

Phylogenetics of native conifer species in Vietnam based on two chloroplast gene regions *rbcL* and *matK*

MAI PHUONG PHAM¹, VIET HA TRAN², DINH DUY VU^{1,3},
QUOC KHANH NGUYEN¹, SYED NOOR MUHAMMAD SHAH⁴

¹Vietnam-Russia Tropical Centre, Hanoi, Vietnam

²College of Forestry, Vietnam National University of Forestry, Hanoi, Vietnam

³Graduate University of Science and Technology (GUST), Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology (VAST), Hanoi, Vietnam

⁴Department of Horticulture, Faculty of Agriculture, Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan

Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM)

The authors are fully responsible for both the content and the formal aspects of the electronic supplementary material. No editorial adjustments were made.

Table S1a. Different genetic distance among the species in Cupressaceae based on the *matK* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. <i>Calocedrus macrolepis</i> JN657251	–							
2. <i>Calocedrus rupestris</i> JN657252	0.001	–						
3. <i>Cunninghamia konishii</i> JN657259	0.072	0.072	–					
4. <i>Cupressus tonkinensis</i> AY988355	0.031	0.031	0.079	–				
5. <i>Fokienia hodginsii</i> JN657258	0.037	0.036	0.081	0.043	–			
6. <i>Glyptostrobus pensilis</i> JN657263	0.045	0.043	0.061	0.051	0.045	–		
7. <i>Taiwania cryptomerioides</i> AB030127	0.081	0.081	0.060	0.085	0.084	0.069	–	
8. <i>Xanthocyparis vietnamensis</i> AY380850	0.024	0.024	0.070	0.010	0.036	0.043	0.075	–

Table S1b. Different genetic distance among the species in Podocarpaceae based on the *matK* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. <i>Dacrycarpus imbricatus</i> JN657262	–					
2. <i>Dacrydium elatum</i> JN657255	0.060	–				
3. <i>Nageia fleuryi</i> JN657256	0.080	0.085	–			
4. <i>Nageia wallichiana</i> KR855701	0.076	0.085	0.005	–		
5. <i>Podocarpus neriifolius</i> JN657264	0.083	0.083	0.060	0.062	–	
6. <i>Podocarpus pilgeri</i> KY021422	0.083	0.083	0.060	0.062	0.000	–

<https://doi.org/10.17221/88/2020-CJGPB>Table S1c. Different genetic distance among the species in Taxaceae based on the *matK* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. <i>Amentotaxus argotaenia</i> JN657253	–					
2. <i>Amentotaxus hatuyenensis</i> KX059357	0.002	–				
3. <i>Amentotaxus poilanei</i> KT072780	0.008	0.010	–			
4. <i>Amentotaxus yunnanensis</i> JN657254	0.000	0.002	0.008	–		
5. <i>Taxus chinensis</i> JN657260	0.088	0.090	0.080	0.088	–	
6. <i>Taxus wallichiana</i> JN657261	0.087	0.088	0.078	0.087	0.002	–

Table S1d. Different genetic distance among the species in Pinaceae based on the *matK* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. <i>Abies delavayi</i> MH230852	–											
2. <i>Keteleeria davidiana</i> AB161020	0.048	–										
3. <i>Keteleeria evelyniana</i> KT150255	0.051	0.003	–									
4. <i>Pinus dalatensis</i> KT236090	0.093	0.088	0.091	–								
5. <i>Pinus kesiya</i> KT247644	0.093	0.093	0.096	0.053	–							
6. <i>Pinus krempfii</i> KT272170	0.085	0.085	0.088	0.040	0.019	–						
7. <i>Pinus kwangtungensis</i> EF546713	0.093	0.088	0.091	0.000	0.053	0.040	–					
8. <i>Pinus latteri</i> JF955524	0.085	0.096	0.099	0.061	0.008	0.021	0.061	–				
9. <i>Pinus wangii</i> KP128409	0.091	0.085	0.088	0.003	0.056	0.043	0.003	0.064	–			
10. <i>Pseudotsuga sinensis</i> AB601120	0.525	0.528	0.531	0.520	0.528	0.523	0.520	0.525	0.517	–		
11. <i>Tsuga chinensis</i> LC095866	0.509	0.517	0.520	0.504	0.512	0.507	0.504	0.509	0.501	0.080	–	
12. <i>Tsuga dumosa</i> MH116937	0.061	0.064	0.067	0.093	0.099	0.091	0.093	0.101	0.091	0.541	0.525	–

Table S2a. Different genetic distance among the species in Cupressaceae based on the *rbcL* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. <i>Calocedrus macrolepis</i> JN039267	–							
2. <i>Calocedrus rupestris</i> JN039266	0.000	–						
3. <i>Cunninghamia konishii</i> JN039274	0.028	0.028	–					
4. <i>Cupressus tonkinensis</i> JN039269	0.016	0.016	0.023	–				
5. <i>Fokienia hodginsii</i> JN039273	0.019	0.019	0.030	0.019	–			
6. <i>Glyptostrobus pensilis</i> JN039281	0.022	0.022	0.015	0.017	0.024	–		
7. <i>Taiwania cryptomerioides</i> L25756	0.030	0.030	0.021	0.023	0.033	0.015	–	
8. <i>Xanthocyparis vietnamensis</i> AY380895	0.014	0.014	0.021	0.005	0.014	0.015	0.023	–

Table S2b. Different genetic distance among the species in Podocarpaceae based on the *rbcL* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. <i>Dacrycarpus imbricatus</i> JN039279	–					
2. <i>Dacrydium elatum</i> JQ062981	0.026	–				
3. <i>Nageia fleuryi</i> JN039271	0.034	0.030	–			
4. <i>Nageia wallichiana</i> HM593616	0.033	0.031	0.008	–		
5. <i>Podocarpus neriifolius</i> JN039282	0.036	0.034	0.025	0.029	–	
6. <i>Podocarpus pilgeri</i> JN039283	0.034	0.034	0.024	0.027	0.006	–

<https://doi.org/10.17221/88/2020-CJGPB>

Table S2c. Different genetic distance among the species in Taxaceae based on the *rbcL* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5
1. <i>Amentotaxus argotaenia</i> JN039268	–				
2. <i>Amentotaxus poilanei</i> JF940824	0.000	–			
3. <i>Amentotaxus yunnanensis</i> JF940826	0.000	0.000	–		
4. <i>Taxus chinensis</i> JN039277	0.021	0.021	0.021	–	
5. <i>Taxus wallichiana</i> JN039278	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.000	–

Table S2d. Different genetic distance among the species in Pinaceae based on the *rbcL* analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. <i>Abies delavayi</i> JF940555	–											
2. <i>Keteleeria davidiana</i> JN935652	0.021	–										
3. <i>Keteleeria evelyniana</i> MH069638	0.018	0.013	–									
4. <i>Pinus dalatensis</i> JQ062979	0.034	0.034	0.031	–								
5. <i>Pinus kesiya</i> JN039276	0.039	0.034	0.026	0.021	–							
6. <i>Pinus krempfii</i> JN039275	0.036	0.036	0.028	0.018	0.013	–						
7. <i>Pinus kwangtungensis</i> JN039280	0.036	0.036	0.034	0.003	0.023	0.021	–					
8. <i>Pinus latteri</i> JF943429	0.039	0.034	0.026	0.021	0.000	0.013	0.023	–				
9. <i>Pinus wangii</i> NC039613	0.577	0.580	0.582	0.564	0.572	0.567	0.567	0.572	–			
10. <i>Pseudotsuga sinensis</i> MH069634	0.026	0.031	0.028	0.034	0.034	0.036	0.036	0.034	0.575	–		
11. <i>Tsuga chinensis</i> AF145462	0.041	0.041	0.031	0.054	0.054	0.057	0.057	0.054	0.580	0.046	–	
12. <i>Tsuga dumosa</i> AF145460	0.039	0.039	0.031	0.052	0.052	0.054	0.054	0.052	0.575	0.044	0.005	–