Supplementary material

A chloroplast phylogeny of *Zieria* (Rutaceae) in Australia and New Caledonia shows widespread incongruence with species-level taxonomy

Rosemary A. Barrett^A, Michael J. Bayly^{A,E}, Marco F. Duretto^B, Paul I. Forster^C, Pauline Y. Ladiges^A and David J. Cantrill^D

^ASchool of Botany, The University of Melbourne, Vic. 3010, Australia.

^BNational Herbarium of New South Wales, Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust, Mrs Macquaries Road, Sydney, NSW 2000, Australia.

^CQueensland Herbarium, Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts, Brisbane Botanic Gardens, Toowong, Qld 4066, Australia.

^DRoyal Botanic Gardens Melbourne, Birdwood Avenue, South Yarra, Vic. 3141, Australia.

^ECorresponding author. Email: mbayly@unimelb.edu.au



Fig. S1. Phylogeny of *Zieria* based on analysis of morphological and chemical characters by Armstrong (2002). Species within groups labelled 'littoralis gr.', for example, were not defined by Armstrong.



Fig. S2. Bayesian majorityrule consensus tree produced analysis of combined by cpDNA markers (as in Fig. 2), showing taxa colour coded according the to groups defined in the phylogeny of Armstrong (2002). Colours of groups follow those indicated on Fig. S1. Taxa shown in grey were not included in Armstrong's (2002) analysis. Bayesian inference (BI) posterior probabilities (PP) are shown above the branches and maximum parsimony bootstrap support (BS) values are shown below the branches.

References

Armstrong JA (2002) Zieria (Rutaceae): a systematic and evolutionary study. Australian Systematic Botany 15, 277–463. doi:10.1071/SB00040