative quantification in real-time RT-PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 29, e45.
- Picard <http://picard.sourceforge.net>.
- Pimm, S.L., Jenkins, C.N., Abell, R., et al., 2014. The biodiversity of species and their rates of extinction, distribution, and protection. *Science* 344, 1246752.
- Porphyrogenitus, C.V., 1993. In: Moravcsik, G. (Ed.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio*. Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Washington D.C. (translated by R.J.H. Jenkins).
- Rasmussen, M., Li, Y., Lindgreen, S., et al., 2010. Ancient human genome sequence of an extinct Palaeo-Eskimo. *Nature* 463, 757–762.
- Rohland, N., Hofreiter, M., 2007. Ancient DNA extraction from bones and teeth. *Nat. Protoc.* 2, 1756–1762.
- Schipper, J., Chanson, J.S., Chiozza, F., et al., 2008. The status of the world's land and marine mammals: diversity, threat, and knowledge. *Science* 322, 225–230.
- Semenov-Zuser, S.A., 1947. Fish market in Chersonesus. *Vestn. Drevney Istor.* 2, 237–246 (Russian).
- Speller, C., van den Hurk, Y., Charpentier, A., et al., 2016. Barcoding the largest animals on Earth: ongoing challenges and molecular solutions in the taxonomic identification of ancient cetaceans. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* 371, 20150332.
- Sremba, A., Martin, A., Baker, C., 2010. Genetic approach to species identification of whale bones from South Georgia Island whaling stations. In: Report to Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission SC/62/SH19.
- Steadman, D.W., 1995. Prehistoric extinctions of Pacific island birds: biodiversity meets zooarchaeology. *Science* 267, 1123.
- Strabo, H.L.J., 1929. The Geography of Strabo.
- Strohm, M., Hassman, M., Košata, B., Kodíček, M., 2008. mMass data miner: an open source alternative for mass spectrometric data analysis. *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 22, 905–908.
- Thunell, R.C., 1979. Pliocene-Pleistocene paleotemperature and paleosalinity history of the Mediterranean Sea: results from DSDP sites 125 and 132. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 4, 173–187.
- Thunell, R.C., Williams, D.F., Kennett, J.P., 1977. Late Quaternary paleoclimatology, stratigraphy and sapropel history in eastern Mediterranean deep-sea sediments. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* 2, 371–388.
- Tregenza, N., Berrow, S., Hammond, P., Leaper, R., 1997. Common dolphin, *Delphinus delphis* L., bycatch in bottom set gillnets in the Celtic Sea. In: Report of the International Whaling Commission. 47. pp. 835–839.
- Ushakov, S.V., 2011. Kruze Basilica in Chersonesus: main results of studies. In: Black Sea Region in the Middle Ages. Aletea, St. Petersburg, pp. 198–212 (Russian).
- Ushakov, S.V., 2013. A new fish salting cistern from Chersonesus (on the issue of time of construction of the Kruze basilique). In: The Ancient Black Sea Region. Fridman, A. S., Odessa, pp. 590–596 (Russian).
- Ushakov, S.V., Lesnaya, E.S., Tyurin, M.I., 2013. A new ceramic complex, 5th century BCE from the north-eastern part of Chersonesus. In: The Black Sea Region in the Ancient and Early Middle Ages. Southern Scientific Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Rostov-on-Don, pp. 308–315 (Russian).
- Viaud-Martinez, K.A., Martínez Vergara, M., Gol'din, P., et al., 2007. Morphological and genetic differentiation of the Black Sea harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 338, 281–294.
- Viaud-Martinez, K.A., Brownell, R.L., Komnenou, A., Bohonak, A.J., 2008. Genetic isolation and morphological divergence of Black Sea bottlenose dolphins. *Biol. Conserv.* 141, 1600–1611.
- Vishnyakova, K., Gol'din, P., 2015a. Seasonality of strandings and bycatch of harbour porpoises in the Sea of Azov: the effects of fisheries, weather conditions, and life history. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 72, 981–991.
- Vishnyakova, K., Gol'din, P.E., 2015b. Differences in skull size of harbour porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena* (Cetacea), in the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea: evidence for different morphotypes and populations. *Vestn. Zool.* 49, 171–180.
- Von Holstein, I.C., Ashby, S.P., van Doorn, N.L., et al., 2014. Searching for Scandinavians in pre-Viking Scotland: molecular fingerprinting of Early Medieval combs. *J. Archaeol. Sci.* 41, 1–6.
- Welker, F., Collins, M.J., Thomas, J.A., et al., 2015. Ancient proteins resolve the evolutionary history of Darwin's South American ungulates. *Nature* 522, 81–84.
- Welker, F., Hajdinjak, M., Talamo, S., et al., 2016. Palaeoproteomic evidence identifies archaic hominins associated with the Châtelperronian at the Grotte du Renne. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 201605834.
- Willerslev, E., Cooper, A., 2005. Review paper. Ancient DNA. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 272, 3–16.
- Yang, D.Y., Speller, C., 2006. Co-amplification of cytochrome b and D-loop mtDNA fragments for the identification of degraded DNA samples. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* 6, 605–608.