



**HAL**  
open science

## An integrative approach to species delimitation in **Benthomangelia (Mollusca: Conoidea)**

Nicolas Puillandre, Michel Baylac, Marie-Catherine Boisselier, Corinne  
Cruaud, Sarah Samadi

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Puillandre, Michel Baylac, Marie-Catherine Boisselier, Corinne Cruaud, Sarah Samadi. An integrative approach to species delimitation in *Benthomangelia* (Mollusca: Conoidea). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2009, 96 (3), pp.696-708. 10.1111/j.1095-8312.2008.01143.x . hal-02458057

**HAL Id: hal-02458057**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02458057v1>**

Submitted on 28 Jan 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**An integrative approach to species delimitation in *Benthomangelia*  
(Mollusca: Conoidea)**

Journal:	<i>Biological Journal of the Linnean Society</i>
Manuscript ID:	BJLS-0618.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Puillandre, Nicolas; MNHN, Systematique & Evolution Baylac, Michel; MNHN, UMR 5202 Boisselier, Marie-Catherine; MNHN, UMR 7138 cruaud, corinne; Genoscope samadi, sarah; IRD, MNHN, Dept Syst & Evol
Keywords:	28S rRNA, COI gene, <i>Benthomangelia</i> , DNA taxonomy , Elliptic Fourier Analysis , Integrative taxonomy , Molluscs



1  
2  
3 **An integrative approach to species delimitation in *Benthomangelia***  
4  
5  
6 **(Mollusca: Conoidea)**  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 N. Puillandre<sup>1,\*</sup>, M. Baylac<sup>2</sup>, M.-C. Boisselier<sup>1</sup>, C. Cruaud<sup>3</sup>, S. Samadi<sup>1</sup>  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 <sup>1</sup> Université Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC), UMR 7138, Systématique, adaptation, évolution  
17 (UPMC/IRD/MNHN/CNRS), Paris, France.  
18

19  
20 <sup>2</sup> Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle (MNHN), USM 0601 Origine, structure et évolution  
21 de la biodiversité, Paris, France  
22

23  
24  
25 <sup>3</sup> GENOSCOPE, Centre National de Séquençage, Evry, France  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 \* Corresponding author: UMR 7138, Systématique, adaptation, évolution, UPMC; IRD;  
31 MNHN; CNRS, Service de systématique moléculaire (CNRS, IFR 101), Département  
32 systématique et évolution, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CP26, 57 rue Cuvier,  
33 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France.; [puillandre@mnhn.fr](mailto:puillandre@mnhn.fr); +33 1 40 79 37 43  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 **Running title:**  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Integrative taxonomy in *Benthomangelia*  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

DNA sequences are currently used to propose primary hypotheses of species delimitation, especially when morphological variability is difficult to assess. In an integrative taxonomy framework, these hypotheses are then compared with other characters, such as morphology or geography, to produce robust species delimitations. For this purpose, the COI gene has been sequenced for almost 50 specimens of the genus *Benthomangelia*, a deep-sea marine gastropod genus, collected in the South-West Pacific. Five genetic groups, displaying low and high genetic distances respectively within and between groups, were defined. COI hypotheses were compared to both the results obtained with the independent nuclear 28S gene and to an Elliptic Fourier Analysis of the shape of the last whorl of the shell. 28S gene analysis confirmed the same well-supported groups as COI, and Elliptic Fourier Analysis identified several morphological characters that vary similarly to genetic variability.

## Keywords

28S rRNA - COI gene – *Benthomangelia* – DNA taxonomy – Elliptic Fourier Analysis - Integrative taxonomy – Molluscs.

## Introduction

Given the sizeable number of species that remains to be described, especially in the context of a rapidly increasing rate of species extinctions, we urgently need to rethink the work of alpha-taxonomy to improve the rate of species description. In marine environments, the amount of unknown diversity is important, especially for molluscs (Bouchet *et al.*, 2002). Among marine molluscs, the Conoidea are one of the most diverse taxa (Bouchet, 1990; Taylor, Kantor & Sysoev, 1993), and it includes a significant portion of undescribed species. Moreover, most of the described taxa from shallow water and deeper ecosystems remain largely underexplored. The difficulty of sampling in such environment and the lack of specialists for most of these groups explain this taxonomic impediment (Boyle *et al.*, 2004;).

Until recently most species descriptions of shelled molluscs were based exclusively on shell characters, leading to brief diagnoses that in some cases apply to more than one taxon. Furthermore, shell variability is difficult to characterize with discrete characters (Pfenninger, Cordellier & Streit, 2006), and consequently the analysis of such characters, as done traditionally, is difficult to reproduce. Finally, the broad plasticity of shell characters for some well known species was demonstrated (Hollander *et al.*, 2006; Brookes & Rochette, 2007), but this problem is rarely integrated in mollusc taxonomy. For all these reasons, taxonomists may differ in how they interpret variability of shell characters: what one specialist interprets as geographical or bathymetrical variation can be interpreted by another as specific differences. As a consequence, quite contradictory opinions about species delimitations in literature are not rare (e.g. Röckel, Rolan & Monteiro (1980) vs Monteiro, Tenorio & Poppe (2004) [Cape Verde *Conus*]).

The difficulty of confronting different opinions is also increased by the lack of a solid theoretical and methodological framework, *de facto* rendering many taxonomical opinions untestable hypotheses. Recently, concepts and methods underlying the delimitation of

1  
2  
3 terminal taxa were clarified, advocating for the use of an integrative framework. De Queiroz  
4 (1998), followed by Samadi & Barberousse (2006), first suggested that a unified view of  
5  
6 “what is a species” is possible if species are considered as definitively diverging lineages and  
7  
8 most of the other so-called “species concepts” as criteria for delimiting species (Sites &  
9  
10 Marshall, 2003). In this context, molecular characters are classically used to propose primary  
11  
12 hypotheses of species delimitation based on genetic distances (Floyd *et al.*, 2002; Vogler &  
13  
14 Monaghan, 2007). Contrary to the morphological characters used in most mollusc species  
15  
16 description, molecular characters are strictly heritable and reproducible. Within an integrative  
17  
18 framework (De Queiroz, 2007) these primary molecular hypotheses can then be tested against  
19  
20 several criteria, namely: (i) monophyly of primary species hypotheses (Wheeler & Meier,  
21  
22 2000; Meyer & Paulay, 2005), (ii) independent genetic markers, such as a nuclear gene, as  
23  
24 gene trees do not necessarily reflect the species tree (Nichols, 2001; Funk & Omland, 2003),  
25  
26 and (iii) morphological analysis to discuss species delimitations based on genetic data  
27  
28 (Bichain *et al.*, 2007; Pfenninger *et al.*, 2006).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In this integrative context, we aim to combine several criteria to propose new hypotheses of  
37  
38 species delimitations in the genus *Benthomangelia* (Conoidea, Conidae). This is a widely  
39  
40 distributed genus of bathyal and abyssal marine molluscs (Bouchet & Warén, 1980). It was  
41  
42 described by Thiele (1925), grouping together species previously placed in other genera.  
43  
44 Since 1925, new species have been described, based on morphological characters such as  
45  
46 ornamentations and shape of the shell (Bouchet & Warén, 1980; Sysoev & Ivanov, 1985;  
47  
48 Sysoev, 1988). Ten species are now considered as valid (Tucker 2004), of which six are  
49  
50 present in the Pacific. Several potential new forms have been recently collected during cruises  
51  
52 organized by the Museum National d’Histoire Naturelle (MNHN) and the Institut de  
53  
54 Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), but the great and sometimes continuous  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 morphological variability complicate the delimitation of species based solely on these  
4 characters (Bouchet & Sysoev, 2001).  
5  
6

7  
8 We demonstrate the delimitation of genetic groups within the genus *Benthomangelia*, using  
9  
10 molecular characters and a tree-based method. Two independent genes are used, one  
11  
12 mitochondrial (COI) and one nuclear (28S) gene. An Elliptic Fourier Analysis (EFA; Rohlf,  
13  
14 1996) of the shape of the last whorl of the shell is also performed, allowing detailed analysis  
15  
16 of complex structures as a whole (Monti, Baylac & Lalanne-Cassou, 2001). Contrary to shell  
17  
18 characters used in most molluscan species descriptions, EFA has the advantage to be  
19  
20 formalized and thus reproducible. EFA analysis complements the DNA-based species  
21  
22 delimitation, as morphological characters are indispensable for the delimitation of species in  
23  
24 an integrative framework. Indeed, the genetically defined groups can be described  
25  
26 morphologically, on the basis of shell characters linked to interspecific genetic variation, as  
27  
28 opposed to the morphological variability linked to geographical or ecological factors.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 35 36 **Material & Methods**

### 37 38 Sampling

39  
40 Specimens of *Benthomangelia* were collected between 2004 and 2007 during several deep-sea  
41  
42 cruises conducted by the MNHN and the IRD in Philippines, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands  
43  
44 (Table 1, Figure 1). Living specimens were anesthetized in MgCl<sub>2</sub> and fixed in 95 % ethanol.  
45  
46 Shells were kept intact, so the same individuals were used for both molecular and  
47  
48 morphological analyses.  
49  
50

### 51 52 Sequencing

53  
54 DNA was extracted from a piece of foot, using 6100 Nucleic Acid Prepstation system  
55  
56 (Applied Biosystem). Two gene fragments were amplified: (i) a fragment of 658 bp of  
57  
58 Cytochrome Oxydase I (COI) mitochondrial gene using universal primers LCO1490 and  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 HCO2198 (Folmer *et al.*, 1994) and (ii) a fragment of 900 bp of the rDNA 28S gene, using  
4 the primers C1 and D3 (Jovelin & Justine, 2001). All PCR reactions were performed in 25  $\mu$ l,  
5 containing 3 ng of DNA, 1X reaction buffer, 2.5 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.26 mM dNTP, 0.3  $\mu$ M of each  
6 primer, 5% DMSO and 1.5 units of Q-Bio Taq (MPBiomedicals) for all genes. COI gene  
7 amplifications were performed according to Hebert *et al.* (2003); for 28S gene, they consisted  
8 in an initial denaturation step at 94°C for 4', followed by 30 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for  
9 30'', annealing at 52°C and extension at 72°C for 1'. The final extension was at 72°C for 10'.  
10 PCR products were purified and sequenced by the Genoscope (genbank accession numbers  
11 EU015528, EU015628, EU015644, EU015743 and EU428956-EU429039). In all cases, both  
12 directions were sequenced to confirm accuracy of each haplotype sequence.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 A specimen of the sister group of *Benthomangelia* (Puillandre *et al.*, in press), the genus  
21 *Toxicochlespira* (17925, genbank accession number: EU015738 and EU015623 for COI and  
22 28S gene respectively) and two other Conoidea (specimens 17866, *Mangelia*, EU015688 and  
23 EU015573 and 17754, *Turris*, EU015677 and EU015562) are used as outgroup. Outgroups  
24 were chosen to form a non-monophyletic group, as recommended by Darlu and Tassy (1993).

### 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 Genetic analysis

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
COI and 28S sequences were manually aligned, as no ambiguous indels were found. Standard  
molecular diversity indices were calculated using Arlequin 3.1 (Excoffier, Laval & Schneider  
2005).

### *Genotypic clustering*

Genetic pairwise distances (excluding outgroups) for each gene separately were calculated  
with PAUP 4.0b10 (Swofford, 2002), using the best fitting model of nucleotide substitution  
for each gene as defined by the program Modeltest (Posada & Crandall, 2001), in conjunction  
with PAUP 4.0b10, following the Akaike information criterion (AIC). These distances are



1  
2  
3 visualized on a NJ tree calculated using PAUP 4.0b10 to define groups of specimens with low  
4 genetic distances within groups and high distances between groups.  
5  
6

#### 7 *Phylogenetic analyses*

8  
9  
10 Phylogenetic reconstruction were conducted using Bayesian Analysis (BA), consisting of two  
11 Markov chains (2000000 generations each with a sampling frequency of one tree each  
12 hundred generations) run in four parallel analyses using Mr. Bayes (Huelsenbeck, Ronquist &  
13 Hall, 2001). When the log-likelihood scores were found to stabilize, a consensus tree was  
14 calculated after omitting the first 25% trees as burn-in. Only the number of nucleotide  
15 substitutions categories was fixed for BA. Phylogenetic analyses were performed on the  
16 cluster housed at the MNHN (17 nodes, 2 Go Ram per node, 30 AMDs 64 bits CPU's for the  
17 slave nodes and 4 Xeon 32 bits CPU's for the two master nodes)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 *Gene flow estimation*

29  
30  
31 Within each group of specimens defined by genotypic clustering and phylogenetic analyses,  
32 population structure was estimated between groups of specimens collected in different  
33 geographic region. Arlequin 3.1 was used to perform AMOVA (with a 10000 permutations  
34 test) for each pair of populations.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 Fourier analysis

41  
42 Morphometric analyses were performed on the same 46 shells used for the molecular analysis.  
43  
44 The shape of the last whorl has been previously considered informative in the alpha-taxonomy  
45 of *Benthomangelia* (Bouchet & Warén, 1980). In order to test the consistency of this  
46 hypothesis with the results obtained with the genetic data, the morphometric analysis  
47 considered only this part of the shell. Shells were placed horizontally, aperture up, and  
48 digitized using a macro stand. To evaluate the potential positioning error, each shell was  
49 digitized twice. The same error was also estimated by digitizing three shells (chosen as three  
50 very similar ones) five times each (Position Test Dataset, PTD). As the labrum of some shells  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 was broken, the lateral orientation of the shell could variate from one shell to another. To  
4 estimate potential error due to this problem of parallax, three shells were digitized five times,  
5  
6 turning the shell around the columellar axis between each picture but keeping the columellar  
7  
8 axis parallel to the support (Orientation Test Dataset, OTD).  
9  
10

11  
12 Six homologous landmarks (Bookstein 1991) were defined in the last whorl of the shell,  
13 corresponding to the junction with the previous whorl (landmarks 2 and 3) and the aperture  
14 (landmark 5) and to the apex of the peripheral chord (landmarks 1, 4 and 6; Figure 2). As  
15 these six points covered only the upper part of the whorl, we also defined a seventh point  
16 located at the apex of the siphonal canal. The position of this point could be problematic for  
17 some shells, as the extremity of the canal can be broken, but the aim was to cover the whole  
18 outline. The seven landmarks and the outlines were digitized using TpsDig (Rohlf, 1996). We  
19 always used the first landmark as starting point. As the labrum of some shells was broken,  
20 two outlines were defined: the first corresponds to the whole last whorl (outline 1) and the  
21 second corresponds to the whole last whorl except the labrum by joining the extremity of the  
22 siphonal canal to the upper part of the aperture following the columellar lip (outline 2, Figure  
23 2). These two outlines were analysed for the 46 shells photographed twice (complete dataset =  
24 92 pictures) and for the PTD and OTD. All pictures and outlines were taken by the same  
25 person (NP).  
26  
27

28  
29 Outlines were used as input for an EFA (Baylac & Friess, 2005). The seven landmarks were  
30 used as control points to rotate the outlines into the same orientation. For the analysis of the  
31 outline 2, the sixth landmark, placed on the labrum of the shell, was removed (Figure 2B).  
32  
33 The images were then centred and normalised for size (using square roots of the surface). A  
34 visualization of Fourier reconstructions using different numbers of harmonics, compared to  
35 the original outline, shows that 40 harmonics are sufficient to reconstruct the outlines with  
36 high accuracy (Figure 2).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The variates resulting from the EFA and used in the subsequent analyses correspond to the  
4 different Fourier coefficients, as described in Rohlf 1996. PTD and OTD were studied using  
5 Principal Components Analysis (PCA) for both outlines 1 and 2. In order to eliminate  
6 potential error due to the positioning of the shell, the mean of each pair of Fourier outlines  
7 corresponding to the two replicates of each specimen was used for the complete dataset,  
8 resulting in the study of 46 outlines. As few specimens were used, an exploratory analysis was  
9 first performed for the complete dataset using PCA in order to evaluate the level of variability  
10 within and among the groups then tested with Canonical Variate Analysis (CVA). For CVA  
11 analysis, variability was maximised following two different grouping variables: the genetic  
12 groups as defined by the molecular analysis and the cruise of collection (Table 1).  
13 Visualizations of the outline deformations along the canonical axes were made using the  
14 procedure described in Monti *et al.* (2001). Multivariate regression parameters of Fourier  
15 coefficients were calculated using the depth of collection of each specimen as the independent  
16 grouping variable (the depth of collection is calculated as the mean between the depth at the  
17 beginning of the trawl and the depth at the end of the trawl, see table 1). Effect of the size of  
18 the last whorl on shape was also estimated, plotting the shape of the shell (measured as the  
19 projection on each axis of the CVA of the Fourier coordinates) as a function of the size of the  
20 specimens. All analyses were performed using specially devised MATLABv5.2 functions  
21 implemented by MB.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **Results**

### 51 Molecular analysis

52  
53 Forty-four specimens were sequenced for COI, resulting in a 658 bp fragment. No indels were  
54 found. Forty-four specimens were sequenced for 28S (42 in common with COI, table 1),  
55 resulting in a 908 bp fragments after the alignment. The Kimura-3-parameter model  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (K81uf+I+G, with  $I = 0.4654$  and  $G = 0.5381$ ) model for the COI gene and the Tamura-Nei  
4  
5 model (TrN+I+G, with  $I = 0.6746$  and  $G = 0.6616$ ) model for the 28S gene were defined as  
6  
7  
8 the best fitting models.

### 9 10 *Genetic clustering*

11  
12 For the COI gene, 25 different haplotypes were found among the 44 specimens, displaying  
13  
14 186 polymorphic loci, and a high haplotypic diversity (0.948). The distribution of pairwise  
15  
16 genetic distances for the COI gene is clearly bimodal (Figure 3). Indeed, the genetic distance  
17  
18 between two specimens is either lower than 2.5% or higher than 7.5%. These two categories  
19  
20 of distances are visualized in the NJ tree (not shown) as five long branches at the end of  
21  
22 which from 1 to 28 genetically similar specimens are clustered. For the clarity of the  
23  
24 discussion, we will refer to these branches as “groups” numbered from 1 to 5 (Table 1),  
25  
26 although one includes only one specimen (17981). Specimens are from Panglao 05, BOA 1  
27  
28 and Salomon 2 for group 1, Aurora 07 and BOA 1 for group 2, Salomon 2 for group 3,  
29  
30 Panglao 05 and Santo 06 for group 4 and Salomon 2 for group 5.

31  
32 Results obtained with the 28S are congruent with those obtained with COI gene. Overall  
33  
34 variability for the 28S gene is less than for the COI gene, with only 5 different haplotypes  
35  
36 among the 44 specimens, 36 polymorphic loci and a haplotypic diversity of 0.584. This low  
37  
38 level of variability does not allow the recognition of a gap between short and large genetic  
39  
40 distances, but specimens displaying short distances with the COI gene possess exactly the  
41  
42 same 28S sequence. This complete congruency between both genes is also visualized in the  
43  
44 figure S1 (supplementary material). Indeed, the same five groups are recognized in the 28S  
45  
46 and COI trees.

### 47 48 *Phylogenetic analysis*

49  
50 The four genetic groups containing several specimens are found monophyletic with the BA  
51  
52 for the COI gene, although the monophyly of one group is not supported (posterior  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 probabilities >0.99 for groups 1, 4 and 5, posterior probabilities = 0.91 for group 1; results not  
4 shown). Since no incongruence is found between the two genes, a dataset combining the two  
5 genes for 42 specimens is created. Here, the data were separated into two different unlinked  
6 partitions corresponding to the two analyzed genes, each following the best fitting model of  
7 substitution estimated for each gene. The four groups are in this case found highly supported,  
8 but the relationships among the five groups are not confidently resolved (posterior  
9 probabilities < 0.95; Figure 4).

#### 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 *Gene flow estimation*

22 It was possible to estimate gene flows only for group 1 because it was the only one that  
23 sampled several specimens from each of the different geographic regions. Population  
24 structure was evaluated only with the COI gene since the 28S gene did not vary within  
25 groups. Three populations were defined: the first including five specimens from BOA 1  
26 (Vanuatu), the second 13 specimens from Panglao 05 (Philippines) and the last 10 specimens  
27 from Salomon 2 (Solomon Islands). The pairwise populations comparisons ( $F_{st}$ ) among the  
28 three populations are 0.066 (p-value = 0.106) between BOA 1 and Salomon 2, 0.321 (p-value  
29 = 0.014) between BOA 1 and Panglao 05 and 0.239 (p-value = 0.003) between Salomon 2 and  
30 Panglao 05.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

#### 43 Fourier analysis

44  
45  
46 Analyses of potential error linked to positioning (PTD) or orientation (OTD) both show that  
47 variability between the replicates of the same shell is always less than the variability between  
48 different shells, as revealed by the PCA, except for the PTD with outline 1 (results not  
49 shown).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 For both outlines 1 and 2, the PCA revealed high variability within and between genetic  
56 groups, allowing separation of two groups (genetic groups 1 and 3 vs genetic groups 2, 4 and  
57  
58  
59  
60

5; supplementary material, Figure S2A). The groups of specimens that correspond to different cruises of collection are not separated (Figure S2B).

The variable “genetic groups” is significantly discriminant using CVA ( $F$  test associated to the Wilk’s lambda = 2.65,  $df = 80$ ,  $p < 10^{-4}$  and  $F = 2.90$ ,  $df = 80$ ,  $p < 10^{-4}$  for outline 1 and 2 respectively). Axes 1 and 2 represent together 91.13% of the variance for outline 1 (Figure 5A) and 86.19% for outline 2 (Figure 5C). They allow the separation of the five genetic groups, except the groups 4 and 5 for outline 2. The variable “cruise of collection” is also significantly discriminant ( $F = 3.27$ ,  $df = 80$ ,  $p < 10^{-4}$  and  $F = 2.27$ ,  $df = 80$ ,  $p < 10^{-4}$  for outline 1 and 2 respectively). Axes 1 and 2 represent together 83.2% of the variance for outline 1 (Figure 5B) and 80.84% for outline 2 (Figure 5D). However, contrary to the results obtained with the genetic groups, specimens from Panglao 05, Salomon 2 and BOA 1 are not completely discriminated.

The first axis shows up an opposition between short and large shells on one hand and more elongated and thin shells on the other hand for both CVA analyses (using “genetic groups” or “cruise of collection” as variables). This can be due to the strong relationships between these two variables (Chi<sup>2</sup> test:  $p < 10^{-4}$ ). On the second axis, genetic groups are separated by the length of the siphonal canal (Figure 5A and C), and specimens from different cruises of collection are separated by the shape of the curvature at the beginning of the siphonal canal (Figure 5B and D), more marked for some specimens collected during Panglao 05.

The following axes do not allow a better separation of the specimens from different cruises. The same patterns are conserved if the unique specimen of the group 5 is removed (CVA using “genetic groups” as variables), if the unique specimen of the cruise Santo 06 is removed (CVA using “cruise of collection” as variables) or if only the groups with the most specimens are considered (genetic groups 1 and 2; CVA using “genetic groups” as variables).

1  
2  
3 Multivariate regressions using the depth of collection as the independent grouping variable  
4  
5 are not significant, whatever the number of axes used:  $\alpha = 0.86, 0.65, 0.50$  and  $0.79$  for  
6  
7 outline 1 and  $\alpha = 0.77, 0.85, 0.63$  and  $0.62$  for outline 2, for 3, 5, 10 and 20 components  
8  
9 respectively.  
10  
11

12 To avoid problems due to the correlation of the different variables, and to estimate the level of  
13  
14 morphological variability between different cruises of collection within a genetic group, CVA  
15  
16 was performed within the one genetic cluster with multiple samples from multiple localities  
17  
18 (group 1: 6 specimens from BOA 1, 13 from Panglao 05 and 10 from Salomon 2) to test for  
19  
20 geographic signal within group. The three different cruises are clearly separated on the two  
21  
22 first axes, for both outline 1 and 2 (results shown only for outline 1, Figure 6). The first axis  
23  
24 represents more than 87% of the variability and distinguishes Panglao 05 specimens from  
25  
26 Salomon 2 and BOA 1 specimens, based again on the shape of the curvature at the beginning  
27  
28 of the siphonal canal, as found with CVA including the complete dataset.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Multivariate regression using the depth of collection was also performed for the genetic  
35  
36 groups 1 and 2: no significant correlation is found (group 1, outline 2:  $F = 0.505, p = 0.770$ ;  
37  
38 group 2, outline 1:  $F = 1.281, p = 0.396$ ; group 2, outline 2:  $F = 0.898, p = 0.0546$ ), except  
39  
40 for the group 1 with the outline 1 ( $F = 6.53, p < 10^{-4}$ ). However, when removing one of the  
41  
42 specimen (17987), whose labrum is broken, test is not significant anymore ( $F = 1.018, p =$   
43  
44  $0.1879$ ).  
45  
46  
47

48 Finally, a potential effect of size on the shape of the last whorl between genetic groups or  
49  
50 cruises of collection was tested: no significant correlation were found, as the entire range of  
51  
52 size is found in each numerous groups (genetic groups 1 and 2 and cruise of collection  
53  
54 Panglao 05, BOA 1, Aurora 07 and Salomon 2). Results are shown only for the genetic  
55  
56 groups, using the first axis of the CVA (supplementary material, Figure S3).  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion

### Species delimitation based on genetic data

The number of specimens included in the molecular analysis performed with COI and 28S genes allows for the detection of five genotypic groups, four of which are represented by several specimens. Since there is a strict congruency between the two unlinked genes, our groups are not only clusters of haplotypes but real genotypic clusters (Mallet, 2001; Sites & Marshall, 2004). Phylogenetic analyses also suggest that the groups defined with the genotypic clustering criterion are monophyletic, thus each displaying an independent event of coalescence for two independent genes (COI and 28S), suggesting the absence of genetic exchange between the groups (Ferguson, 2002). Moreover, as three of the five groups include specimens from different geographic regions (e.g. Philippines and Vanuatu), the genetic groups do not reflect a geographic structure among distant populations. The expected dispersal capacity of the larvae of *Benthomangelia* supports the observed genotypic clustering as members of this genus have a planktotrophic protoconch (between 2.5 and 3 whorls), indicating that the larvae can stay in the water column for a long period and can potentially disperse long distances (Shuto, 1974).

Thus, on the basis of our results, five lineages can be recognized, and we propose these lineages as primary hypotheses of species delimitation in *Benthomangelia*. The first species (group 1) is identified as *B. trophonoidea*, and the four other species does not correspond to any of the nine other described species of *Benthomangelia*, and could thus constitute new species (A. Sysoev, pers. com.).

However, recent species are not necessarily characterized by high genetic distances between species or by reciprocal monophyly (Hickerson, Meyer & Moritz, 2006; Knowles & Carstens 2007). Consequently we cannot exclude that the moderate genetic structure within group 1, especially between the Philippines (Panglao 05 cruise) and the two others archipelagos



1  
2  
3 (Solomon Islands and Vanuatu), is due to the presence of several species. This structure can  
4  
5 also be interpreted as intraspecific genetic structure linked to geographic differentiation, as  
6  
7  
8 Philippines and Solomon islands are separated by more than 4000 km, and Philippines and  
9  
10 Vanuatu by more than 5000 km. Similarly, weak but non-negligible genetic structure is found  
11  
12 between Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, separated by only 1200 km.

13  
14  
15 The only group present in three different geographic regions is also the group with the most  
16  
17 specimens. Consequently, the apparently limited geographic distribution of some species,  
18  
19 illustrated by the strong correlation between the two variables “genetic groups” and “cruise of  
20  
21 collection”, can only be an artifact due to undersampling of some species. Furthermore, it is  
22  
23 important to note that our data set does not cover the whole genus since the whole Pacific is  
24  
25 not sampled and putative distinct species of *Benthomangelia* from the Atlantic are not  
26  
27 represented (Bouchet & Warén, 1980).  
28  
29  
30

### 31 Comparison with morphological results

32  
33  
34 While the heritability of morphologic characters is difficult to document, the use of objective  
35  
36 and repeatable morphometric analysis allows retrieving the five genetic groups. A large part  
37  
38 of the morphological variability of the last whorl of the shell gives valuable characters to  
39  
40 delimit species. Specimens from genetic group 1 are characterized by a more elongated shell  
41  
42 and a long canal, those from group 2 also by a long canal, but a relatively short last whorl, and  
43  
44 those from group 4 by a short shell and a short canal. Outline 2 does not distinguish genetic  
45  
46 group 4 and 5, suggesting that the labrum could also be a valuable character to delimit species  
47  
48 (Kohn, pers. com.).  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 However, the morphometric analysis also revealed that a part of the variability of the shape of  
54  
55 the shell imparts the separation of specimens collected during different cruises within group 1.  
56  
57 Thus, specimens of group 1 collected during Panglao 05 are characterized by a more vaulted  
58  
59 siphonal canal, in opposition to the specimens collected during Salomon 2 and BOA 1. The  
60

1  
2  
3 morphologic differentiations between geographic groups within group 1 can be either  
4 associated to the genetic structure found between the same groups or to a morphologic  
5 plasticity of the shell in response to different environment conditions encountered in the  
6 different archipelagos. The potential combination of genetic and environmental effects on the  
7 shape of the shells constitutes one of the reasons why it is difficult to use solely the  
8 morphological characters in such a problematic groups.  
9

#### 10 On the use of shell characters to delimit species

11 Shell characters are known to be highly plastic, and several studies clearly identify characters  
12 that vary according to environmental factors: shells can be thicker (Brookes & Rochette,  
13 2007) and shape can be modified in response to the presence of predators (Palmer, 1990), to  
14 flow velocity (Baker *et al.*, 2004) or biochemical conditions (Chiu *et al.*, 2002), and  
15 ornamentation of the shell can vary along with the environment (Yeap, Black & Johnson,  
16 2001). The analysis of several character sets, such as DNA and morphology, is needed to  
17 avoid the use of characters that reflects environmental differences rather than taxonomic  
18 differences (Kantor *et al.*, unpublished data; Samadi *et al.*, 2000; Bichain *et al.*, 2007). For  
19 example, in the pulmonate genus *Radix*, shell characters are correlated with environmental  
20 factors, and do not differ constantly among the species defined with DNA (Pfenninger *et al.*,  
21 2006). These authors suggest that erroneous species delimitations based on unsuitable  
22 morphological characters are likely to be widespread in molluscs with species description  
23 based solely on shell characters. Without a test of morphological characters using an  
24 integrative approach, taxonomists risk defining species based on non-genetically determined  
25 characters (Godfray, 2007). Mating trials are useful to test for species boundaries (Ribi &  
26 Porter, 1995; Pickles & Grahame 1999), but such tests are difficult with deep-sea groups such  
27 as *Benthomangelia*. In these cases, combining genetic and morphological analyses appears to  
28 be a robust method to propose hypotheses of species delimitations.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusion

In *Benthomangelia*, we demonstrated that the morphological characters analysed are congruent with the groups recognized by genetic analyses. They can thus be used in systematic to delimitate species and identify specimens. Furthermore, the use of reproducible methods, for both genetic and morphological analyses, will allow future tests of these hypotheses of species delimitation, including more replicates but also other species that are not represented here. The identification of taxonomically valuable morphological characters (i.e. genetically determined) is of particular interest for marine gastropods, where the majority of collected specimens are empty shells. In the perspective of a more complete assessment of species diversity of *Benthomangelia*, CVA analyses performed with genetically and morphologically characterized specimens can be used as a guideline to include in the same analysis empty shells for which DNA characters are not available.

## **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to Bertrand Richer de Forges, cruise leader of several deep-sea cruises of the *Tropical Deep Sea Benthos* programme on board R/V *Alis*, that generated the deep-sea samples used in this study. We are also pleased to thank the staff of MNHN's "Service de Systématique Moléculaire" for technical facilities; the Consortium National de Recherche en Génomique, Génoscope for the sequencing facilities, Allowen Evin, Raphaël Cornette and Vincent Debat ("Plateforme Morphométrie") for their help in the morphological analysis and Philippe Jarne for constructive comments on the manuscript. The authors thank Line Le Gall, Mandë Holford, Alan J. Kohn and two anonymous referees that greatly improved the quality of the manuscript.

## References

- Baker AM, Sheldon F, Somerville J, Walker KF, and Hughes JM. 2004.** Mitochondrial DNA phylogenetic structuring suggests similarity between two morphologically plastic genera of Australian freshwater mussels (Unionoida: Hyriidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **32**: 902-912.
- Baylac M, and Friess M. 2005.** Fourier descriptors, Procrustes superimpositions and data dimensionality: An example of cranial shape analysis in modern human populations. In: D.E. S, ed. *Modern Morphometrics in Physical Anthropology*. Chicago: Kluwer. 145-165.
- Bichain JM, Boisselier MC, Bouchet P, and Samadi S. 2007.** Delimiting species in the genus *Bythinella* (Mollusca: Caenogastropoda: Rissosoidea): molecular and morphometric approaches. *Malacologia* **49**: 291-311.
- Bookstein FL. 1991.** *Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data: Geometry and Biology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bouchet P. 1990.** Turrid genera and mode of development: the use and abuse of protoconch morphology. *Malacologia* **32**: 69-77.
- Bouchet P, Lozouet P, Maestrati P, and Héros V. 2002.** Assessing the magnitude of species richness in tropical marine environments : exceptionally high numbers of molluscs at a new Caledonian site. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **75**: 421-36.
- Bouchet P, and Sysoev A. 2001.** *Typhlosyrinx*-like tropical deep-water turritiform gastropods (Mollusca, Gastropoda, Conoidea). *Journal of Natural History* **35**: 1693-1715.
- Bouchet P, and Warén A. 1980.** Revision of the north-east Atlantic bathyal and abyssal Turridae (Mollusca, Gastropoda). *Journal of Molluscan Studies Suppl.* **8**: 1-19.
- Boyle EE, Zardus JD, Chasea MR, Etter RJ, and Rex MA. 2004.** Strategies for molecular genetic studies of preserved deep-sea macrofauna. *Deep-Sea Research I* **51**: 1319-1336.
- Brookes JI, and Rochette R. 2007.** Mechanism of a plastic phenotypic response: predator-induced shell thickening in the intertidal gastropod *Littorina obtusata*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **20**: 1015-1027.
- Chiu YW, Chen HC, Lee SC, and Chen CA. 2002.** Morphometric Analysis of Shell and Operculum Variations in the Viviparid Snail, *Cipangopaludina chinensis* (Mollusca: Gastropoda), in Taiwan. *Zoological Studies* **41**: 321-331.
- Darlu P, and Tassy P. 1993.** *La reconstruction phylogénétique. Concepts et méthodes*. Masson, Paris.
- De Queiroz K. 1998.** The general lineage concept of species, species criteria, and the process of speciation: a conceptual unification and terminological recommendations. In: Howard DJaB, S.H, ed. *Endless forms. Species and speciation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 57-75
- De Queiroz K. 2007.** Species Concepts and Species Delimitation. *Syst. Biol.* **56**: 879-886.
- Excoffier L, Laval G, and Schneider S. 2005.** Arlequin ver. 3.0: An integrated software package for population genetics data analysis. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics Online* **1**: 47-50.
- Ferguson JWH. 2002.** On the use of genetic divergence for identifying species. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **75**: 509-516.
- Floyd R, Abebe E, Papert A, and Blaxter M. 2002.** Molecular barcodes for soil nematode identification. *Molecular Ecology* **11**: 839-850.
- Folmer O, Black M, Hoeh W, Lutz R, and Vrijenhoek R. 1994.** DNA primers for amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology* **3**: 294-299.

- 1  
2  
3 **Funk DJ, and Omland KE. 2003.** Species-level Paraphyly and Polyphyly: Frequency,  
4 Causes, and Consequences, with Insights from Animal Mitochondrial DNA. *Annual*  
5 *Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **34**: 397-423.
- 6  
7 **Godfray HCJ. 2007.** Linnaeus in the information age. *Nature* **446**: 259-260.
- 8 **Hebert PDN, Cywinska A, Ball SL, and deWaard JR. 2003.** Biological identifications  
9 through DNA Barcodes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **270**: 313-21.
- 10 **Hickerson JH, Meyer CP, and Moritz C. 2006.** DNA Barcoding Will Often Fail to  
11 Discover New Animal Species over Broad Parameter Space. *Systematic Biology* **55**:  
12 729-739.
- 13  
14 **Hollander J, Collyer ML, Adams DC, and Johannesson K. 2006.** Phenotypic plasticity in  
15 two marine snails: constraints superseding life history. *Journal of Evolutionary*  
16 *Biology* **19**: 1861-1872.
- 17 **Huelsenbeck JP, Ronquist F, and Hall B. 2001.** MrBayes: bayesian inference of phylogeny.  
18 *Bioinformatics* **17**: 754-755.
- 19  
20 **Jovelin R, and Justine JL. 2001.** Phylogenetic relationships within the Polyopisthocotylean  
21 monogeneans (Plathyhelminthes) inferred from partial 28S rDNA sequences.  
22 *International Journal for Parasitology* **31**: 393-401.
- 23 **Knowles LL, and Carstens BC. 2007.** Delimiting Species without Monophyletic Gene  
24 Trees. *Systematic Biology* **56**: 887-895.
- 25  
26 **Mallet J. 2001.** The speciation revolution. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **14**: 887-888.
- 27 **Meyer PC, and Paulay G. 2005.** DNA Barcoding: Error rates based on comprehensive  
28 sampling. *PLoS Biology* **3**: 1-10.
- 29 **Monteiro A, Tenorio M, and Poppe G. 2004.** *The West African and Mediterranean species*  
30 *of Conus*. ConchBooks, Hackenheim.
- 31  
32 **Monti L, Baylac M, and Lalanne-Cassou B. 2001.** Elliptic Fourier analysis of the form of  
33 genitalia in two *Spodoptera* species and their hybrids (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae).  
34 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **72**: 391-400.
- 35 **Nichols R. 2001.** Gene trees and species trees are not the same. *Trends in Ecology &*  
36 *Evolution* **16**: 358-364.
- 37  
38 **Palmer AR. 1990.** Effect of crab effluent and scent of damaged conspecifics on feeding,  
39 growth, and shell morphology of the Atlantic dogwhelk *Nucella lapillus* (L.).  
40 *Hydrobiologia* **193**: 155-182.
- 41 **Pfenninger M, Cordellier M, and Streit B. 2006.** Comparing the efficacy of morphologic  
42 and DNA-based taxonomy in the freshwater gastropod genus *Radix*  
43 (Basommatophora, Pulmonata). *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **6**: 100.
- 44 **Pickles AR, and Grahame J. 1999.** Mate choice in divergent morphs of the gastropod  
45 mollusc *Littorina saxatilis* (Olivi): speciation in action? *Animal Behaviour* **58**: 181-  
46 184.
- 47  
48 **Posada D, and Crandall KA. 2001.** Selecting models of nucleotide substitution: an  
49 application to human immunodeficiency virus 1 (HIV-1). *Molecular Biology and*  
50 *Evolution* **18**: 897-906.
- 51  
52 **Puillandre N, Samadi S, Boisselier MC, Sysoev AV, Kantor YI, Cruaud C, Couloux A,**  
53 **and Bouchet P.** Starting to unravel the toxoglossan knot: Molecular phylogeny of the  
54 "turrids" (Neogastropoda: Conoidea). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*: In  
55 Press. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2007.11.007.
- 56  
57 **Ribi G, and Porter AH. 1995.** Mating between two hybridizing species, *Viviparus ater* and  
58 *V. contectus* (Mollusca: Prosobranchia). *Animal Behaviour* **49**: 1389-1398.
- 59 **Röckel D, Rolan E, and Monteiro A. 1980.** *Cone shells from Cape Verde Islands. A difficult*  
60 *puzzle*. . Feito.
- Rohlf FJ. 1996.** *TpsDig*. Available at Stony Brook, <http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/>.

- 1  
2  
3 **Samadi S, and Barberousse A. 2006.** The tree, the network, and the species. *Biological*  
4 *Journal of the Linnean Society* **89**: 509-521.
- 5 **Samadi S, Roumegoux A, Bargues MD, Mas-Coma S, Yong M, and Pointier JP. 2000.**  
6 Morphological studies of Lymnaeid snails from the human Fasciolasis endemic zone  
7 of Bolivia. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* **2000**: 31-44.
- 8 **Shuto T. 1974.** Larval ecology of prosobranch gastropods and its bearing on biogeography  
9 and paleontology. *Lethaia* **7**: 239-256.
- 10 **Sites JW, and Marshall JC. 2003.** Delimiting species: a Renaissance issue in systematic  
11 biology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **19**: 462-470.
- 12 **Sites JW, and Marshall JC. 2004.** Operational criteria for delimiting species. *Annual Review*  
13 *of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **35**: 199-227.
- 14 **Swofford DL. 2002.** PAUP\*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony\* and other methods. .  
15 Sunderland: Sinauer Associates.
- 16 **Sysoev AV. 1988.** Ultra-abysal findings of the family Turridae (Gastropoda, Toxoglossa) in  
17 the Pacific Ocean. *Zoologicheskii Zhurnal* **67**: 972.
- 18 **Sysoev AV, and Ivanov DL. 1985.** New taxa of the family Turridae (Gastropoda,  
19 Toxoglossa) from the Naska Ridge (south east Pacific). *Zoologicheskii Zhurnal* **64**:  
20 197.
- 21 **Taylor JD, Kantor YI, and Sysoev AV. 1993.** Foregut anatomy, feedings mechanisms and  
22 classification of the Conoidea (= Toxoglossa)(Gastropoda). *Bull. Nat. Hist. Mus. Lond*  
23 **59**: 125-70.
- 24 **Tucker JK. 2004.** Catalogue of recent and fossil turrids (Mollusca: Gastropoda). *Zootaxa*  
25 **682**: 1-1295.
- 26 **Vogler AP, and Monaghan MT. 2007.** Recent advances in DNA taxonomy. *Journal of*  
27 *Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research* **45**: 1-10.
- 28 **Wheeler QD, and Meier R. 2000.** *Species concepts and phylogenetic theory*. Columbia  
29 University Press, New-York.
- 30 **Yeap KL, Black R, and Johnson MS. 2001.** The complexity of phenotypic plasticity in the  
31 intertidal snail *Nodilittorina australis*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **72**:  
32 63-76.
- 33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure caption**

Figure 1: South-west Indo-Pacific map, with emphasis on Philippines (1), Solomon Islands (2) and Vanuatu (3). Sampling sites for each cruise are represented, with the same symbols used for CVA analyses (Figures 5, 6 and S2).

Figure 2: Outlines reconstructions with increasing number of harmonics indicated within outlines, for outline 1 (A) and outline 2 (B). The seven landmarks are represented on the original outline 1; only six landmarks were used for the second outline 2.

Figure 3: Histogram of genetic distances for COI gene.

Figure 4: Bayesian tree for combined dataset corresponding to both genes. Posterior Probabilities (superior to 0.5) are given for each node. Groups are numbered top downwards from 1 to 5. For each group and for each cruise within group, one shell is illustrated (numbered from 1 to 9).

Figure 5: CVA for the complete dataset. CVA for the first outline using genetic groups as grouping variable (A), CVA for the first outline using cruise of collection as grouping variable (B), CVA for the second outline using genetic groups as grouping variable (C), CVA for the second outline using cruise of collection as grouping variable (D). Superimposed outlines for minimum (dotted line) and maximum (full line) projections onto the two principal axes are represented.

Figure 6: CVA on the first outline for the genetic group 1. Superimposed outlines for minimum (dotted line) and maximum (full line) projections onto the two principal axes are represented.

Table 1: Identification number, cruise, station, depth, coordinates and species number as determined by the molecular analysis are given for each specimen. In the column COI and 28S, a cross indicates that the specimen has been successfully sequenced for the gene.

ID	Cruise	Station	Depth (min-max)	Latitude	Longitude	DNA group	COI	28S
17950	Aurora 07	CP2678	507-540m	14°46.54N	123°09.69E	2		x
17952	Aurora 07	CP2729	593-600m	15°19.04N	121°37.02E	2	x	x
17953	Aurora 07	CP2729	593-600m	15°19.04N	121°37.02E	2	x	x
17954	Aurora 07	CP2734	453-460m	15°56.41N	121°48.71E	2	x	x
17955	Aurora 07	CP2734	453-460m	15°56.41N	121°48.71E	2	x	x
17956	Aurora 07	CP2734	453-460m	15°56.41N	121°48.71E	2	x	x
17957	Aurora 07	CP2749	473m	15°56.38N	121°49.46E	2	x	x
17958	Aurora 07	CP2749	473m	15°56.38N	121°49.46E	2	x	x
17959	Aurora 07	CP2749	473m	15°56.38N	121°49.46E	2	x	x
17960	BOA 1	CP2427	745-827m	14°56.2'S	166°54.8'E	1	x	x
17961	BOA 1	CP2422	667-750m	14°55.1'S	166°55.4'E	1	x	x
17835	BOA 1	CP2462	618-641m	16°37.5'S	167°57.4'E	1	x	x
17962	BOA 1	CP2462	618-641m	16°37.5'S	167°57.4'E	1	x	x
17963	BOA 1	CP2462	618-641m	16°37.5'S	167°57.4'E	2	x	x
17964	BOA 1	CP2461	582-614m	16°35.5'S	167°57.9'E	1		x
17965	BOA 1	CP2461	582-614m	16°35.5'S	167°57.9'E	1	x	x
17966	Panglao 05	CP2333	584-596m	9°38.2'N	123°43.5'E	1	x	x
17967	Panglao 05	CP2334	606-631m	9°37.5'N	123°40.2'E	1	x	x
17968	Panglao 05	CP2358	569-583m	8°52.1'N	123°37.1'E	1	x	x
17969	Panglao 05	CP2388	762-786m	9°26.9'N	123°34.5'E	1	x	x
17970	Panglao 05	CP2388	762-786m	9°26.9'N	123°34.5'E	1	x	x
17971	Panglao 05	CP2388	762-786m	9°26.9'N	123°34.5'E	1	x	x
17972	Panglao 05	CP2381	259-280m	8°43.3'N	123°19.0'E	4	x	x
17973	Panglao 05	CP2384	624-647m	8°46.2'N	123°16.1'E	1	x	x
17974	Panglao 05	CP2386	2120-2149m	8°49.3'N	123°01.9'E	1	x	x
17975	Panglao 05	CP2389	784-786m	9°27.9'N	123°38.4'E	1	x	x
17976	Panglao 05	CP2388	762-786m	9°26.9'N	123°34.5'E	1	x	x
17977	Panglao 05	CP2389	784-786m	9°27.9'N	123°38.4'E	1	x	x
17978	Panglao 05	CP2389	784-786m	9°27.9'N	123°38.4'E	1	x	x
17979	Panglao 05	CP2392	242-400m	9°29.0'N	123°41.1'E	4	x	x
17980	Panglao 05	CP2396	609-673m	9°36.3'N	123°42.0'E	1	x	x
17981	Salomon 2	CP2268	632-640m	7°48.7'S	156°53.3'E	5	x	x
17982	Salomon 2	CP2175	579-585m	9°05.8'S	158°59.9'E	1	x	x
17983	Salomon 2	CP2219	650-836m	7°58.3'S	157°34.4'E	3	x	x
17984	Salomon 2	CP2219	650-836m	7°58.3'S	157°34.4'E	3	x	x
17985	Salomon 2	CP2182	762-1060m	8°47'0S	159°37.9'E	1	x	
17930	Salomon 2	CP2269	768-890m	7°45.1'S	156°56.3'E	3	x	x
17986	Salomon 2	CP2196	724-765m	8°25.6'S	159°25.9'E	1	x	x
17987	Salomon 2	CP2196	724-765m	8°25.6'S	159°25.9'E	1	x	x
17988	Salomon 2	CP2196	724-765m	8°25.6'S	159°25.9'E	1	x	x
17989	Salomon 2	CP2264	515-520m	7°52.4'S	156°51.0'E	1	x	x
17990	Salomon 2	CP2195	543-593m	8°25.5'S	159°26.4'E	1	x	x
17991	Salomon 2	CP2194	440-521m	8°24.8'S	159°26.7'E	1	x	
17992	Salomon 2	CP2213	495-650m	7°38.7'S	157°42.9'E	1	x	x
17993	Salomon 2	CP2213	495-650m	7°38.7'S	157°42.9'E	1	x	x
17994	Santo 06	AT105	408-444m	15°03.0'S	166°34.5'E	4	x	x
17925	Salomon 2	CP2227	508-522m	6°37.2'S	156°12.7'E	<i>Toxichochlespira</i>	x	x
17866	Panglao 04	S19	3-4m	9°42.1'N	123°51.4'E	<i>Mangelia</i>	x	x
17754	Panglao 04	R42	8-22m	9°37.1'N	123°52.6'E	<i>Turris</i>	x	x



Figure S1: Comparison of 28S and COI genetic distances for each specimen.




Figure S2: PCA for the complete dataset, with a visualisation of the genetic groups (A) and the cruise of collection (B). Only results for the first outline are are shown. Superimposed outlines for minimum (dotted line) and maximum (full line) projections onto the two principal axes are represented.








Figure S3: Plots of the shape of the last whorl of the shell as a function of the size. The five genetic groups are represented. Size of the shells was measured as the square root of the area.





**Figure 1: South-west Indo-Pacific map, with emphasis on Philippines (1), Solomon Islands (2) and Vanuatu (3). Sampling sites for each cruise are represented, with the same symbols used for CVA analyses (Figures 5, 6 and S2).**


99x102mm (300 x 300 DPI)



**Figure 2: Outlines reconstructions with increasing number of harmonics indicated within outlines, for outline 1 (A) and outline 2 (B). The seven landmarks are represented on the original outline 1; only six landmarks were used for the second outline 2.**


80x120mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




**Figure 3: Histogram of genetic distances for COI gene.**  
99x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review




**Figure 4: Bayesian tree for combined dataset corresponding to both genes. Posterior Probabilities (superior to 0.5) are given for each node. Groups are numbered top downwards from 1 to 5. For each group and for each cruise within group, one shell is illustrated (numbered from 1 to 9).  
 127x201mm (300 x 300 DPI)**



**Figure 5: CVA for the complete dataset. CVA for the first outline using genetic groups as grouping variable (A), CVA for the first outline using cruise of collection as grouping variable (B), CVA for the second outline using genetic groups as grouping variable (C), CVA for the second outline using cruise of collection as grouping variable (D). Superimposed outlines for minimum (dotted line) and maximum (full line) projections onto the two principal axes are represented.**

119x84mm (300 x 300 DPI)



**Figure 6: CVA on the first outline for the genetic group 1. Superimposed outlines for minimum (dotted line) and maximum (full line) projections onto the two principal axes are represented.**

99x69mm (300 x 300 DPI)