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**Supplementary Materials**

**1. Tables**

**\* Note**: Tables which were too large to fit in the main text and are therefore supplied separately as single Excel files.

**Table S1**. The node age (Ma) and 95% HPD at each node (see Fig. 3 and Fig. S1) generated from BEAST calibration dating analyses in both gene trees and species trees of the mtDNA and (mtDNA+nDNA) datasets, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | **mtDNA** | **mtDNA+nDNA** |
|   | Gene tree | Species tree | Gene tree | Species tree |
| Node | Age | 95% HPD | Age | 95% HPD | Age | 95% HPD | Age | 95% HPD |
| n1 | 26.8 | 25.32-29.74 | 26.82 | 24.99-30.12 | 32.88 | 28.75-37.26 | 33.28 | 28.99-37.9 |
| n2 | 19.6 | 18.37-21.89 | 19.51 | 17.53-22.16 | 23.44 | 20.61-26.24 | 23.1 | 20.25-26.01 |
| n3 | 17 | 15.21-19.12 | 16.95 | 15.11-18.32 | 20.28 | 18.38-21.57 | 20.12 | 18.07-21.57 |
| n4 | 8.13 | 6.89-9.31 | 8.33 | 7.09-9.58 | 10.01 | 8.27-11.8 | 9.98 | 8.2-11.79 |
| n5 | 7.37 | 5.92-8.36 | 7.83 | 6.17-8.79 | 8.96 | 7-10.46 | 9.14 | 6.97-10.52 |
| n6 | 4.52 | 3.48-5.62 | 4.64 | 3.52-5.83 | 5.75 | 4.36-7.25 | 5.72 | 4.26-7.26 |
| n7 | 4.42 | 3.5-5.38 | 4.27 | 3.4-5.26 | 5.34 | 4.12-6.62 | 4.93 | 3.77-6.17 |
| n8 | 3.16 | 2.41-3.94 | 3.05 | 2.3-3.34 | 3.85 | 2.89-4.39 | 3.54 | 2.62-4.56 |
| n9 | 2.2 | 1.54-2.88 | 2.13 | 1.42-2.86 | 2.71 | 1.9-3.58 | 2.5 | 1.63-3.38 |

**Table S2**. The independent BioGeoBEARS model test results for the six habitat reconstruction models with consideration of the “founder effect” parameter “J” on geographic regions, biome and topographic barriers datasets. The selected best model of each analysis with its criteria is shown in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Geographic |   | log | Number of |   | Parameters |   |   | AICc |
| region | Model | likelihood | parameters | d | e | j | AICc | weight |
|  | DEC | -25.05 | 2 | 0.026 | 0.057 | 0 | 57.1 | 3.60E-02 |
|  | DEC+J | -91.33 | 3 | 0.006 | 3.80E-09 | 0.0034 | 188.8 | 0.039 |
|  | DIVALIKE | -96.35 | 2 | 0.012 | 1.00E-12 | 0 | 196.8 | 0.0007 |
|  | **DIVALIKE + J** | **-88.13** | **3** | **0.007** | **1.00E-12** | **0.0034** | **182.4** | **0.96** |
|  | BAYAREALIKE | -120.8 | 2 | 0.012 | 0.12 | 0 | 245.7 | 1.70E-14 |
|   | BAYAREALIKE + J | -102.8 | 3 | 0.006 | 0.062 | 0.0039 | 211.8 | 3.90E-07 |
|  |   | log | Number of |   | Parameters |   |   | AICc |
| Biome | Model | likelihood | parameters | d | e | j | AICc | weight |
|  | DEC | -25.05 | 2 | 0.026 | 0.057 | 0 | 57.1 | 3.60E-02 |
|  | DEC+J | -91.33 | 3 | 0.006 | 3.80E-09 | 0.0034 | 188.8 | 0.039 |
|  | DIVALIKE | -96.35 | 2 | 0.012 | 1.00E-12 | 0 | 196.8 | 0.0007 |
|  | **DIVALIKE + J** | **-88.13** | **3** | **0.007** | **1.00E-12** | **0.0034** | **182.4** | **0.96** |
|  | BAYAREALIKE | -120.8 | 2 | 0.012 | 0.12 | 0 | 245.7 | 1.70E-14 |
|   | BAYAREALIKE + J | -102.8 | 3 | 0.006 | 0.062 | 0.0039 | 211.8 | 3.90E-07 |
| Topographic |   | log | Number of |   | Parameters |   |   | AICc |
| barrier | Model | likelihood | parameters | d | e | j | AICc | weight |
|  | DEC | -25.05 | 2 | 0.026 | 0.057 | 0 | 57.1 | 3.60E-02 |
|  | DEC+J | -91.33 | 3 | 0.006 | 3.80E-09 | 0.0034 | 188.8 | 0.039 |
|  | DIVALIKE | -96.35 | 2 | 0.012 | 1.00E-12 | 0 | 196.8 | 0.0007 |
|  | **DIVALIKE + J** | **-88.13** | **3** | **0.007** | **1.00E-12** | **0.0034** | **182.4** | **0.96** |
|  | BAYAREALIKE | -120.8 | 2 | 0.012 | 0.12 | 0 | 245.7 | 1.70E-14 |
|   | BAYAREALIKE + J | -102.8 | 3 | 0.006 | 0.062 | 0.0039 | 211.8 | 3.90E-07 |

**Table S3**. The ANOVA based LRT test results retrieved from the likelihood function models of different scenarios investigated under character dependency analyses BiSSE and MuSSE with different models of regions, biomes and the two sides of the Orange River. “Minimal”: the null model assumed all parameters are equal between different characters states; “all different”: the full parameter model considered lambda, mu and q as different between character states; “free.lambda”: the model considered lambda as different only between different character states, “free.mu”: the model considered only mu as different between different character states, “free.lambda.mu”: the model considered only lambda and mu as differ between different character states, “free.q”: the model considered only q as different between different character states. The best model with its criteria from the LRT test in each analysis is shown in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Object  | Model | df | ln Likelihood | AIC | Δ AIC | Chi-square | *p*-value  | AIC weight |
| Region (MuSSE) | Minimal | 3 | -199.57 | 405.15 | 50.87 | *NA* | *NA* | 8.77E-12 |
|   | all.different | **12** | **-165.14** | **354.28** | **0** | **68.87** | **\*\*\*** | **9.75E-01** |
|   | free.lambda | 5 | -178.66 | 367.31 | 13.03 | 41.835 | \*\*\* | 1.44E-03 |
|   | free.mu | 5 | -176.12 | 362.24 | 7.96 | 46.908 | \*\*\* | 1.82E-02 |
|   | free.lambda.mu | 7 | -175.44 | 364.87 | 10.59 | 48.275 | \*\*\* | 4.88E-03 |
|   | free.q | 8 | -195.15 | 406.29 | 52.01 | 8.856 | *NS* | 4.95E-12 |
| Biome (MuSSE) | Minimal | 3 | -279.86 | 565.72 | 82.67 | *NA* | *NA* | 1.12E-18 |
|   | all.different | **12** | **-229.52** | **483.05** | **0** | **100.674** | **\*\*\*** | **1.00E+00** |
|   | free.lambda | 5 | -267.19 | 544.38 | 61.33 | 25.345 | \*\*\* | 4.82E-14 |
|   | free.mu | 5 | -264.77 | 539.54 | 56.49 | 30.185 | \*\*\* | 5.42E-13 |
|   | free.lambda.mu | 7 | -247.74 | 509.47 | 26.42 | 64.25 | \*\*\* | 1.83E-06 |
|   | free.q | 8 | -243.14 | 502.28 | 19.23 | 73.439 | \*\*\* | 6.66E-05 |
| Orange River (BiSSE) | all.different | 6 | -157.26 | 326.51 | *NA* | *NA* | *NS* | *NA* |
|   | free.lambda | 5 | **-157.26** | **324.53** | *NA* | 0.018 | *NS* | *NA* |
|   | free.q | 5 | -168.64 | 347.28 | *NA* | 22.769 | \*\*\* | *NA* |
| Significance code:  | 0-0.001: '\*\*\*' |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0.001-0.01: '\*\*' |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 0.01-0.05: '\*' |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | > 0.05: '*NS*' |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | “NA”: Not applicable |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | df: degrees of freedom |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**Table S4**. The average test AUC criterion under the ROC curve and its standard deviation (SD) generated by ENM analyses for each group through the given timeline.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Group | **LIG** | **LGM** | **MIDH** | **Current** | **Future** |
|   | Test AUC | SD | Test AUC | SD | Test AUC | SD | Test AUC | SD | Test AUC | SD |
| **C1** | 0.961 | 0.017 | 0.954 | 0.022 | 0.955 | 0.011 | 0.955 | 0.02 | 0.96 | 0.011 |
| **C2** | 0.958 | 0.015 | 0.961 | 0.013 | 0.951 | 0.011 | 0.958 | 0.02 | 0.957 | 0.01 |
| **C3** | 0.99 | 0.014 | 0.994 | 0.004 | 0.99 | 0.004 | 0.991 | 0 | 0.992 | 0.005 |
| **C4** | 0.993 | 0.006 | 0.991 | 0.008 | 0.992 | 0.006 | 0.992 | 0.01 | 0.992 | 0.008 |
| **C5** | 0.992 | 0.015 | 0.967 | 0.053 | 0.994 | 0.005 | 0.995 | 0 | 0.996 | 0.005 |
| **C6** | 0.977 | 0.034 | 0.973 | 0.043 | 0.967 | 0.045 | 0.963 | 0.05 | 0.973 | 0.039 |
| **C7** | 1 | 0 | 0.999 | 0.001 | 1 | 0 | 0.995 | 0.01 | 1 | 0 |
| **entire complex** | 0.905 | 0.016 | 0.919 | 0.016 | 0.904 | 0.019 | 0.912 | 0.02 | 0.904 | 0.016 |

**Table S5**. The results of the optimization of parameters settings for all ENM analyses across groups and timelines. Features: Linear features (L), Quadratic features (Q), Product features (P) and Hinge features (H); RM = Regularization multiplier.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | **LIG** | **LGM** | **MIDH** | **Current** | **Future** |
|   | Features | RM | Features | RM | Features | RM | Features | RM | Features | RM |
| **C1** | LQ | 0.5 | LQ | 0.5 | LQ | 0.5 | LQH | 3 | LQH | 2.5 |
| **C2** | LQHP | 1.5 | LQHP | 2 | LQ | 0.5 | LQH | 2 | LQH | 1.5 |
| **C3** | LQH | 3 | LQ | 0.5 | LQ | 0.5 | LQ | 1 | LQ | 0.5 |
| **C4** | LQH | 2.5 | LQ | 2.5 | LQHP | 2.5 | LQHP | 1.5 | LQHP | 1.5 |
| **C5** | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 1 |
| **C6** | LQH | 3 | LQH | 1.5 | LQ | 0.5 | LQ | 0.5 | LQH | 2.5 |
| **C7** | LQHP | 0.5 | LQHP | 0.5 | LQHP | 0.5 | LQHP | 0.5 | LQHP | 0.5 |
| **All** | LQH | 2 | LQ | 0.5 | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 1 | LQHP | 2.5 |

**Table S6**. The pairwise results of niche difference analysis between clades (candidate species). The pairwise comparisons showing significant niche differences are in bold, whilst, comparisons without significant niche differences are underlined. Note: If the point estimated value (the matrix at the bottom-left) was lower than the 5% threshold value (the matrix at the top-right), then the niches were significantly different.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Taxon | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 |
| C1 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.59 | 0.70 | 0.64 |
| C2 | **0.78** | 1.00 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.72 |
| C3 | **0.39** | **0.19** | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.72 |
| C4 | **0.65** | **0.56** | **0.48** | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.72 |
| C5 | 0.67 | **0.38** | **0.55** | **0.67** | 1.00 | 0.66 | 0.87 |
| C6 | **0.44** | **0.55** | **0.09** | **0.25** | **0.20** | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| C7 | 0.81 | **0.55** | **0.45** | **0.65** | **0.66** | **0.21** | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table S7**. The ENM analyses estimating the area of suitable habitats of clades 1-7 and the entire *P. tentorius* species complex, as well as changes in the area of suitable habitats against the timeline (for details about the timeline see the Materials and Methods). The arrow " ↑ " represents increasing area, whilst, " ↓ " indicates decreasing area. Groups currently showing a decrease in the area of suitable habitats or future habitats are given in bold.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | **LIG** | **LGM** |  | **MIDH** |  | **Current** |  | **Future (km²)** |   |
| Clade 1 | 309455.59 | 367477.15 | **↑** | 322701.53 | ↓ | 361375.33 | ↑ | 216495.14 | **↓** |
| Change |   | 58021.57 |  | -44775.62 |   | 38673.81 |   | **-144880.20** |   |
| Clade 2 | 289803.82 | 297078.23 | ↑ | 305394.95 | ↑ | 297729.67 | **↓** | 271476.65 | **↓** |
| Change |   | 7274.41 |   | 8316.71 |   | **-7665.27** |   | **-26253.02** |   |
| Clade 3 | 69161.18 | 63819.38 | ↓ | 62386.21 | ↓ | 78498.49 | ↑ | 67380.58 | **↓** |
| Change |   | -5341.81 |   | -1433.17 |   | 16112.28 |   | **-11117.90** |   |
| Clade 4 | 76088.16 | 67597.73 | ↓ | 69769.20 | ↑ | 61105.05 | **↓** | 66555.43 | ↑ |
| Change |   | -8490.43 |   | 2171.47 |   | **-8664.15** |   | 5450.38 |   |
| Clade 5 | 98649.69 | 118410.03 | ↑ | 151894.03 | ↑ | 137584.07 | **↓** | 123404.40 | **↓** |
| Change |   | 19760.34 |   | 33484.00 |   | **-14309.96** |   | **-14179.67** |   |
| Clade 6 | 276036.73 | 229784.51 | ↓ | 226918.17 | ↓ | 263029.65 | ↑ | 235517.18 | **↓** |
| Change |   | -46252.22 |   | -2866.33 |   | 36111.48 |   | **-27512.47** |   |
| Clade 7 | 17241.44 | 13463.09 | ↓ | 8794.44 | ↓ | 72070.95 | ↑ | 80648.24 | ↑ |
| Change |   | -3778.35 |   | -4668.65 |   | 63276.51 |   | 8577.29 |   |
| All | 640734.41 | 614264.24 | ↓ | 572246.38 | ↓ | 522997.53 | **↓** | 553137.48 | ↑ |
| Change |   | -26470.17 |   | -42017.86 |   | **-49248.84** |   | 30139.94 |   |
|   |   |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**Table S8\***. The climatic variables that made significant impacts in each group across different period (All: including all individuals, C1-C7: Clade 1-7) from the ENM analyses.

**Table S9\***. List of all samples, their corresponding localities and NCBI GenBank accession numbers across different genes. All NCBI accessions of outgroups used in this study are given at the bottom.

**Table S10\***. List of primers used in the study with corresponding oligo sequences, optimized annealing temperatures and sources.

**Table S11**. Optimal partition scheme, substitution model, likelihood score (-InL), Gamma shape, proportion of estimated invariable sites for the mtDNA+nDNA based BEAST phylogenetic inference.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| Partition scheme | Model | -InL | Gamma shape | P-inv |
| *12S* | TIM3+I+G | 1733.56 | 0.661 | 0.397 |
| *16S* | TIM2+I+G | 2096.84 | 0.58 | 0.511 |
| *Cytb\_*1 | TPM2uf+I | 1090.84 | NA | 0.6 |
| *ND4\_*2*, Cytb\_*2 | TPM3uf+G | 648.6 | 0.1 | NA |
| *Cytb\_*3 | TVM+I+G | 2250.85 | 4.99 | 0.03 |
| *ND4\_*1 | TrN+G | 1254.58 | 0.306 | NA |
| *ND4\_*3 | TIM1+G | 2303.49 | 2.41 | NA |
| *tRNA* | TrN+G | 448.23 | 0.35 | NA |
| *PRLR\_*1 | TPM1uf+I | 338.38 | NA | 0.79 |
| *PRLR\_*2 | TrN+G | 379.73 | 0.45 | NA |
| *PRLR\_*3 | K80 | 438.53 | NA | NA |
| Note: " \* " - *p* < 0.05 |   |   |   |
|  " \*\* " - *p* < 0.01 |   |   |   |
|  " \*\*\* " indicate *p* < 0.0001 |   |   |   |
|  "NA"- Not applicable |   |   |   |

**Table S12\***. Allele size ranges, repeat motifs with their NCBI GenBank accession numbers, multiple-mix reaction grouping schemes, the oligo-nucleotide sequences of primers with dyes, optimal annealing temperatures and the sources of primers of all microsatellite DNA markers tested in this study. "NA" indicates the primer pair failed to amplify.

**Table S13\***. The genotyping results of 14 microsatellite DNA loci used in this study, together with locality and subpopulation information.

**Table S14**. Optimal partition scheme, substitution model, likelihood score (-InL), Gamma shap, and proportion of estimated invariant sites for the BEAST calibration dating analyses.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| Partition scheme | Model | -InL | Gamma shape | P-inv |
| *12S* | GTR+I+G | 1733.3 | 0.682 | 0.407 |
| *16S* | GTR+I+G | 2078.7 | 0.598 | 0.513 |
| *Cytb\_*1 | TVM+I+G | 1111.64 | 0.677 | 0.589 |
| *Cytb\_2，ND4\_2*  | GTR+I+G | 650.18 | 0.461 | 0.462 |
| *Cytb\_*3 | GTR+I+G | 2257.6 | 5.368 | 0.044 |
| *ND4\_*1 | TrN+G | 1244.97 | 0.309 | NA |
| *ND4\_*3 | TIM1+G | 2327.01 | 2.193 | NA |
| *tRNA* | TrN+G | 447.4 | 0.41 | NA |
| *PRLR\_*1 | HKY+I | 318.72 | NA | 0.496 |
| *PRLR\_*2 | TrN | 361.84 | NA | NA |
| *PRLR\_*3 | HKY+I+G | 427.63 | 1.63 | 0.288 |
| Note: " \* " - *p* < 0.05 |   |   |   |
|  " \*\* " - *p* < 0.01 |   |   |   |
|  " \*\*\* " indicate *p* < 0.0001 |   |   |   |
|  "NA"- Not applicable  |   |   |   |

**Table S15**. The constraint of the five most recent common ancestors used in the BEAST calibration dating analyses for the mtDNA and mtDNA+nDNA datasets.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   |   |
| MRCA  | Node position | mtDNA (Ma) | mtDNA+nDNA (Ma) |
| 1 | *P. oculifer*+*P. geometricus* | 16.89 | 16.89 - 21.57 |
| 2 | *Stigmochelys*+*Psammobates* | 26.63 | 26.63 - 39.72 |
| 3 | *Chersina*+*Chersobius* | 19.68 | 19.68 - 29.51 |
| 4 | *Homopus*+(*Chersina*+*Chersobius*) | 28.64 | 28.64-42.20 |
| 5 | *Astrochelys*+*Pyxis* | 26.44 | 26.44 - 36.29 |

**Table S16\***. The bioclimatic variables and their percentage contribution, permutation importance and jack-knife test AUC’s used in the ENM to determine suitable habitat ranges of the *P. tentorius* species complex. Variables with AUC above 0.75 were considered as potentially useful (given in bold).

**Table S17\***. The correlation matrix retrieved from the correlation test between each pair of bioclimatic variables. The R-square values varied from zero to one, with "zero" representing no correlation and "one" representing 100% correlation. The bioclimatic variables (in bold) are the ones used in further niche modelling analyses after trimming variables showing strong correlation. The pairwise values (R-square) > 70 or < -70 were considered as strong correlations. All pairwise R-square values showing a strong correlation between bioclimatic variables are underlined.

**2. Figures**



**Figure S1**. The species tree chronograms generated from the BEAST calibration dating analyses, A: mtDNA chronogram, B: mtDNA+nDNA chronogram. The red dots were the five constrained calibration points for calibration dating analyses.



**Figure S2**. The macroevolution cohort matrix for the seven clades of the *P. tentorius* species complex. BAMM Bayesian diversification rate analysis based on the mean phylorate plot trees, are shown at the top and on the left side of the cohort matrix, for purposes of comparison. The matrix shows pairwise probabilities of two groups sharing the same evolutionary dynamics. The “warm” colours represent high cohort similarities (highest value “1” refers to 100% similarity), whilst, the “cool” colours represent low cohort similarities (lowest value “0” refers to 0% similarity).